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BACKGROUND

On the February 20, 2020 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 (Balboa Park, Eastern Neighborhoods, Market Octavia, Rincon Hill, Transit Center, 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 Team. 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:
January 2020 Annual IPIC Report
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**INTRODUCTION**

The Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) is responsible for overseeing the implementation of eleven Area Plans, which taken together, are expected to create 34,000 housing units and 60,000 jobs over the next twenty to twenty-five years.

To help implement these Area Plans, the City created geographically based impact fees to fund infrastructure projects that serve the Plans’ new growth.

Since the creation of IPIC, the City has collected $251 million dollars of infrastructure-related impact fees and expects to collect $547 million dollars over the next ten years, of which $393 million is anticipated in the next five.

**MAP OF PLAN AREAS**

The Area Plans that IPIC implements includes Eastern Neighborhoods (comprised of separate Area Plans for East SoMa, Western SoMa, Central SoMa, Mission, Central Waterfront, and Showplace Square / Potrero), Market Octavia, Rincon Hill, Transit Center District, Balboa Park and Visitacion Valley (Visitacion Valley is comprised of the Executive Park Subarea Plan, the Schlage Lock master plan project, and the Sunnydale HOPE SF master plan project).

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
5. Administration
IPIC’s duties include identifying capital projects within the Area Plans for implementation, recommending funding amounts for these projects, facilitating intra-departmental collaboration, coordinating with the Area Plans’ Citizen Advisory Committees (CACs), and producing this annual report. The IPIC is chaired by Planning Department and includes representatives from the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), San Francisco Public Works Department (PW), Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE), Office of Public Finance (OPF) Mayor’s Office of Public Policy and Finance, and Capital Planning Committee, among other agencies.

This report serves as the annual progress report required by Administrative Code Article 36.4.

IPIC BUDGET CYCLE PROCESS
Each year, the IPIC updates capital plans for each Area Plan and makes recommendations for impact fee expenditure. 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, revenue projections, and anticipated 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.

TEN YEAR CAPITAL PLAN AND MINI-CAPITAL PLANS
Every other year, the expenditure plans and related mini-capital plans for each area are incorporated into the City’s Ten Year Capital Plan. The Mini-Capital Plans take a more comprehensive view of each Area Plan by looking at the full capital needs and planned expenditure beyond those projects funded by impact fees.

IPIC maintains an ongoing list of infrastructure projects for each plan area that includes projects originally identified in each respective plan area’s implementation documents along with new projects identified through ongoing Planning Department, IPIC, and community deliberation.

Capital Planning surveys the agencies to see the implementation readiness of these projects; the Ten Year Capital Plan then includes a discussion of the full capital need and funding plan for these Plan Areas.

These Mini-Capital Plans enable City staff and the community to have a fuller sense of the scope of needed growth-serving improvements, what is planned for implementation, and what funding still needs to be identified. These Plans also provide staff and the community with a prioritization tool that enables them to have a full sense of what planned and potential projects have already been identified, and what the trade-offs are when advocating for new projects.

TRENDS, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES
Slowing Of Revenue
In this past year, revenue came in more slowly than anticipated. As a result, many infrastructure projects for which funds were appropriated in FY19 have not received the funds as originally planned; most of the Expenditure Plans now show “appropriation deficits” for FY19, the most recently completed fiscal year.

In some cases, these “appropriation deficits” also carry forward to the current and upcoming fiscal years, due to downward adjustments to revenue projections. Because, revenue has not come in at the pace previously experienced, there is relatively fewer proposed new expenditures in FY21; this is to enable revenue to catch up with previously appropriated but yet-to-be funded projects.

Area Plan Expenditure Plans that show appropriation deficits are accompanied by a list of the yet-to-be funded projects and their unfunded balances.

Creation of new CAC
In this past year, the Board of Supervisors approved legislation creating the SoMa Community Advisory Committee (SoMa CAC). The SoMa CAC will advise the Department and other agencies on the implementation of the newly adopted Central SoMa Plan along with the existing East SoMa Plan and Western SoMa Plan. The existing Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee (EN CAC), which currently has jurisdiction over SoMa, will continue to have jurisdiction over the Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero and Central Waterfront (aka Dogpatch).

The SoMa CAC will be comprised of eleven members appointed by both the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. The CAC will have a varied composition of residents, small
business owners, open space advocates, complete streets and transit advocates, and operators of affordable housing and other community-serving organizations.

The enabling legislation empowers the new CAC to not only provide input on the programming of impact fees, but also to provide input of development proposals, open space, and other policy matters relevant to implementing the three South of Market Plans. The CAC is expected to be seated in early 2020.

Incorporating new EP for Central SoMa based on Central SoMa Implementation Plan

The Central SoMa Plan anticipates the creation of $2.1 billion worth of community benefits over the next 25 years. Because the new SoMa CAC has yet to be seated, this year’s IPIC Report does not include a full Expenditure Plan for SoMa. Rather identifies expenditures for FY21 that:

1. carries forward those IPIC line items previously identified in previous years’ EN Expenditure Plans, and
2. provides general appropriations in FY21 for the Recreation and Parks Department, MTA, and Public Works to cover initial staff costs to plan and design various infrastructure projects called out in the Central SoMa Plan.

Over the next year, Planning will work with the new CAC and the agencies in creating a full SoMa expenditure plan for the next five years.

The HUB Implementation Plan

Planning staff anticipates the approval of the Market Octavia Plan Amendments (previously identified as “The HUB”) within the next six months.

These Plan amendments will enable the creation of 1,700 additional residential units within the portion of Market Octavia centered around the Market Street and Van Ness intersection.

The additional development capacity is expected to generate $300M in Market Octavia impact fee revenue (inclusive of affordable housing-related fees). That additional revenue is anticipated to fund a wide range of complete streets, transit and open space projects. This year’s MO IPIC Expenditure Plan reflects the new revenue and expenditures enabled by these Plan Amendments.

Level-of-Service and Nexus Reports

The Planning Department and the Office of Resiliency and Capital Planning are currently working on the update to the Level-of-Service Report and the Nexus Analysis, which together, provide policy guidance in planning infrastructure for new growth and assure that the City’s impact fees are legally justifiable in accordance with the California Fee Mitigation Act.

The Reports are anticipated to be complete spring 2020; the completion of the Reports will be followed by legislation that at a minimum, will tie the current fee rates to the new analysis. This legislation could also potentially add new fees for library and Fire Department infrastructure and revise category distribution of the existing fees.

Southeast Framework

The Planning Department and the Office of Resiliency and Capital Planning completed an assessment of community facilities needs in the southeast part of San Francisco given the expected growth. This framework includes a growth analysis for seven community facility types, existing standards, and opportunities and recommendations for how the City might think about community facility needs in the southeast through 2040.
AREA PLAN REPORTS

The following Chapters provide summaries of 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. The projects included are:

1. BALBOA PARK

2. EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS
   - East Soma,
   - Western Soma,
   - Mission,
   - Central Waterfront,
   - Showplace Square / Potrero

3. MARKET AND OCTAVIA

4. RINCON HILL

5. TRANSIT CENTER

6. VISITATION VALLEY
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 $2,707,000 in impact fee revenue in the Plan Area through Fiscal Year 2025.

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 on actual development projects in the pipeline and expected additional development project in future years. The expected revenues that are generated will be allocated to the appropriate agencies to fund streetscape, open space or other projects in the plan area.

Due to the several ongoing planning efforts and projected funding needs beyond the scale of projected impact fees, the IPIC has been allocating enhancement funds to close funding gaps and complete agency projects that further the goals of the area plan.

Despite the minimal impact fees, the Balboa Park Station Area continues to be a focus of ongoing improvement and future planning to increase the safety, access and mobility improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders particularly along the Ocean and Geneva Corridor. To that end, several transportation plans and projects were recently completed, while still others get closer to implementation. In addition to transportation projects, the City College Facilities Master Plan was recently completed, while the Balboa Reservoir, and the Upper Yard project are all in planning. Additional projects are summarized below.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROJECTS

- Pedestrian safety and access to Balboa Park Station continues to be one of the highest community priorities. The Ocean and Geneva Corridor Design, from Frida Kahlo Way to San Jose, includes concept designs to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety along Ocean Avenue; realign the Ocean/FKW/Geneva intersection; and add bike facilities, pedestrian bulbouts, trees, and lighting. Planning and implementing agencies will continue collaborating to secure capital funds for implementation.

- The Ocean Avenue Safety Project builds on the public input provided to the Ocean and Geneva Corridor Design and Balboa Reservoir projects. It aims to improve the safety, accessibility, and comfort for people traveling on Ocean Avenue, specifically between Geneva Avenue / Frida Kahlo Way (Phelan Avenue) and San Jose Avenue. The project will focus on a variety of traffic safety improvements – ranging from nearer-term changes that can be implemented with inexpensive ‘paint and posts’ to larger infrastructure changes that would necessitate significant capital changes to right-of-way.

- The Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue Intersection Study is a planning-level study to develop conceptual designs to enhance multimodal connectivity at the intersection and adjacent transit facilities. The work is being coordinated with the Upper Yard Development, BART station projects and other adjacent projects. The SFMTA has developed a conceptual configuration for the M Line pick-up/drop-off on San Jose Avenue south of Geneva Avenue which is being discussed with various stakeholder groups. Project outreach was conducted in 2019. A report is expected to be submitted to the SFCTA for final review in early 2020.

- The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) is planning to realign the I-280 Southbound Off-Ramp at Ocean Ave to improve safety along Ocean Ave at the intersection. The SFCTA is working closely with Caltrans to complete the environmental phase. The project team submitted the revised PSR/PR which is in final review with Caltrans. Caltrans has requested an additional study of adjacent area along the I-280 Freeway. The design phase is anticipated to start in 2020 and construction phase in 2021.

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 housing and open space is planned for the site. OEWD and the Planning Department are working with a developer team, who submitted an environmental evaluation application in the fall of 2018. The draft EIR was published in July 2019, and the EIR certification and project approval hearings are anticipated in the spring and summer of 2020.

- 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 took place in 2017. The 2018 approved design includes 130 units of affordable
housing, ground floor commercial, community serving spaces and a child care facility. Construction is expected to start in January 2021.

