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Transportation Revenues (including revenue for operations) over 28-year period for Fiscal Years 2012/13 – 2039/40

Draft Estimated Revenue Sources for San Francisco

- **Local** 60%
- **Federal** 18%
- **State** 11%
- **Regional** 8%
- **Anticipated Unspecified** 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Estimated Revenues for San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Unspecified</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of $66.3 billion in both capital ($14.64 billion) and operating ($51.7 billion) revenues expected over the 28-year SFTP period
$66.3 billion (YOE$) revenue forecast assumes¹

- New bridge toll
- 10-cent a gallon regional gas tax
- Treasure Island and Downtown Cordon Congestion Pricing in San Francisco
- Existing sales tax reauthorization
- Anticipated/Unspecified

Each of these new revenue sources requires some type of voter and/or legislative action to be implemented.

¹ Consistent with draft MTC Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) assumptions
Uses of Transportation Funds
over 28-year period for Fiscal Years 2012/13 – 2039/40

- State of Good Repair (SOGR)
- Local Streets and Roads (LS&R)
  - Maintains existing pavement condition
- Transit
  - Fully funds operations and maintenance (O&M) at existing service levels
  - Fully funds revenue vehicles and 70% of total Score 16 assets

- Multi-Modal/Flexible funds are discretionary funds which are subject to the tradeoff discussion in the SFTP
### Cost of the SFTP Baseline Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Cost (in Millions of YOE$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidio Parkway(^1)</td>
<td>$2,052.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay Transit Center, Phase 1</td>
<td>$1,589.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay Transit Center, Phase 2/Downtown Extension of HSR/Caltrain</td>
<td>$2,596.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Subway</td>
<td>$1,578.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Electrification/Signal System (SF share of total cost)</td>
<td>$485.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary Boulevard BRT</td>
<td>$184.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ness Avenue BRT</td>
<td>$126.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Funded Projects (Parkmerced, Mission Bay, Treasure Island, SE Waterfront)</td>
<td>$302.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerba Buena Island Ramp Improvements</td>
<td>$103.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,015.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Includes 30 years of operations and maintenance costs and TIFIA repayments.
### Possible Programmatic Categories for the SFTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Local Streets, Roads, and Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit preferential streets improvements/BRT</td>
<td>New and upgraded streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry improvements</td>
<td>New and upgraded signals and signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit enhancements</td>
<td>Street resurfacing, including safety/access improvements and complete street elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit rehabilitation (facilities, vehicles, guideways)</td>
<td>Non-capacity increasing local bridge rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM</th>
<th>Pedestrian and Bicycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation demand management and parking management</td>
<td>Pedestrian safety, circulation, and rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate protection strategies</td>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle safety, circulation, and rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree planting and maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Programmatic categories cover projects not listed individually**
- **For example: most pedestrian and bicycle projects and transit vehicle and facility rehabilitation projects are handled programmatically**
## Total Estimated SOGR Need

Maintaining current SOGR levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOGR Asset Category</th>
<th>Draft 28-Year Need (billions)(^1,2)</th>
<th>Draft Annual Need (billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads (pavement &amp; non-pavements)</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Structures</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>&lt;$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capital Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$35.6</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Data based on draft MTC RTP/SCS projections

\(^2\) In YOE$
Potential New Funding Sources
Beyond those already assumed in revenue forecast

- Additional ½ cent sales tax (for a total of 1% of SF local sales tax capacity dedicated to transportation)
- Parcel tax (flat rate or progressive)
- Citywide community facilities district (Mello-Roos)
- Transit fare increases
- Parking tax
- Hotel tax increase
- Vehicle License Fee
- HOT lanes on US 101/I-280
- Fine increases
- General obligation bonds
- State cap and trade revenues

➤ Each of these revenue sources involves tradeoffs
➤ Some sources present challenges from an equity standpoint – each needs to be comprehensively evaluated
➤ Other public priorities (education, health care, parks, etc.) are also competing for public funding
Potential New Funding Sources
Key policy considerations

- We need additional transportation revenues to bring our system to a SOGR and to meet the public’s demand for improvements, but must use existing revenues more efficiently to build voter confidence.

- What should SF’s role be in stabilizing Caltrain's operations finances while also addressing SFMTA's needs?

- Continued uncertainty at the federal and state levels present opportunities (e.g. Public-Private Partnerships), but also mean new revenues might need to be local solutions.
San Francisco
Transportation Plan Update

Framework for Developing Preferred Alternative
Prioritizing Projects & Programs
Rank Project/Bundle Performance among Each Goal Area

POTENTIAL PROJECTS

- 2004 Countywide Plan
- Approved Plans & Projects
- Public Input & Call for Projects

Project Effectiveness Scoring
Plan Goals

- Reduce motorized delay
- Increase non-auto trips
- Reduce greenhouse gases
- Reduce transit crowding

Project Effectiveness Scoring Process - Based on Goals and Performance Measures
# Final Cost Effectiveness Ranking and Additional Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness (score/ cost)</th>
<th>Additional Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier I – Top Priority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Packs projects</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses &amp; buggy project</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier II – Middle Priority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaceship project</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Additional Considerations include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollerblade project</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- Socio-economic equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Feasibility/ability to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier III – Lowest Priority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel wings project</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- Ability to phase/segment project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip line project</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>- Unique system performance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Difficult to implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional considerations include:
- Public support
- Traffic safety
- Socio-economic equity
- Geographic distribution
- Feasibility/ability to implement
- Ability to phase/segment project
- Unique system performance issues
Summary:
Developing a Preferred Alternative

Total Available Funding → State of Good Repair Needs → Programs → DRAFT Financially Constrained Plan → Draft Vision Scenario → FINAL ADOPTED PLAN

Project Tiers → Programs → DRAFT Financially Constrained Plan

Public Feedback → DRAFT Financially Constrained Plan

State of Good Repair Needs

www.sfcta.org/MoveSmartSF | twitter.com/SanFranciscoTA | www.facebook.com/MoveSmartSF