» 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. In Spring 2019, City College adopted the FMP and is planning to begin environmental review on expected facility improvements in early 2020.
### Balboa Park - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY 21 - 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,667,000</td>
<td>$ 2,600</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLETE STREETS</strong></td>
<td>$ 255,000</td>
<td>$ 7,600</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 23,500</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 161,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE</strong></td>
<td>$ 196,000</td>
<td>$ 6,800</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,900</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 129,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILD CARE</strong></td>
<td>$ 114,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,300</td>
<td>$ 18,200</td>
<td>$ 18,200</td>
<td>$ 18,200</td>
<td>$ 62,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMIN</strong></td>
<td>$ 24,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 6,100</td>
<td>$ 6,100</td>
<td>$ 6,100</td>
<td>$ 21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,267,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 61,800</td>
<td>$ 121,400</td>
<td>$ 121,400</td>
<td>$ 121,400</td>
<td>$ 426,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total In-Kind Value</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,579,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Value</strong></td>
<td>$ 682,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation / Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,650,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit: Planning and Near-Term Improvements Enhancement Fund</strong></td>
<td>$ 71,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian, Bicycle and Streetscape Enhancement Fund</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,579,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,600</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 55,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Balance Per Year</strong></td>
<td>$ 19,600</td>
<td>$ 19,600</td>
<td>$ 27,600</td>
<td>$ 34,400</td>
<td>$ 59,200</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 122,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Complete Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$ 7,600</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 235,00</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 161,800</td>
<td>$ 424,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 260,000</td>
<td>$ 34,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian, Bicycle and Streetscape Enhancement Fund</strong></td>
<td>$ 260,000</td>
<td>$ 34,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 260,000</td>
<td>$ 34,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 23,500</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 46,100</td>
<td>$ 141,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Balance Per Year</strong></td>
<td>$ (26,400)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Cumulative Balance Per Year</strong></td>
<td>$ (26,400)</td>
<td>$ (26,400)</td>
<td>$ (31,400)</td>
<td>$ (73,000)</td>
<td>$ 84,300</td>
<td>$ 139,400</td>
<td>$ 139,400</td>
<td>$ 268,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recreation and Open Space

### Child Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Balance Per Year</th>
<th>Category Cumulative Balance Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,000$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,700)$</td>
<td>3,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,200$</td>
<td>6,200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,900$</td>
<td>18,100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,255$</td>
<td>36,355$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Program Administration

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$2,261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$2,232,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$2,464,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$2,648,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>$2,855,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>$3,049,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>$3,264,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$2,091,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$2,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$2,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>$2,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>$2,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>$2,440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Surplus (Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$191,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$284,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$471,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$715,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>$999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>$1,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>$1,814,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>$2,239,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Balboa Park Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Pipeline Net Units</th>
<th>Commercial Pipeline Net Gross Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 100</td>
<td>10,000 – 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 500</td>
<td>100,001 – 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Balboa Park Projects:

1. Unity Plaza
2. Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design
3. Ingleside Library Garden
4. Lee Avenue and Brighten Avenue Extension Plazas
5. Balboa Park Station Area and Plaza Improvements
6. Geneva Car Barn
BALBOA PARK

1. Balboa Reservoir Proposed Site Plan
2. Balboa Park Eastside Connection Project
3. Balboa Park Eastside Connection Project
4. Geneva Car Barn and Powerhouse Renovation Construction
5. Geneva Car Barn and Powerhouse Renovation Construction
6. Geneva Car Barn and Powerhouse Renovation Construction

Photo credits: (1) Reservoir Community Partners; (2-3) BART; (4-6) Aidlin + Darling Design
EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

BACKGROUND AND HIGHLIGHTS

Eastern Neighborhoods (EN) Area Plan (originally comprised of East SoMa, Western SoMa, the Mission, Showplace Square / Potrero, and Central Waterfront (aka Dogpatch)), 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), made available previously industrial neighborhoods to mixed use development, and set forth policies that require new mixed use and residential neighborhoods be developed as complete neighborhoods.

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.

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 the Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan.

Ongoing Planning

THE CENTRAL SOMA PLAN

The Central Soma Plan, which was approved in late 2018, enables greater development potential within the portions of South of Market in close proximity to the Central Subway alignment. The Plan includes 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 32,500 jobs and 8,800 housing units above what would have been created under previous 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.

For the upcoming fiscal year, IPIC is proposing to limit SoMa appropriations to

- projects for which FY21 appropriations had been anticipated when they were included in the EN Expenditure Plan in previous cycles;
- small amounts for MTA and Public Works to be able to help prioritize projects and ready them for construction; and
- $25 million for Gene Friend given its high priority status for SoMa.

CENTRAL WATERFRONT / DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN

In 2018, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors approved the Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan and associated General Plan amendments. 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 includes an analysis of the neighborhood’s open space and streetscape needs. For the Complete Streets portion of the Public Realm Plan, SF Public Works is working with the community to further defining project scopes and prioritize improvements for implementation.
The Plan can be found here:

https://sf-planning.org/
central-waterfront-dogpatch-public-realm-plan

THE SHOWPLACE / SOMA NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION STUDY (SNACS)
Several area plans and projects are positioning the Showplace/SoMa area for long-term change. The SNACS will identify strategies to coordinate these efforts, including potential opportunities to support neighborhood goals for increasing housing, PDR jobs and public space access.

The study will identify strategies to create a cohesive urban design between neighborhood plans, while analyzing opportunities to create:

- additional market-rate and affordable housing
- capacity for PDR jobs
- a seamless network of open spaces and walkable streets.

The Study will produce:

- a guiding policy report;
- recommendations and/or Planning Code updates to implement policies; and
- a feasibility analysis.

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES
The EN CAC started meeting on a monthly basis in October 2009. The CAC, originally comprised of 19 members, is now comprised of eleven members appointed by the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor. The CAC focus on implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Program and priority projects.

This past year, the CAC provided Planning Department input on coordinating upcoming Central Soma infrastructure projects mostly around creation of a new Soma specific CAC, which passed the Board of Supervisors in October. Through this process, the CAC honed their own input process to assure that their concerns are well documented and can be specifically addressed. The CAC began an effort to look and analyze the effectiveness of IPIC/CAC funding of completed projects.

The CAC endorsed the 2021-2025 EN IPIC Expenditure Plan with specific conditions and concerns expressed in their correspondence to IPIC attached to this Report as Appendix 2.

As alluded to above, the EN CAC previously had jurisdiction over SoMa along with the Mission, Showplace / Potrero and Central Waterfront. With the creation of the new SoMa CAC, the EN CAC now only has jurisdiction over the three later neighborhoods.
## Eastern Neighborhoods

**Mission, SP/Potrero, Central Waterfront/Dogpatch** - IPIC Expenditure Plan FY21 - FY25

### Revenue
- **Housing**: $1,765,000, $669,000, $962,000, $208,000, $5,631,000, -$, $6,801,000, $9,235,000, -$, $9,235,000
- **Transportation / Transit**: $12,865,292, $2,182,000, $724,000, $1,017,000, ..., $7,052,000, $10,220,000, $25,267,292, $2,248,000, $27,515,292
- **Complete Streets**: $13,261,914, $3,005,000, $1,054,000, $2,434,000, ..., $8,276,000, $14,857,000, $31,123,914, $5,550,000, $36,673,914
- **Recreation and Open Space**: $22,557,612, $3,725,000, $1,338,000, $3,505,000, ..., $7,874,000, $17,811,000, $44,093,612, $7,995,000, $52,088,612
- **Childcare**: $3,155,697, $518,000, $174,000, $482,000, ..., $1,200,000, $2,450,000, $6,123,697, $1,106,000, $7,229,697
- **Admin**: $2,639,867, $531,000, $224,000, $403,000, ..., $1,285,000, $2,746,000, $5,916,867, $893,000, $6,809,867

### Expenditure
- **Housing**: $1,589,000, $669,000, $962,000, $208,000, ..., $6,801,000, $9,059,000, $9,059,000
- **Transportation / Transit**: $17,844,000, $2,575,000, $985,000, $-,-, ..., $21,404,000, $985,000, $21,404,000
- **Complete Streets**: $1,418,000, $-,-, $-,-, $-,-, ..., $1,418,000, $1,418,000, $1,418,000
- **Recreation and Open Space**: $290,000, $-,-, $-,-, $-,-, ..., $290,000, $290,000, $290,000
- **Childcare**: $150,000, $-,-, $-,-, $-,-, ..., $150,000, $150,000, $150,000
- **Admin**: $150,000, $-,-, $-,-, $-,-, ..., $150,000, $150,000, $150,000

### Category Balance Per Year - Non-Soma
- $176,000, $-, $-, $-, $-, ..., $176,000, $176,000, $176,000

### Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma
- $176,000, $176,000, $176,000, $176,000, ..., $176,000, $176,000, $176,000

### Transportation / Transit
- **Expenditure**: $15,000,000, $2,000,000, $500,000, $500,000, ..., $18,000,000, $18,000,000, $21,000,000
- **Revenue**: $15,000,000, $2,000,000, $500,000, $500,000, ..., $18,000,000, $18,000,000, $21,000,000
- **Category Balance Per Year**: $7,006,708, $-393,000, $-261,000, $-7,052,000, ..., $7,052,000, $8,458,000, $1,058,292, $2,248,000, $3,306,292
## Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission, SP/Potrero, Central Waterfront/Dogpatch) - IRC Expenditure Plan FY21 - FY25

### Complete Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Non-Soma</th>
<th>Through FY19</th>
<th>FY21 (Current Year)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY21 - FY25</th>
<th>Through FY25</th>
<th>Through FY30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Non-Soma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,261,914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22nd Street Green Connections</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Central Waterfront Short Term Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycler, and Streetscape Enhancement Fund</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$2,939,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Loop Phase 1 (17th Street)</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Central Waterfront/Dogpatch, Showplace/Potrero Streetscape Project</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$6,132,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure Non-Soma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,466,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Balance Per Year - Non-Soma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$204,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,040,914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recreation and Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Non-Soma</th>
<th>Through FY19</th>
<th>FY21 (Current Year)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY21 - FY25</th>
<th>Through FY25</th>
<th>Through FY30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Non-Soma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,657,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>17th and Folsom Park</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$2,710,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Franklin Square Par-Course</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$2,710,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Potrero Recreation Center</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mission Recreation Center*</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$1,880,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Jackson Playground**</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$3,224,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Garfield Square Aquatic Center</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$6,132,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Just Communities **</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$1,427,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Central Waterfront Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Expert Park</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The Loop Phase 1 (Cal Trans ROW)</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Community Challenge Grant</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bond Planning and Implementation</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Childcare

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Balance Per Year - Non-Soma</th>
<th>Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>$3,155,697</td>
<td>$(1,424,320)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Balance Per Year - Non-Soma</th>
<th>Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>$4,580,017</td>
<td>$(1,424,320)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

- The cummulative deficits (Line 72, Fiscal Years 2019 through 2021) are appropriation deficits and not cash. Having an appropriation deficit means that some previously appropriated projects need to wait for additional revenue before receiving cash. See the attached list for previously and currently appropriated projects that have not yet received cash.
EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS APPROPRIATED PROJECTS FOR WHICH CASH HAS NOT BEEN TRANSFERRED
Projects listed in general priority order for transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPIC LINE ITEM</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE TITLE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>OWED AT END OF FY19</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR APPROPRIATION)</th>
<th>TOTAL OWED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN-9</td>
<td>16th Street / 22-Fillmore Improvements</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 2,575,000</td>
<td>$ 2,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-49</td>
<td>Community Challenge Grant</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-48</td>
<td>The Loop Phase 1 (CalTrans ROW)</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-29</td>
<td>Central Waterfront/Dogpatch, Showplace/Potrero Streetscape Project</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>$ 4,536,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,536,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-15</td>
<td>Transit Enhancement Fund</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$ 326,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-40</td>
<td>Mission Recreation Center</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$ 940,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-41</td>
<td>Jackson Playground</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-46</td>
<td>Central Waterfront Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 2,256,000</td>
<td>$ 2,756,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-39</td>
<td>Gene Friend / Soma Recreation Center</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$ 650,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 9,202,000</td>
<td>$ 5,031,000</td>
<td>$ 14,233,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eastern Neighborhoods Projects

9. 16th Street Streetscape Improvements
10. 2nd Street Improvements
11. Folsom Street / Howard Street Improvements
12. 22nd Street Green Connections Improvements
13. Potrero Avenue Improvements
16. Ringold Alley Improvements
25. Bartlett Street / Mission Mercado Improvements
26. Central Waterfront Short Term Improvements (Bridge Lighting)
28. The Loop Street and Open Space
29. Central Waterfront/Dogpatch and Showplace Potrero Streetscapes
34. Chan Kaajal Park (17th and Folsom)
36. South Park Rehabilitation
38. Potrero Recreation Center Improvements
39. Gene Friend Park Rehabilitation
40. Mission Rec Center Rehabilitation
41. Jackson Playground Rehabilitation
42. Garfield Square Aquatic Center
43. Juri Commons
44. Jose Coronado Playground
45. 11th Street Park (New Soma Park)
46. Central Waterfront Recreation and Open Space
47. Esprit Park Rehabilitation
49. Community Challenge Grant
   a. Tunnel Top Park
   b. Angel Alley
   c. Connecticut Friendship Garden
   d. Fallen Bridge Park
   e. Potrero and Dogpatch Greening
51. Daggett Park
52. Dogpatch Park Plaza
53. Eagle Plaza
59. Potrero Kids Child Care Center
EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

1. Garfield Pool Construction
2. Franklin Square Improvements
3. Gene Friend Rendering
4. Espirit on-site Workshop
5. Potrero Recreation Center
6. Espirit Public Realm Plan Rendering
7. 22nd Street Improvements

Photo credits: (1-5) RPD; (6) Fletcher Studio; (7) DPW
Eastern Neighborhoods  
Project Descriptions

2ND STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP/EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10, 23 AND 24)

The Second Street Improvement project is intended to transform the Second Street corridor in the east South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood into a pedestrian and bicycle friendly complete street, consistent with the vision identified by the community in the East SoMa Area Plan.

The Plan identified Second Street as a primary pedestrian, bicycle, and transit thoroughfare and a green connector for the neighborhood. The Project consists of the following features between Market and King Streets:

- one-way cycle track bicycle facilities in the northbound and southbound directions
- transit boarding islands at most transit stops along with planted medians;
- ADA-compliant curb ramps
- street trees
- site furnishings (trash receptacles, bike racks, benches, and pedestrian lighting)
- curb-to-curb roadway grinding and repaving

In order to achieve the complete street along the corridor, the travel lanes along Second Street will be reduced to two in each direction, restrict left-hand turn lanes at most intersections, widen sidewalks from 10-feet to 15-feet between Harrison and Townsend Streets. It should be noted that because 2nd Street travels through both the Eastern Neighborhoods and the Transit District Area Plans, funds from both impact fees are being used to fund this project.

Project Origin:
East SoMa Area Plan, San Francisco Bicycle Plan; EN Area Plan Implementation Maps

Project Status and Delivery:

Project is under construction and has four segments of phasing: Segment 1 (Market to Folsom streets), Segment 2 (Bryant to Townsend streets), Segment 3 (Folsom to Bryant streets) and Segment 4 (Townsend to King streets). Utility undergrounding, bus island construction and sidewalk improvements are underway.

Total Costs:
Approximately $40 million

IPIC Funds:
$4.9 million in FY 19 and prior for streetscape elements within the Eastern Neighborhoods boundaries.

16TH STREET / 22-FILLMORE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 9)

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.

The project is being phased with ongoing construction scheduled to finish on Phase 1 between Potrero Avenue and 3rd Street in Spring of 2020 and construction scheduled to begin on Phase 2 between Church Street and Potrero Avenue in Spring of 2020.

The project will include transit only lanes, accessible pedestrian signals and visible crosswalks, new bus shelters and boarding islands, bus bulbs for easier/safer boarding, bus priority traffic signals, and new trees and streetscape improvements.

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. Phase 1 between Potrero Avenue and 3rd Street is currently under construction.

Total Costs:
Approximately $78 million for both phases

IPIC Funds:
$21.4 million total; $2,575,000 in FY 20
FOLSOM STREET / HOWARD STREET STREETSCAPE PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 11 AND 21)

The project includes Howard between 11th and 4th (3rd to 4th will be a future phase) and Folsom between 11th and 2nd. The project will include two-way protected bikeways, a transit only lane on Folsom, bulbouts, traffic signal upgrades, new mid-block traffic signals, and public realm improvements.

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:
The Folsom-Howard Streetscape Project collaborated with community stakeholders to implement near-term safety improvements while designing a long-term future for this critical corridor. Near-Term improvements were installed in early 2018 and again in 2019 to improve safety in SoMa before the long-term designs are implemented.

The first near-term improvements to Folsom were installed in early 2018 from 11th to Falmouth (between 6th and 5th. Safety enhancements included parking-protected bikeways; increased yellow zones to provide additional space for commercial loading and reduce the frequency of double parking; boarding islands to reduce conflicts between the 12-Folsom and bicycle riders while decreasing travel time and improving reliability; “daylighting” by using red zones near crosswalks to improve the visibility of everyone using the street.

In Winter of 2019 the SFMTA built on those changes taking new measures on Howard Street similar to those already made on Folsom Street. These changes included installing a parking-protected bike lane, more loading zones and daylighting intersections. A huge success of the project was the level of outreach conducted with the public.

110 business were canvassed and gave input on loading conditions on these two streets. The public has had 6 open house sessions to provide input on public realm improvements, transportation improvements, and how the project can reflect the identity of the community (specifically the Filipino community, Youth and Family Special Use District, and Leather and LGBTQ Cultural District).

The project entered detailed design in October 2019. Construction is planned to commence in 2022.

Total Costs:
$91,000,000

IPIC Funds:
$6.83 million are programmed in FY 20 and 21. Costs may cover any aspect of design, engineering or construction. A total IPIC appropriation is approximately $27 million.

22ND STREET GREEN CONNECTION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 12 AND 22)

Streetscape improvements along 22nd Street in the Dogpatch neighborhood between Illinois Street and Pennsylvania includes new pedestrian lighting, paving, corner bulb-outs, new street trees and drought tolerate planting, and decorative cross walk treatments.

Project Origin:
GreenTrust SF 22nd Street Master Plan; 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:
Complete

Total Costs:
Approximately $4.5 million

IPIC Funds:
$3.8 million (including $650 thousand from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancement Fund); Funds appropriated in 2017 and prior

POTRERO AVENUE STREETSCAPE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 13)

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:**
Complete

**Total Costs:**
Approximately $19.8 million

**IPIC Funds:**
$1.4 million in FY 17 and prior

**TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE NO. 15)**
This fund was created to enable flexible, nimble and strategic spending of Eastern Neighborhood transit dollars. The funds are to provide MTA 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 for transit projects upon request and after consultation with IPIC and the EN CAC.

**PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND STREETScape ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 14 AND 27)**
This fund was created to enable flexible, nimble, and strategic spending of Eastern Neighborhood transportation dollars in the short term. 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 projects generally include, but are not limited to, streetscape projects that are being identified in the Central Waterfront Dogpatch Public Realm Plan.

$650,000 has gone toward 22nd Street as previously described; $689,000 will go toward Treat Plaza; and $300,000 for new streetscaping on Minnesota Street.

**Total Costs:**
$2,939,000 total

**IPIC Funds:**
$2,939,000 total

**DOGPATCH / CENTRAL WATERFRONT AND SHOWPLACE / POTRERO STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 29)**
This IPIC line item was created to set aside funds for Central Waterfront and Showplace/Potrero streetscape projects. The Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan has been completed and documents the need for streetscape improvements throughout the Dogpatch neighborhood.

As a next step, Public Works is working with the community on identifying and scoping projects for implementation. While funds within this project can also be spent on Showplace / Potrero street projects, IPIC and the CAC indicated a desire to have funds spent in Dogpatch as an initial priority given the readiness of Dogpatch projects.

The Minnesota Streetscape project will install sidewalks and streetscape elements (trees, lighting, etc.) along the east side of Minnesota from 23rd to 25th Streets in Dogpatch. The project will also make modifications to the existing linear green space known as Minnesota Grove.

**Project Origin:**
Dogpatch / Central Waterfront Public Realm Plan; Showplace Square Open Space Plan

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Public Realm Plan completed 2018. Minnesota Streetscape project is in the schematic design phase.

**Total Costs:**
TBD; $4.5M for Minnesota Streetscape Project

**IPIC Funds:**
$10,210,000 total; $6,133,000 in FY 2020
POTRERO GATEWAY PROJECT (PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO AS “THE LOOP”) (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48)

The Potrero Gateway (previously referred to as “The Loop”) project consists of a series of open space and streetscape improvements under and around Highway 101 on 17th Street between Vermont and San Bruno.

**Project Origin:**
Community sponsored and proposed project

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Schematic Design Phase

**Total Costs:**
$2.8 million

**IPIC Funds:**
$1,800,000 ($300,000 from FY17 Ped and Bike Fund)

TREAT PLAZA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 29.1)

The project will improve safety, comfort, and mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, and motorists. The sidewalk will be extended farther into the intersection, and planters will offer decorative seating, and provide a protective barrier to traffic.

**Project Origin:**
The Project was envisioned as part of the Mission District Master Streetscape Plan.

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Design Phase

**Total Costs:**
$2 million

**IPIC Funds:**
$1.1 million

IN CHAN KAAJAL PARK (17TH STREET AND FOLSOM STREET) (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 34)

This new .8 acre park located at 17th and Folsom Street in the Mission District includes a children’s play area, demonstration community 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:**
Complete

**Total Costs:**
$7.2 million

**IPIC Funds:**
$3.16 million appropriated in 2016 and prior

SOUTH PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 35)

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.

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

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Complete

**Total Costs:**
$3.7 million

**IPIC Funds:**
$1.5 million appropriated prior to 2017
FRANKLIN SQUARE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 36)
The project is to construct new fitness equipment, and lighting improvements.

Project Origin:
The EN CAC requested Rec and Park identify and implement a set of smaller park projects that could be implemented quickly.

Total Costs:
$451,000

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete, open to public August 2019.

IPIC Funds:
$210,000

POTRERO RECREATION CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 38)
The project is to provide a safe well lit trail from Missouri Street through the park to Wisconsin Street. The project also includes a full renovation of the natural turf ball fields, new field furnishings, ADA upgrades, irrigation and grading work for drainage improvements, and improved Dog Play Area.

Project Origin:
2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond and community request for improved trail lighting for Walking School Bus Route

Total Costs:
$5.8 million

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete, open to public September 2019

IPIC Funds:
$1.3 million total through FY19 [IPIC Report says 1.08M]

GENE FRIEND / SOMA RECREATION CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 39)
Gene Friend / Soma Recreation Center is located at Folsom Street and 6th Street and is largely comprised of a single-story recreational facility. The proposal is to demolish the existing structure and construct a two-story recreational center along with new outdoor amenities, including the outdoor basketball court, expanded multi-use spaces, and playground.

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

Project Status and Delivery:
Recreation and Park Commission approved the concept design in September 2019. Construction is anticipated to begin summer 2021.

Total Costs:
$61 million

IPIC Funds:
$2.8 million FY18 and prior
$25 million in future years from Central SoMa

MISSION RECREATION CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 40)
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 include relocation of the play equipment and expanding the sports court.

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
JACKSON PLAYGROUND (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 41)
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 to scope a rehabilitation of the park, which could include reconfiguring the site by relocating the clubhouse and adding unprogrammed open 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:
$1.6 million FY17 and prior; (IPIC contribution to act as seed funds for later additional funds).

GARFIELD SQUARE AQUATICS CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 42)
The project includes the full renovation of the existing pool building into a higher-capacity Aquatics Center by demolishing and replacing the adjacent clubhouse building. The newly reconfigured aquatic center will include a shared entry lobby to access the pool facility and clubhouse, a new multi-purpose courtyard, new and restored murals and, improved park accessibility and new landscaping.

Project Origin:
Identified as a Let’sPlaySF! site and Community Opportunity Fund project from the 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond

Project Status and Delivery:
Construction planned to begin spring 2020.

Total Costs:
$1.6 million

IPIC Funds:
$825,000 total; $175,000 in FY 21

11TH STREET PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 45)
Recreation and Park executed a purchase and sale agreement to acquire 11th and Natoma, where they plan to build a new park. Currently working with staff to identify project schedule and start feasibility analysis.

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

Project Status and Delivery:
Site was officially acquired in early 2018 with Open Space funds. Design and community engagement expected to begin in 2020. Existing leases in the buildings extend to September 2021. The Department plans to begin park construction shortly after expiration of the leases.

Total Costs:
$22 million for acquisition and park creation
IPIC Funds:
$8.8 million in FY 18 and prior; $3,039,298 scheduled for FY 22 from Market Octavia Impact Fee

CENTRAL WATERFRONT OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 46)

This line item was created to set aside sufficient funds for Central Waterfront open space rehabilitation projects or new projects. Projects for which these funds could be used include, but are not limited to, Esprit Park, Woods Yard, the Minnesota Grove, and Warm Water Cove.

Project Origin:
Original Implementation Document

Project Status and Delivery:
This line item was kept flexible to enable further scoping and prioritization with the community.

Total Costs:
TBD

IPIC Funds:
$2.8 million in FY 20

ESPRIT PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 47)

Proposed improvements to Esprit Park include replacement of aging out trees, children’s play elements, upgrading or replacing the par course, drainage, irrigation, and ADA upgrades, and accommodations for dog play.

Project Origin:
Original Implementation Document (the document planned for one rehabilitation project and one new park in each of the EN Neighborhoods); Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
Conceptual design and community engagement in process. Concept plan anticipated spring 2020.

Total Costs:
$7.7 million

IPIC Funds:
$2.7 million FY 18 and Prior

COMMUNITY CHALLENGE GRANT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 49)

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. Three rounds of grants have been announced in the first two years of this programming, which include six community projects in Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill. These projects include:

» Tunnel Top Park
» Angel Alley
» Connecticut Friendship Garden
» Fallen Bridge Park
» Progress Park
» Dogpatch and Potrero Sidewalk Landscaping

Project Origin:
EN CAC

Project Status and Delivery:
Ongoing. One to two rounds of applications and grants are offered each year.

Total Costs:
$200,000 / year

IPIC Funds:
$200,000 / year
CHILD CARE (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 57)

The Eastern Neighborhood Plan calls for the construction of new child care facilities to meet the needs of future residents and employees. To spend the funds, IPIC delegates the Office of Early Child Education (OECE) to work with child care operators to identify new opportunities for child care in the plan area, to develop new facilities and increase access. In 2018, OECE issued a Notice of Availability of Funds and selected the Mission Neighborhood Center to receive $1.2 million to go toward the acquisition/renovation of a new site at 1240 Valencia Street.

Project Origin:
EN Implementation Document

Project Status and Delivery:
Ongoing

IPIC Funds:
In general, OECE receives IPIC EN funds on a formulaic basis based on 6.5% on EN impact fees paid by residential projects, and 2% paid by non-residential projects. Approximately $4.1 million has been appropriated through FY 19. The Child Care category is expected to receive $250,000 in FY 21.

POTRERO KIDS CHILD CARE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 59)

Project Description:
A daycare center at the Potrero Launch development project was established through an in-kind agreement and opened three years ago. It provides 62 child care slots.

Project Origin:
EN Implementation Document;

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete

Total Costs:
$1,916,000
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. From 2008 through the end of 2017, nearly 2,900 net new units have been added in the Plan Area; of these, about 760 units are affordable Below Market Rate (BMR) rental or ownership units, representing roughly 25 percent of new units delivered to date. Another 56 development projects, totaling approximately 4,700 units, were in the Planning Department’s development pipeline as of the second quarter of 2018, 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 “SOMA-West.” 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 as well as new projects to serve new development in the Hub area.

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 informed recommendations for new land use and heights controls, designs for the public realm and a public benefits package.

The DEIR was released in July 2019 and the project is expected to be before the Planning Commission in March 2020.

More information, visit the project website: http://sf-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 $44.3 million in revenue from this fee over the next five fiscal years (July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2025).

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 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 $33.2 million over the next five years, for a combined total of roughly $77.6 million over the next five years between the two fees.

In addition to impact fee revenue, other funding sources have been identified for Plan Area improvements, including proceeds from the sale of the Central Freeway parcels. Parcel sales to date have yielded a total of $56.2 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. In addition, proceeds from the sale of remaining parcels are projected to yield a total of between $2 million and $5 million by 2022. These funds have not yet been programmed but must be dedicated to transportation and streetscape improvements in the Market and Octavia area.
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 October 2019, the CAC passed a resolution in support of the proposed IPIC expenditure plan for Market and Octavia infrastructure funds.
## Revenue: Actuals FY18 and Prior – Projected FY19 and Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY19 Actuals</th>
<th>FY20 Actuals</th>
<th>FY21 Projected</th>
<th>FY22 Projected</th>
<th>FY23 Projected</th>
<th>FY24 Projected</th>
<th>FY25 Projected</th>
<th>FY26 - FY30 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Transit</td>
<td>$7,709,000</td>
<td>$3,141,000</td>
<td>$3,418,000</td>
<td>$8,089,000</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
<td>$3,916,000</td>
<td>$14,417,000</td>
<td>$17,914,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>$8,091,000</td>
<td>$6,484,000</td>
<td>$6,884,000</td>
<td>$16,217,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$8,384,000</td>
<td>$2,846,000</td>
<td>$34,442,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>$6,409,000</td>
<td>$1,541,000</td>
<td>$3,428,000</td>
<td>$8,009,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gearing</td>
<td>$4,298,000</td>
<td>$3,428,000</td>
<td>$6,884,000</td>
<td>$16,217,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,033,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>$2,417,000</td>
<td>$1,541,000</td>
<td>$3,428,000</td>
<td>$8,009,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$1,304,000</td>
<td>$3,428,000</td>
<td>$6,884,000</td>
<td>$16,217,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>$3,609,000</td>
<td>$3,428,000</td>
<td>$6,884,000</td>
<td>$16,217,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$30,557,000</td>
<td>$15,283,000</td>
<td>$36,493,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$10,221,000</td>
<td>$17,603,000</td>
<td>$115,174,000</td>
<td>$208,988,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditure: Appropriations FY19 and Prior – Planned FY20 and Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY19 Actuals</th>
<th>FY20 Actuals</th>
<th>FY21 Projected</th>
<th>FY22 Projected</th>
<th>FY23 Projected</th>
<th>FY24 Projected</th>
<th>FY25 Projected</th>
<th>FY26 - FY30 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haight Two-way Transportation and Streetscape</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Service Enhancement</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Transportation Improvements Study</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Addition CEFP Improvements (total project cost now $275,000)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Transportation Improvements Fund</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus TP</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Sub Total</td>
<td>$10,010,000</td>
<td>$1,196,000</td>
<td>$1,072,000</td>
<td>$7,661,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,996,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY19 Actuals</th>
<th>FY20 Actuals</th>
<th>FY21 Projected</th>
<th>FY22 Projected</th>
<th>FY23 Projected</th>
<th>FY24 Projected</th>
<th>FY25 Projected</th>
<th>FY26 - FY30 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$7,709,000</td>
<td>$3,141,000</td>
<td>$3,418,000</td>
<td>$8,089,000</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
<td>$3,916,000</td>
<td>$14,417,000</td>
<td>$17,914,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$26,264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue / Complete Streets</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 09/10</td>
<td>FY 10/11</td>
<td>FY 11/12/13/14</td>
<td>FY 12/13/14/15/16</td>
<td>FY 13/14/15/16/17</td>
<td>FY 14/15/16/17/18</td>
<td>FY 15/16/17/18/19</td>
<td>FY 16/17/18/19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Revenue</td>
<td>$12,389,000</td>
<td>$3,011,000</td>
<td>$6,864,000</td>
<td>$16,215,000</td>
<td>$2,842,000</td>
<td>$34,642,000</td>
<td>$45,834,000</td>
<td>$39,775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Diversion and Market Intersection Improvements (In-kind)</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 12th/Otis Plaza IKA (potential - 30 Otis)</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Gough Plaza IKA (potential - 33 Gough)</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hayne Two-way</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Living Alleys Community Challenge Grants</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Better Market Street - Market from 10th to Otis</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Page Street Neighbourly</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Market/Octavia Plazas Rotating Art Project</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Pedestrian Improvements Rotating Art Project</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1 Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Predevelopment - Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Re-establish Octavia Boulevard ROW with Hayward Park</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Sidewalk Grooming Program</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Streetscape Enhancement Fund</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Housing Park Access Improvements</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission proj.</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Neighborhood Heritage Project</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Octavia Boulevard Irrigation System</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 MOPB Public Realm Improvements Plan</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.2 13th Street</td>
<td>MTA $2,180,893</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
<td>2,180,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Expenditure Sub Total</td>
<td>$16,527,257</td>
<td>$3,011,000</td>
<td>$6,864,000</td>
<td>$16,215,000</td>
<td>$2,842,000</td>
<td>$34,642,000</td>
<td>$45,834,000</td>
<td>$39,775,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Octavia - P1C Expenditure Plan - FY 21 - 25**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</th>
<th>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</th>
<th>FY 20 (Current Year)</th>
<th>FY 21 (Budget Year)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Expenditure</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Appropriations FY19 and Prior</td>
<td>Planned FY20 and Forward Agency Through FY19</td>
<td>FY 20 (Current Year)</td>
<td>FY 21 (Budget Year)</td>
<td>FY 22</td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>FY 25</td>
<td>FY 21 - FY 25 Through FY 25</td>
<td>FY 26 - FY 30 Through FY 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Program Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YE)</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$3,052,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,029,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Admin Fees</td>
<td>$1,095,098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,778,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin Fees Transferred back to Programs</td>
<td>$962,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$962,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin Fees Transferred back to Programs (Cont.)</td>
<td>$962,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$962,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Admin Fees Sub Total</td>
<td>$2,058,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,741,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category Balance Per Year</td>
<td>$430,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,271,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category Cummulative Balance Per Year</td>
<td>$430,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,271,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The cumulative deficits (line 67, fiscal years 2019 through 2021) are appropriation deficits and not cash deficits. Appropriation deficits indicate that there has been more expenditure cumulatively appropriated through the budget process than actual revenue cumulatively received. Having an appropriation deficit means that some previously appropriated projects need to wait for additional revenue before receiving the cash. See the attached list of appropriated projects that have not yet received cash transfers.
### MARKET OCTAVIA APPROPRIATED PROJECTS FOR WHICH CASH HAS NOT BEEN TRANSFERRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPIC LINE ITEM</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE TITLE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>OWED AT END OF FY19 ($)</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR APPROPRIATION) ($)</th>
<th>TOTAL OWED ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MO-10</td>
<td>HUB Transportation Improvements Fund</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$1,696,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-24</td>
<td>Living Alleys Community Challenge Grants</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-53</td>
<td>NOFA for new/expanded facilities</td>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-4</td>
<td>Light Rail Service Enhancement</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-9</td>
<td>Western Adddition CBTP Improvements</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-33</td>
<td>Sidewalk Greening Program</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-25</td>
<td>Better Market Street - Market from 10th to Octavia</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-27</td>
<td>Patricia’s Green Rotating Art Project (FY20)</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-35</td>
<td>Koshland Park Access Improvements</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-39.2</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO-48</td>
<td>HUB Open Space Improvements Fund</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$498,810</td>
<td>$498,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,530,000</td>
<td>$1,323,810</td>
<td>$8,853,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market-Octavia Pipeline

Residential Pipeline
Net Units
- < 13
- 13 – 100
- 101 – 500
- > 500

Commercial Pipeline
Net Gross Square Feet
- < 10,000
- 10,000 – 100,000
- 100,001 – 1,000,000
- > 1,000,000
Market-Octavia Projects

2. Haight Two-way Transportation and Streetscape
3. Muni Forward
4. Light Rail Service Enhancements
5. Polk Street Northbound Bicycle Improvements
8. Valencia Bikeway
9. Western Addition CBTP Improvements
10. Hub Transportation Improvements
19. Dolores and Market Intersection Improvements (In-Kind)
20. Oak Plaza (In-Kind)
21. 12th / Otis Plaza (Potential In-Kind)
22. Gough Plaza (Potential In-Kind)
23. Hayes Two-Way
24. Living Alleys Community Challenge Grants
25. Better Market Street - Market from 10th to Octavia
26. Page Street Neighborway
27. Patricia’s Green Rotating Art Project
28. Market / Octavia Plazas Rotating Art Project
29. Pedestrian Improvements - Franklin and Gough Intersections
30. Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements
31. Predevelopment - Upper Market Street Pedestrian Improvements
32. Re-Establish Octavia Boulevard ROW with Hayward Park
33. Sidewalk Green Program
35. Koshland Park Access Improvements
37. Neighborhood Heritage Program
38. Octavia Boulevard Irrigation System
39. HUB Public Realm Improvements
39.2 13th Street Bike Improvements
44. Hayward Park Rehabilitation
45. Brady Block Park - design
47. Re-Connect Buchanan Street Mall ROW Study
48. HUB Open Space Improvement Fund
48.25 11th and Notoma
48.5 Civic Center/Improved Civic Center Public Spaces
MARKET AND OCTAVIA

1. Upper Market Street
2. Margaret Hayward Park under construction;
3. Arts Commission Initial Public Art Project at Market and Octavia
4. Upper Market Street Cross Section

Photo credits: (1) SFMTA; (2) Recreation and Parks Department; (3) SF Arts Commission; (4) SF Planning
Market and Octavia Project Descriptions

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-2018:

» 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 23)

» 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 5)

» 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 (Expenditure Plan Line Item 19).

» 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.

» A new skate park and dog play area, a 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 2017; 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; construction commenced on the center median extension and corner bulbout on Octavia at Oak Street was completed in early 2018.

» The Pedestrian Improvements to Franklin and Gough Intersections project was substantially complete as of 2017. 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.

» The Page Street Neighborway project was partially completed in 2017, with the installation of a center-running green bicycle lane from Buchanan to Octavia Blvd. Remaining improvements are in final design phase and a near term improvement on Page was installed in 2018 in advance of the more substantial project. (Map / Expenditure Plan 26)

» 2017 saw the completion of the 55 Laguna Street rental development, on the site of the former UC Cooperative Extension campus. The project includes three In-Kind Improvements valued at approximately $4.9 million: Waller Park (a 28,000 sq ft terraced plaza), a Community Garden (a 10,600 sq ft garden with 56 plots for community members), and Woods Hall Annex (the seismic upgrade of a historic 12,000 sq ft facility, to be provided rent-free to the nonprofit Haight Street Art Center).

LIGHT RAIL SERVICE ENHANCEMENT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 4)

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. 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:
underway

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. 6 AND 36)

The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project will develop 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:
Continued with potholing of utilities and work dictated by Van Ness Project Schedule. Project is moving into final phase of utility work.

Total Costs:
aprox. $315 million

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$2,000,000

VALENCIA PROTECTED BIKE LANES (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 8)

Project implemented a quick build project to plan, design, and construct upgraded protected bikeways on Valencia Street from Market Street to 15th Street, following the recommendations of the Hub Public Realm Plan. Implementation from 19th Street to Cesar Chavez is scheduled in 2020 and implementation from 15th to 19th Streets is scheduled in 2021.

The project will design protected bikeways in conjunction with community outreach, including extensive analysis of curb management and turn restrictions to ensure that Valencia Street works for all users.

Project Origin:
Hub Public Realm Plan

Total Costs:
$15,859,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$1,000,000 in FY20; $4,650,000 total through FY22

WESTERN ADDITION CBTP IMPLEMENTATION (MAP / EXPENDITURE LINE ITEM NO. 9)

Implement medium-term project efforts identified in the Western Addition Community Based Transportation Plan. This includes traffic-calming and pedestrian safety corridor treatments on Golden Gate Avenue, Turk Street and Laguna Street, pedestrian countdown signals at selected intersections, and pedestrian rapid flashing beacons at mid-block crossings on the former Octavia Street ROW corridor.


Project Origin:
Western Addition Community Based Transportation Plan (SFMTA CIP)

Project Status and Delivery:
Design commenced in 2019

Total Costs:
$3,711,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$395,000 in FY21; $725,000 total
HUB TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS FUND 
(MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10)
To fund projects consistent with the Hub Public Realm Improvements Plan and SFMTA Capital Improvements Plan to ensure that transit and transportation services are enhanced to support significant growth in the Hub area over the next several years, including Local Muni Bus Transit Signal Priority devices that will improve transit reliability.

Projects will be scoped by SFMTA on a rolling basis, with input from the MO CAC, and are anticipated to include substantial enhancements to the Van Ness Muni Station and circulation improvement projects on Hub area streets to reduce traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian conflicts in the area. Some of this fund will be used to purchase and deploy Transit Signal Priority (TSP) devices and communications equipment in the Hub area in FY20.

**Project Origin:**
Hub Public Realm Plan

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Ongoing

**Total Costs:**
TBD

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$12.9 million through FY25

LOCAL MUNI BUS TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY 
(MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10.1)
To purchase and deploy Transit Signal Priority (TSP) devices and communications equipment for intersections on the Local Muni Bus TSP network and to replace aging traffic signal controllers and cabinets within the plan area. This project will improve travel time and service reliability for Muni riders.

**Project Origin:**
SFMTA

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Project is on-going with intersections in the Market-Octavia area scheduled for TSP implementation by end of 2020.

**Total Costs:**
$27,407,567

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$196,000 in FY20

OAK PLAZA IN-KIND AGREEMENT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 20)

**Project Description:**
A new 16,050 sq/ft public plaza would be constructed on Oak Street between Franklin and Van Ness in coordination with the development at 1540 Market Street (a.k.a. One Oak). Improvements include; a shared public way (4,843 sq/ft), improvements to the north side of Oak Street (2,869 sq/ft), four new publicly-owned “micro-retail” kiosks on the northern edge of Oak Plaza adjacent to the 25 Van Ness property; six new landscaped planters or trees along the 25 Van Ness façade; four new street lights on the north side of Oak Street; and electric power to support programming in the Plaza.

**Project Origin:**
Hub Public Realm Plan; IKA application

**Project Status and Delivery:**
TBD

**Total Costs:**
$6,129,940

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$2,181,000

LIVING ALLEYS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 24)
The Living Alleyways is an ongoing effort led by Public Works 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 may utilize impact fee revenue through Public Works 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

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$4,500,000 total through FY24

BETTER MARKET STREET – MARKET FROM 10TH TO OCTAVIA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 25)

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.

Total Costs:
$500,000,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$2,000,000 total through FY25

PAGE STREET NEIGHBORWAY PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 26)

The Page Street Neighborway (formerly the Page Street Green Connection project) is a series of efforts to transform Page Street into a safer and more pleasant place to walk and bike to neighborhood destinations and nearby parks and provide landscaping and greening opportunities as appropriate.

‘Phase One’ of the project comprises capital improvements for the segment of the corridor within the Market & Octavia Plan Area (from Market Street to Webster Street), including multiple corner bulbouts, a raised intersection at Buchanan, and sidewalk landscaping.

Related pilot circulation and bikeway changes include traffic diversion at Webster and Octavia streets; one-way conversion from Octavia to Laguna; Class II, III and IV bikeway facilities on Page Street; and parking/turn restrictions on Haight Street.

Project Origin:
Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
Anticipated construction start late 2020. A 12-month pilot project to test circulation and bikeway changes was approved at the SFMTA Board in November 2019 and is slated for initial implementation in the first quarter of 2020, with evaluation, public outreach and potential adjustments to the pilot ongoing through early 2021.

Total Costs:
$2,700,000 (Phase One)

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$1,250,000 total

PATRICIA’S GREEN ROTATING ART PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 27)

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 programming of this project.

Project Origin:
Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
going

Total Costs:
$500,000 over 10 years

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$50,000 in FY21; $510,000 total through FY25
MARKET/OCTAVIA PLAZAS ROTATING ART PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 28)

The CAC passed a resolution in May 2019 to approve the placement of the temporary 20-foot California grizzly bear clad with copper pennies as submitted by the Arts Commission for 1 year period with a possible extension. The proposed art installation will be located in the northwest corner of the intersection of Market and Octavia Blvd.

The Arts Commission is planning to soon take the proposal to the Commission’s Visual Arts Committee and then full Commission for approval. The timing of the art installation will be carefully coordinated with the SFMTA Market Street Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvement Project to ensure that the visibility and access to the artwork will not be impacted.

Project Origin:
Market and Octavia CAC

Project Status and Delivery:
TBD

Total Costs:
TBD

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$50,000 total through FY24

UPPER MARKET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO.30)

SFMTA’s Upper Market Street Safety Project is substantially funded by impact fee revenue for work along Market Street extending from Octavia Boulevard to Castro Street. Improvements will include sidewalk bulbouts (most locations are implemented currently with painted pedestrian safety zones), signal timing and hardware improvements, landscaping and public realm enhancements, and bicycle improvements including enhanced bike lanes west of Buchanan and a physically protected bikeway from Buchanan/Duboce to Octavia Boulevard.

Additional related project elements that have yet to receive approval include potential circulation changes (turn restrictions, new protected turn phases) and implementation of a comprehensive curbspace management plan.

Project Origin:
Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
In design; construction to commence in 2020

Total Costs:
$9,700,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$4,305,257 total

RE-ESTABLISHING THE OCTAVIA BOULEVARD RIGHT-OF-WAY WITH HAYWARD PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 32)

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:
$300,000 total through FY25

SIDEWALK GREENING PROGRAM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 33)

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.

Utilizing a portion of these funds, San Francisco Public Works will partner with non-profit organizations and interested community members to implement tree planting
and sidewalk landscaping installation. Additional tree planting and establishment activities will be performed by San Francisco Public Works Urban Forestry staff or through a City managed contractor.

**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:**
$100,000 in FY20; $700,000 total through FY24

**STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 34)**
The Streetscape Enhancement Fund sets aside impact fee revenue for a series of capital projects to make Octavia Boulevard and surrounding streets safer, more pedestrian-friendly, and better at balancing competing demands.

After years of community engagement to update and confirm priorities, the scopes of work covered by this fund will include the Hayes Street “Follow the Paving” project (sidewalk bulbouts on Hayes at Laguna and Buchanan intersections); Oak/Octavia Safety Improvements project (sidewalk bulbouts, extended center medians and landscaping); Market Street/Octavia Boulevard project (intersection improvements and potential circulation changes); Octavia Boulevard Enhancement Project (sustainable streetscape upgrades on northbound lane of Octavia from Page to Patricia’s Green); and area-wide crosswalk upgrades and spot improvements that were completed in 2016

**Project Origin:**
Market and Octavia Plan; Vision Zero

**Project Status and Delivery:**
partially complete; remaining work in design or construction phase;

**Total Costs:**
$6,700,000

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$6,700,000 total through FY25

**KOSHLAND PARK ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 35)**
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, and will be delivered in combination with the Page Street Neighborhood project (see No. 24 above).

**Project Origin:**
Market and Octavia Plan

**Project Status and Delivery:**
in planning

**Total Costs:**
$450,000

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$450,000 total through FY25

**NEIGHBORHOOD HERITAGE PROGRAM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 37)**
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 could 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 total through FY23

**OCTAVIA BOULEVARD IRRIGATION SYSTEM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 38)**

**Project Description:**
Install a new sub-surface drip irrigation system, building off of existing water pipes and backflow preventers, to replace the existing deficient pop-up overspray system in the side medians of Octavia Boulevard. The new irrigation system will service the street trees and landscaping in the side medians of Octavia Boulevard, which was the central infrastructure enhancement of the Market and Octavia Plan, while reducing water loss and maintenance obligation for the system.

**Project Origin:**
Market and Octavia CAC

**Project Status and Delivery:**
TBD

**Total Costs:**
$100,000

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$100,000 total through FY25

**13TH STREET BIKE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 39.2)**

This project will create protected bikeways on 13th Street from Folsom Street to Valencia Street, following the recommendations of the Hub Public Realm Plan. The project will provide an important bike connection from Valencia Street to the existing protected bike lanes on 13th St, substantial signal modifications, and key pedestrian safety elements. This project does not include long-term elements of the Hub Public Realm Plan design, including sidewalk widening, re-paving, lighting, and green infrastructure.

**Project Origin:**
Hub Public Realm Plan

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Design in 2020; Completion by 2023

**Total Costs:**
$3,900,000

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$175,000 in FY20

**HAYWARD PARK RENOVATION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 44)**

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 planned improvements, including a new playground, removal of certain existing structures and replacement with a new community building, an operations facility, large central plaza for events, and the replacement of existing fields with synthetic fields supplemented by organic infill turf.

**Project Origin:**
Market and Octavia Plan

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Currently under construction; expected completion summer 2020.

**Total Costs:**
$28 million

**MO Impact Fee Funds:**
$8 million total through FY18
BUCHANAN STREET MALL – FULTON TO GROVE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 47)

Buchanan Street Mall extends from Grove to Eddy Streets; the southernmost block of the Mall, from Fulton to Grove, is within 250 feet of the Plan Area boundary, and thus eligible for funding through MO impact fees. The Mall provides a vital green connection between Hayes Valley and Western Addition, as well as play and recreation space for neighboring residents.

This project will fund pre-construction design work as well as planning and community engagement work to explore options to connect the Mall to Hayes Valley.

Project Origin:
Market and Octavia CAC

Project Status and Delivery:
Buchanan Vision Plan completed early 2018. Currently developing concept plan for all five blocks. Awaiting potential grant funding for block between Turk St. and Golden Gate Ave. as part of the Let’sPlaySF! program with the 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond.

Total Costs:
TBD

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$515,000 through FY19

CIVIC CENTER / IMPROVED CIVIC CENTER PUBLIC SPACES (MAP/EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48.5)

The Civic Center Public Realm Plan provides a comprehensive vision for Civic Center’s public spaces, including improvements to Civic Center Plaza, Fulton Street Mall, United Nations Plaza and War Memorial Gateway. Improvements include:

- Civic Center Plaza improvements that enhance the space for neighborhood and civic use. Except for the existing playgrounds and, potentially, the existing cafe kiosk, the Plan proposes a complete reconstruction of Civic Center Plaza with a new site plan;

- Fulton Street Mall improvements that convert this block into a new plaza and neighborhood recreation space;

- United Nations Plaza Improvements that provide greater flexibility of existing programming, strengthening of the Leavenworth gateway, and improvement of the BART entry; and

- War Memorial Gateway improvements that better define the western gateway into Civic Center via a flexible-use plaza and improvements to pedestrian circulation.

Project Origin:
Civic Center Public Realm Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
TBD

Total Costs:
TBD

11TH STREET PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 45)

See 11TH STREET PARK in the Eastern Neighborhoods Project Descriptions section.

CHILD CARE (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 59)

A portion of Market and Octavia impact fee funds are dedicated to supporting the provision of new or expanded licensed child care facilities within the plan area. These funds are administered by the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE), which was previously appropriated $1,273,000 in FY16 to solicited applications for new or expanded facilities. A portion of those funds will provide for a new childcare center at 49 South Van Ness. In FY19, OECE will be appropriated an additional $2,250,000 to solicit further applications for eligible projects in the area.
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. Most fee revenue expected to be generated from the Rincon Hill Area Plan has been received totaling roughly $31 million when including in-kind improvements.

The Planning Department projects about $4.2 million in impact fee revenue available for infrastructure impact fees over the next five years.

There is an identified need of $46.6 million for Rincon Hill infrastructure based on the original Rincon Hill Area Plan and Streetscape Master Plan of which approximately $37 million can be funded through impact fees leaving an unmet funding need of $9 million.

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 soon complete design, 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 Expenditure Plan - FY 21 - FY 25

#### Revenue: Actuals FY18 and Prior -- Projected FY19 and Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>$19,413,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$19,413,000 $</td>
<td>$19,413,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE STREETS</td>
<td>$8,951,000 $</td>
<td>$1,368,300 $</td>
<td>$1,068,100 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,064,700 $</td>
<td>$2,064,700 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>$1,814,000 $</td>
<td>$277,100 $</td>
<td>$216,300 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$493,400 $</td>
<td>$493,400 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>$1,309,000 $</td>
<td>$86,600 $</td>
<td>$67,600 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$154,200 $</td>
<td>$154,200 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$31,487,000 $</td>
<td>$1,732,000 $</td>
<td>$1,352,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,863,000 $</td>
<td>$2,863,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Fund Expenditures: Appropriations FY19 and Prior -- Planned FY20 and Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape Priority 1 - Harrison Street and Fremont Street</td>
<td>DW</td>
<td>$12,565,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$12,565,000 $</td>
<td>$12,565,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape / Public Realm Priority 2</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$8,087,000 $</td>
<td>$911,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$8,998,000 $</td>
<td>$8,998,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Place Park - Design and Construct</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$4,836,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,836,000 $</td>
<td>$4,836,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>$326,000 $</td>
<td>$40,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$366,000 $</td>
<td>$366,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Admin Transfer to Programs</td>
<td>$296,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$296,000 $</td>
<td>$296,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Transfer to SOMA Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
<td>$6,000,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$6,000,000 $</td>
<td>$6,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Street (Partially between Essex and First North Side) (In-kind)</td>
<td>IN-KIND</td>
<td>$626,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$626,000 $</td>
<td>$626,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Mid-block ped path between Folsom and Harrison near Fremont (In-Kind)</td>
<td>IN-KIND</td>
<td>$573,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$573,000 $</td>
<td>$573,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street and Harrison Street (In-Kind)</td>
<td>IN-KIND</td>
<td>$1,110,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,110,000 $</td>
<td>$1,110,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revenue Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$31,487,000 $</td>
<td>$1,732,000 $</td>
<td>$1,352,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,863,000 $</td>
<td>$2,863,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$34,719,000 $</td>
<td>$951,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$35,670,000 $</td>
<td>$35,670,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annual Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,232,000 $</td>
<td>$781,000 $</td>
<td>$1,352,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,764,000 $</td>
<td>$1,764,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25 THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30 THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,232,000 $</td>
<td>$781,000 $</td>
<td>$1,352,000 $</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,764,000 $</td>
<td>$1,764,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rincon Hill Pipeline

Residential Pipeline
Net Units
- < 13
- 13 – 100
- 101 – 500
- > 500

Commercial Pipeline
Net Gross Square Feet
- < 10,000
- 10,000 – 100,000
- 100,001 – 1,000,000
- > 1,000,000
Rincon Hill Projects

6. Streetscape Priority 1 - Harrison Street and Fremont Street
7a. Living Streets (Potential Priority 2 Project)
7b. Guy Place Streetscape (Potential Priority 2 Project)
7d. First Street (Potential Priority 2 Project)
8. Guy Place Park
12. Harrison Street (Between Essex and First - North Side) (In-Kind)
13. Ped Mid-block ped path between Folsom and Harrison near Fremont (In-Kind)
14. First Street and Harrison Street (In-Kind)
15. Rincon Hill Park
WE’VE GOT IT COVERED

+ Soda Phase A (under construction or completed)
+ Has/Will be Built by Private Development
+ Not-Soda Project (e.g. Better Market Street)

PHASE B

PHASE C

PHASE D

PHASE E

RINCON HILL

1. South Downtown Streetscape Implementation Phasing (Soda Planning Process)
2. Guy Place Mini Park
3. Fremont streetscape Improvements

Photo credits: (1, 3) SF Planning; (2) RPD
Rincon Hill Project Descriptions

HARRISON STREET – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 1
(MAP NO. 6A / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 6)

Streetscape improvements for Harrison Street would run along both sides 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:

Total Costs:
$12,565,000

IPIC Funds:
Priority 1 Projects have been fully funded through FY18.

FREMONT STREET – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 1
(MAP NO. 6B / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 6)

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 7A / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

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 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds:
$7,514,000 have been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, which could be used for these projects.

MID-BLOCK CROSSINGS – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2
(MAP 7B / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

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 which “Priority 2” project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

Total Costs:
$3,695,000 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds:
$7,514,000 has been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, which could be used for this project.

GUY PLACE STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2
(MAP 7C / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

Guy Place Streetscape project would complete the Lansing/Guy streetscape improvements for the rest of the loop created by the two streets.
Project 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 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds:
$7,514,000 has been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, which could be used for this project.

FIRST STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP NO. 7D / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM 7)
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 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds:
$7,514,000 has been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, which could be used for this project.

GUY PLACE PARK (MAP NO. / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 8)
This small intimate pocket park will feature living green columns, water features, seating areas and other landscaping.

Project Origin:
Rincon Hill Area Plan
TRANSLIT 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 Transbay Terminal Center (now known as the Salesforce Transit Center). Since plan adoption, about 3,070 units and 2.4 million square footage of commercial space have been entitled by the Planning Department.

The new Transit Center serves as the new heart of downtown San Francisco and a new terminus for Caltrain and eventually High Speed Rail. The Transit Center 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 (TJBA). 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.

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. The CFD is projected to raise at least $460 million in the next five years towards construction of the Transbay Terminal projects and other streetscape, transit, and open space improvements.

The Planning Department projects over $63 million in impact fee revenues available for infrastructure impact fees in the Transit Center District over the next five years. Nearly $16 million of these impact fees are set aside for open space while the other $47 million are set aside for transportation and streetscape projects.

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 special tax. Based on pipeline projects under the jurisdiction of the Planning Department, $81 million is expected to be collected through the end of this fiscal year, with an additional $64 million in the next five years.

SOUTH DOWNTOWN DESIGN AND ACTIVATION PLAN (“SODA”)

The Planning Department, SF Public Works, SFMTA, OCII, and the East Cut Community Benefit District are wrapping up a planning process that will create a comprehensive vision for the design, implementation, and stewardship of the public spaces within Transit Center and Rincon Hill (together, “South Downtown”).

A major component of this effort will be to holistically prioritize Rincon Hill and Transit Center streetscape and open space projects that are not yet underway.

The plan is largely completed. The City anticipates environmental clearance to be completed within six months. Final adoption of the Plan is expected late 2020.
## Transit Center - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY 21 - 25

### Revenue - Actuals FY18 and Prior – Projected FY19 and Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> TRANSIT R&amp;I / TRANSIT</td>
<td>$60,028,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,153,000</td>
<td>$ 42,068,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 47,281,000</td>
<td>$ 108,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> In-Kind</td>
<td>$ 27,508,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 37,504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Cash</td>
<td>$ 22,590,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,153,000</td>
<td>$ 42,068,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 35,477,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category: RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Streetscape Design and Construction (1)</td>
<td>$ 12,780,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,095,000</td>
<td>$ 14,155,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,410,000</td>
<td>$ 37,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Streetscape Design (Planning)</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Cash</td>
<td>$ 8,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,504,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind</strong></td>
<td>$ 81,307,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,084,000</td>
<td>$ 56,081,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 65,601,000</td>
<td>$ 146,938,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash</strong></td>
<td>$ 45,267,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,084,000</td>
<td>$ 56,081,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,410,000</td>
<td>$ 25,694,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Revenue</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 60,028,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,153,000</td>
<td>$ 42,068,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 47,281,000</td>
<td>$ 108,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Transit Center Streetscape Plan - Project Management</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 36,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 14,010,000</td>
<td>$ 43,199,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 63,631,000</td>
<td>$ 144,938,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Streetscape Design and Construction</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 26,570,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,800,000</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,410,000</td>
<td>$ 25,694,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Streetscape Design (Planning)</td>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Phase 1 TX</td>
<td>TPA</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Phase 11 TX</td>
<td>TPA</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Railyard Realignment Study</td>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>$ 3,800,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Admin (Planning)</td>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>$ 180,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Better Market Street</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> 2nd Street (1)</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.2</strong> Congestion Charging Studies and Pilot</td>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.3</strong> BART Capacity Projects</td>
<td>BART</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.5</strong> Transit Delay Mitigation</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Rail Corridor (In-Kind - Transit Tower)</td>
<td>IN-KRD</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Katrina (In-Kind - Transit Tower)</td>
<td>IN-KRD</td>
<td>$ 11,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> Bus Bounding Island Mission Street (In-kind - Transit Tower)</td>
<td>IN-KRD</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transit Center

#### IPC Expenditure Plan - FY 21 - 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>THROUGH FY19</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Transit Tower In-Kind Agreement</td>
<td>IN-KIND</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Category Balance Per Year</td>
<td>$26,577,000</td>
<td>$34,227,000</td>
<td>$30,874,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Category Cumulative Balance</td>
<td>$26,577,000</td>
<td>$34,227,000</td>
<td>$30,874,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
<td>$10,444,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 2nd Street (Line Item 12.05) now included as part of larger Streetscape line item (Line Item No. 5)

### Recreation and Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>19 Revenue</th>
<th>21,279,000</th>
<th>$ -</th>
<th>$1,895,000</th>
<th>$14,315,000</th>
<th>$ -</th>
<th>$ -</th>
<th>$ -</th>
<th>$ -</th>
<th>$16,410,000</th>
<th>$37,689,000</th>
<th>$11,638,000</th>
<th>$49,327,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 City Park (JPA)</td>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>$12,044,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$0,044,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$12,044,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 IPC Park (per Famis Report)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Improvements to Downtown/Chinatown Parks</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>$1,352,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,352,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,352,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Central Subway Open Space</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Portsmouth Square improvements (IPIC)</td>
<td>RRD</td>
<td>$878,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$878,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$878,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Portsmouth Square improvements (Planning)</td>
<td>DCPC</td>
<td>$281,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$281,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$281,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Guy Place Park</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 City Park (In-Kind - Transit Tower)</td>
<td>IN-KIND</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and Open Space Expenditure Subtotal</td>
<td>$31,582,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$31,582,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$31,582,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Category Balance Per Year</td>
<td>$10,303,000</td>
<td>$6,408,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Category Cumulative Balance</td>
<td>$10,303,000</td>
<td>$6,408,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
<td>$6,017,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Running Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THROUGH FY19</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 21 (BUDGET YEAR)</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 21 - FY 25</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26 - FY 30</th>
<th>THROUGH FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Revenue Totals</td>
<td>$81,307,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$7,068,000</td>
<td>$56,983,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$63,631,000</td>
<td>$94,938,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$118,187,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$128,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Annual Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$36,880,000</td>
<td>$ (7,460,000)</td>
<td>$5,380,000</td>
<td>$55,833,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$61,081,000</td>
<td>$16,551,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$36,880,000</td>
<td>$ (84,580,000)</td>
<td>$50,500,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
<td>$16,315,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that cumulative deficits (Lines 18, 30, and 34, FY 19 and FY 20) are appropriation deficits and not cash deficits. Appropriation deficits indicate that there has been more expenditures cumulatively appropriated than budgeted; however, actual revenue is cumulatively not received. A deficit means that some previously appropriated projects need to wait for additional revenue before receiving cash. See Table X for previously appropriated projects for which cash transfers are proposed for deferral.
## TRANSIT CENTER APPROPRIATED PROJECTS FOR WHICH CASH HAS NOT BEEN TRANSFERRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPIC LINE ITEM</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE TITLE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>OWED AT END OF FY19</th>
<th>FY 20 (CURRENT YEAR APPROPRIATION)</th>
<th>TOTAL OWED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC-5</td>
<td>Streetscape Design (Planning)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-12.3</td>
<td>BART Capacity Projects</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>DCP to BART</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-12.2</td>
<td>Congestion Charging Studies and Pilot</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>DCP to CTA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-8</td>
<td>Phase II DTX</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>DCP to TJPA</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-5</td>
<td>Streetscape Design and Construction</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 2,280,000</td>
<td>$ 1,300,000</td>
<td>$ 3,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-12.5</td>
<td>Transit Delay Mitigation</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-12</td>
<td>SODA Streetscape</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$ 8,500,000</td>
<td>$ 8,500,000</td>
<td>$ 8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-21</td>
<td>City Park (TJPA)</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>TJPA</td>
<td>$ 10,044,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 10,044,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 36,924,000</td>
<td>$ 4,550,000</td>
<td>$ 41,474,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Center District Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Pipeline Net Units</th>
<th>Commercial Pipeline Net Gross Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 100</td>
<td>10,000 – 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 500</td>
<td>100,001 – 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transit Center District Projects

3. Transit Center Streetscape
5. Transit Center and DTX
9. Better Market Street
10. SODA Streetscape
11. Mid-Block Crossings (In-Kind)
12. Natoma Streetscape (In-Kind)
13. Bus Boarding Island on Mission (In-Kind)
14. Transit Center In-Kind
20. Sales Force Park (aka City Park)
21. Downtown / Chinatown Parks
22. Central Subway Open Space
23. Portsmouth Square Improvements
TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT

1. Salesforce Transit Center Bus Deck
2. Salesforce Park
3. New Midblock Crossing at Shaw and Mission
2. Salesforce Park Walking Path

Photo credits: (1, 3 4) SF Planning; (2) Google Maps
Transit Center Project Descriptions

TRANSIT CENTER STREETSCAPE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 5)

The Transit Center Plan assumes streetscape and public right-of-way improvements on almost all of District’s streets. Streetscape improvements have been divided into five phases. As an initial phase, priority street segments have been identified to coincide with the opening of the Transbay station. These street segments include the west side of 1st Street between Mission and Minna 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:

Total Costs:
$166 million for all phases (original estimate of streetscape, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements escalated from 2010 to 2017)

IPIC Funds:
$30,870,000 (Through FY20)

TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER AND DOWNTOWN RAIL EXTENSION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 7 AND 8)

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 (Salesforce 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:
$16,000,000 in FY19, which would enable design, engineering, and other preconstruction work.

RAIL ALIGNMENT AND BENEFITS STUDY (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 9)
The Rail Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Implementation Program is a continuation of the work San Francisco Planning completed in 2018 that focused on the efficient and effective movement of Caltrain and High Speed Rail trains through the City and into the Transbay Transit Center (TTC).

The preliminary preferred alignment utilizes the planned Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) and the Pennsylvania Avenue alignment which would move the trains underground further south (around Cesar Chavez) via. By tunneling the trains further south, six new street connections can be made along the alignment while preserving the current crossings.
The follow-on work will include additional engineering, design, cost estimates, and impacts analysis as well as environmental studies for these work items.

**IPIC Funds:**
$3.8 million in FY 18

**BETTER MARKET STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 11)**
The Better Market Street Project provides various streetscape and transportation improvements to a 2.2-mile-long corridor along Market Street between Steuart Street and Octavia Boulevard, including a sidewalk-level bicycle facility, pedestrian facilities, and streetscapes along Market Street. The project also introduces changes to the roadway configuration, private vehicle access restrictions, traffic signals, surface transit, commercial and passenger loading, vehicular parking, and utilities. Funds from Transit Center Transportation Impact fee would go toward design and engineering for the project segment in the Transit Center District.

**Total Costs:**
Approx. $73,500,000 for portion immediately adjacent to Transit Center

**IPIC Funds:**
$2,500,000 in FY 19

**SODA STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 12)**
As described above, the SODA planning effort looks to prioritize public realm improvements in Transit Center and Rincon Hill holistically. Because Transit Center and Rincon Hill are immediately adjacent to each other, public realm projects in each neighborhood serve both areas along with the City as a whole.

SODA Streetscape Improvements is being described separately from the Transit Center Streetscape Improvements to indicate that funds appropriated to this IPIC Project could potentially pay for Rincon Hill streetscape projects if the SODA Plan prioritizes them above other Transit Center streetscape plans for near-term implementation.

**Project Origin:**
Rincon Hill Master Streetscape Plan, Transit Center Implementation Plan, SODA Planning Process

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Planning Phase. Public outreach and prioritization process underway.

**Total Costs:**
TBD

**IPIC Funds:**
$8.5 million

**DECONGESTION PRICING AND INCENTIVES STUDY (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 12.2)**
Traffic congestion is a significant problem in downtown San Francisco and SoMa. The Downtown Congestion Pricing Study is exploring how a fee to drive into downtown/SoMa during the most congested times could keep traffic moving while making our transportation system safer and more equitable.

The study begins with an analysis of existing congestion and how it impacts residents, businesses, and other users of the transportation system with a focus on social equity. The study also includes working with stakeholders to identify goals and objectives for potential congestion pricing policies.

The study team will then develop, evaluate, and refine potential congestion pricing program scenarios to identify which best meet the goals and objectives before developing a final recommendation and potential implementation plan. Program elements to be considered include different pricing parameters, discounts and incentives for using non-auto travel modes, credits or discounts to improve equity outcomes, and provision of improved transit service and multimodal infrastructure using revenue raised through pricing.

The study will evaluate potential approaches from three main perspectives: efficacy, equity, and economy. First, the study will evaluate strategies with a focus on efficacy at reducing congestion and its negative effects.

Second, the study will include an equity analysis to assess who would benefit and be impacted by a potential system and what it would take to ensure the resulting program provides net benefits to low-income travelers in San Francisco.

And third, the study will seek to understand business impacts to ensure the approach would foster continued economic growth. The study will also include a robust and
inclusive outreach effort to inform the alternatives, analysis, and conclusions. Ultimately, the study will identify the most promising pricing and incentives alternative(s) and next steps for environmental analysis, design, funding, and implementation.

**Project Origin:**
The Transportation Authority first studied congestion pricing in the 2010 Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study. It has since been included in a wide range of local and regional plans, including the 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan, 2017 San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan, 2017 San Francisco Transportation Sector Climate Action Strategy, 2018 Transportation Task Force 2045 Report, and 2019 San Francisco Vision Zero Action Strategy.

**Project Status:**
The Transportation Authority Board requested the study in Fall 2018 and appropriated local Prop K sales tax funding in early 2019. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved funding to support the study in Summer 2019. The study launched in July 2019 and is anticipated for completion by the end of calendar 2020. Ultimately, implementation would require consensus by city leaders and state authorization.

**Total Cost:**
Total estimated study cost is $2.45 million.

**IPIC/CFD Funds:**
$470,000 in IPIC funds and $880,000 in CFD funds are needed in FY2019-2020. The remainder of the study cost, $1.1 million, is funded through a combination of local Prop K sales tax ($500,000); regional MTC funds ($400,000); and potential private ($200,000) grant sources.

**BART CAPACITY PROJECTS: EMBARCADERO STATION PLATFORM ELEVATOR CAPACITY AND REDUNDANCY PROJECT (EXPENDITURE PLAN / LINE ITEM NO. 12.3)**
The project will purchase and install a new vertical elevator between the BART platform and the concourse level at the north end of the Embarcadero BART/Muni Station. A glass-enclosed cab and hoistway will provide visual transparency. The elevator will be located completely within the BART paid area, thus helping to reduce fare evasion. The elevator will serve the BART platform only, but an emergency stop will be provided at the Muni platform. The existing elevator will then be used exclusively to access the Muni platform. Since both elevators will be able to stop at both platforms, if one elevator is taken out of service, the other can be used to maintain accessible service for both operators.

**Project Origin:**
Currently a single elevator connects the concourse level to the BART and Muni platforms at the Embarcadero Station. Adding an additional elevator will increase the capacity of vertical circulation, ensure redundancy and greatly enhance accessibility. The project is documented in the Embarcadero and Montgomery Capacity Implementation Plan and Modernization Study and is coordinated with the Better Market Street project.

**Project Status and Delivery:**
Project design is complete. The construction contract will be advertised in Spring 2019. Notice to Proceed is anticipated in Summer 2019. Construction is estimated to begin in Fall 2019. Project duration is anticipated to be 2 years.

**Total Costs:**
$15 million

**IPIC Funds:**
$3 million

**TRANSIT CENTER STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS PROVIDED THROUGH 101 FIRST STREET IN-KIND AGREEMENT (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 13, 14, 15, AND 16)**
The Transit Tower project met the majority of its impact fee obligations through provision of infrastructure identified in the Area Plan. The Transit Tower is providing 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):

13. Fremont and First mid-block crossings $1 million
14. Natoma Street: $11 million
15. Bus boarding island on Mission Street $500,000
16. DTX, phase I (Trainbox): $15.2 million
SALESFORCE PARK (PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO AS "CITY PARK") (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 21)

City Park, a 5.4-acre rooftop public park that is 1,400-foot-long 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); $12 million in FY17

CENTRAL SUBWAY CHINATOWN STATION OPEN SPACE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 24)

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

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. 25, AND 26)

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

Total Costs:
$1,100,000

IPIC Funds:
$1,100,000 (In-Kind)
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 development project.

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 15 years. Over the next five years, the Planning Department projects approximately $10 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.

Because impact fee revenue in Visitacion Valley is reliant on three large-scale development projects (Executive Park, Schlage Lock and Sunnydale HOPE SF), projected revenue has the potential of changing dramatically from year to year depending on the progress of those projects. In fact, last year staff was assuming that significant portions of Schlage Lock and Executive Park would be under construction within the year based on where they were in the development pipeline. As it turns out, these projects did not meet these assumed targets and now revenue is now expected to come in later than anticipated. Because revenue was not realized as anticipated, and projections have been pushed out in the next couple of years, IPIC is recommending that no new appropriations be provided in FY 21.

SCHLAGE LOCK/BAYLANDS NORTH

In 2014, the Board of Supervisor’s approved a master development for Schlage Lock. The Schlage Lock site is 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 historic Schlage Lock office building for community use. The Schlage Lock Development Agreement (“DA”) waives the recreation and open space portion of its Visitacion Valley fee in exchange for the Project’s commitment to these improvements.

The Development Agreement also stipulates that the transportation portion of the fee be specifically dedicated to transportation improvements called out in the Bi-County Transportation Study, as described below under “Complete Streets.” Note, in 2019 the Project Sponsor, Universal Paragon Corporation (UPC), rebranded the Schlage Lock project “Baylands North” to acknowledge its future as an interconnected neighborhood with the larger Baylands site immediately adjacent to the south in Brisbane; UPC is the Project Sponsor for both sites.

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 2019

Because the Visitacion Valley fee area is not a comprehensive plan 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. Since the Schlage Lock master approvals were certified by the Board of Supervisors on May 19, 2015, City staff have held six community meetings, the most recent of which was on September 11, 2019. The purpose of these community meetings is to enable community input into the IPIC process, to understand community priorities for the programming of projected impact fees, and to collect community feedback on project design and implementation. The City will hold at least one meeting per year until all impact fees are programmed and any associated projects are implemented. The proposed projects are in the following categories: park and playground improvements, bike and transit improvements, McLaren Park access improvements, and intersection and pedestrian safety improvements. The implementing agency (i.e. Public Works, SFMTA, or Rec and Park) for each project listed in Table VV1 will host a community design process.
to take each proposed project from conceptual design through detailed design during which additional community feedback will be solicited.

As noted above, construction of the Executive Park and Schlage Lock projects has proceeded more slowly than anticipated, resulting in a delay in the availability of impact fees for utilization on local projects. While this delay is unfortunate given the severe housing shortage in the city and region, it has allowed City staff to work with the community on developing a strong list of priority projects for implementation (see Tables VV1 and VV2) and to begin planning, design, and implementation for a few priority projects, including the following:

- **Visitacion Avenue McLaren Park Connector.** In collaboration with the community, City staff began initial planning and design work for the Vis Ave Connector in FY17-18. Due to the lack of impact fee funds available, no additional progress was made in FY18-19.

- **Blanken Avenue Underpass Illumination.** In Spring 2019, lighting in the Blanken Avenue underpass was upgraded to improve safety and access for this key neighborhood gateway. Additional fixtures were installed and lighting was upgraded to LED. This project installation was completed with the coordination of Public Works and SFPUC.

- **Herz Playground Renovation.** The Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) commenced the redesign of Herz Playground in 2019 and held two community workshops in June and August. Park design will be finalized in early 2020 and is slated for review and approval by the RPD Commission in Spring 2020.

- **Blanken Underpass Art Mural.** The installation of art murals on Blanken Avenue in the Route 101 underpass was originally proposed for implementation utilizing impact fees, however, the District 10 Supervisor provided $20,000 in add back funding for the project. While no impact fees are needed for this project, it is described here since it was conceived by Vis Valley residents during the impact fee prioritization process starting in 2015. Project funding was distributed in early 2019 through an San Francisco Arts Commission artist grant to 1brush, a San Francisco non-profit that connects communities and artists for the development of public art projects. Vis Valley/Little Hollywood residents, 1brush staff, and Planning Department staff convened a series of three community workshops in February, March, and August to select an artist and a design for the mural. Community input on the design was also collected through a bilingual online poll (English and Chinese), which received 172 responses. As the mural will be installed on Caltrans property, Planning Department and Public Works staff will work to secure the required Caltrans permit by Spring of 2020 for a Summer 2020 installation.

**TRANSPORTATION / COMPLETE STREETS**

Of the $3,158,000 that is expected to be available for transportation spending between FY21 and FY 25, $1,674,000 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 originally included 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 since 2014, the complete streets projects listed below in Tables VV1 and VV2 were presented by City staff and discussed at the July 2016 and May 2017 community workshops. As noted above, projects listed in Table VV1 have been prioritized for implementation using impact fees and the responsible implementing agency will begin working with the community on detailed project design once funds are available.

For IPIC, revenue is proposed to be held in a flexible "Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streetscape Enhancement Fund" in the near term. This will enable the funds to be made available within the same fiscal year. Because revenue did not come in as anticipated over the last three years (FY18, FY19, and FY20), there is already $3,549,000 appropriated without the cash-in-hand in this category. Until revenue catches up with previous appropriations, IPIC is recommending that no new appropriations be provided (Expenditure Plan Line Item 5).
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 and May 2017 community workshops are listed in TablesVV1 and VV2; 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 an initial scope and budget in preparation for the next community meeting.

Similar to the C category, Recreation and Open Space funding is being kept flexible through FY21 to allow access to the funds once projects are identified. For FY 21. (Expenditure Plan Line Item 19)
### Table VV1: Visitacion Valley Impact Fee Priority Projects and Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visitacion Ave McLaren Park Connector</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>Initial planning and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visitacion Valley Greenway Connections</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Not yet commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blanken Underpass Illumination</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>Installation complete as of Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Herz Playground Renovation</td>
<td>$8,120,003</td>
<td>Design nearly complete; anticipated Rec Park Commission approval spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blanken Underpass Art Murals</td>
<td>$200,004</td>
<td>Mural design selected by community; installation anticipated Summer 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Projects identified through the first prioritization round, concluding May 20, 2017. Additional projects (see table below) will be prioritized through future community engagement.

2. Cost estimates are in 2017 dollars and do not include escalation.

3. The full cost of the Herz Playground Renovation is estimated at $2.5 million; 25-40% of the cost is anticipated to be contributed from impact fees.

4. Through an add-back, the District 10 Supervisor provided $20,000 for this project, distributed through a San Francisco Arts Commission artist grant in early 2019. No impact fees will be utilized for this project.

### Table VV2: Visitacion Valley Impact Fee Projects for Study and Future Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Visitacion Valley Ballfield Renovation</td>
<td>~$585,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elliot Street Staircase</td>
<td>~$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Visitacion Valley Playground Renovation</td>
<td>~$812,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bike Routes To Bay Trail &amp; Candlestick Point</td>
<td>~$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leland &amp; Cora Bulb-Out &amp; Sidewalk Widening</td>
<td>~$237,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Cost estimates are in 2017 dollars and do not include escalation.
### Revenue:

- **VV Fee - Other than Schlage Set Aside**
  - Complete Streets: $506,000 $2,029,000 $598,000 $58,000
  - Transportation / Complete Streets: $1,488,000 $3,978,397 $3,836,912 $7,814,912
  - Recreation and Open Space: $597,000 $1,488,000 $15,000 $43,000
  - Childcare: $398,000 $992,000 $828,000 $29,000
  - Admin: $76,000 $237,000 $198,000 $7,000

### Expenditures:

- **Expenditure Sub Total**: $3,762,000

### Category Balance Per Year:

- Transportation / Complete Streets: $2,029,000 $598,000 $58,000 $1,931,300 $6,344,048 $8,275,348

### Transportation / Complete Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>FY 28</th>
<th>FY 29</th>
<th>FY 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leland Avenue (Phase II undergrounding) DPW</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Connections - Sunnydale (or other) from Schage Lock to Sunnydale DPW</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle and Streetscape Enhancement Fund (MTA) MTA</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for PCDF** $4,163,000

**Grand Total** $4,163,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Revenue (FY19)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY20)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY21)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY22)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY23)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY24)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY25)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY26)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY27)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY28)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY29)</th>
<th>Revenue (FY30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rec and Open Space: Planning</td>
<td>4,069,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Bayview Park/Executive Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Expenditure Sub Total</td>
<td>4,069,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Category Balance Per Year</td>
<td>1,488,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Category Cumulative Balance</td>
<td>(1,984,000)</td>
<td>(1,969,000)</td>
<td>(1,926,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Child Care to H.S.A.</td>
<td>2,269,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Expenditure Sub Total</td>
<td>2,269,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Category Balance Per Year</td>
<td>992,000</td>
<td>543,000</td>
<td>(571,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Category Cumulative Balance</td>
<td>(879,000)</td>
<td>(336,000)</td>
<td>(907,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Admin DCP</td>
<td>216,289</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Admin Transfer to Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Expenditure Sub Total</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Category Balance Per Year</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>(193,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Category Cumulative Balance</td>
<td>(73,000)</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>(268,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenue Totals:**

- FY19: $1,886,000
- FY20: $4,746,000
- FY21: $1,639,000
- FY22: $137,000
- FY23: $7,629,400
- FY24: $14,261,373
- FY25: $15,303,360
- FY26: $29,564,760

**Total Expenditures:**

- FY19: $11,700,000
- FY20: $114,000
- FY21: $485,000
- FY22: $800,000
- FY23: $2,567,000
- FY24: $13,053,000
- FY25: 0
- FY26: 0

**Annual Surplus (Deficit):**

- FY19: $9,814,000
- FY20: $4,632,000
- FY21: $1,154,000
- FY22: 0
- FY23: 0
- FY24: 0
- FY25: 0
- FY26: 0
Visitacion Valley Pipeline

Residential Pipeline
Net Units
- < 13
- 13 – 100
- 101 – 500
- > 500

Commercial Pipeline
Net Gross Square Feet
- < 10,000
- 10,000 – 100,000
- 100,001 – 1,000,000
- > 1,000,000
VISITACION VALLEY PROJECTS

1. Visitacion Avenue McLaren Park Connector (sidewalk and bike facility improvements)
2. Visitacion Valley Greenway Mid-block crossings
3. Aleta Avenue Intersection Improvements
4. Blanken Underpass Illumination
5. Herz Playground Renovation
6. Blanken Underpass Art Mural
7. Visitacion Valley Ballfield Renovation
8. Elliot Street Stair
9. Visitacion Valley Playground Revovation
10. Bike Routes to Bay Trail and Candlestick Point
11. Leland and Cora Bulbout and Sidewalk Widening
VISITACION VALLEY

1. Visitacion Avenue Design Concept
2. Visitacion Valley Branch Library
3. New park at Schlage Lock rendering

Photo credits: (1-4) SF Planning
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 its 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.
Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee
Impact Fee Expenditure Plan Recommendations (FYs 2021-25)

The Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee endorses the expenditure plan outlined in the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) proposed expenditure plan dated 10/18/2019, subject to the following questions and comments:

Line Item 29, Central Waterfront/Dogpatch, Showplace/Potrero Streetscape Project.

How will funds be allocated for the Central Waterfront streetscape improvements? Presumably, the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan will guide the expenditures. How will work items be prioritized?

Line Item 29.2, Treat Plaza.

We would like an update and clarification on the status of this project.

Line item 41, Jackson Park.

The CAC has shown that it considers improvements to Jackson as a priority item. $6.3 million has been allocated for FY 24/25. The CAC would like an earlier allocation of those funds.

Line item 47, Esprit Park.

Esprit Renovation is now fully one year off the schedule published by Rec and Park in late October 2018, as the project team has spent a full year, trying unsuccessfully to change community consensus on the park design. This project is 90% funded by a UCSF grant to cushion their development in Dogpatch, and the design endorsed by the Esprit stakeholder advisory group and supported by Supervisor Walton achieves that objective.

Given the project needs to clear a vote by the BOS, and it’s Rec and Park policy to implement the design which has community consensus, the CAC encourages Rec and Park to move forward immediately.

APPENDIX 2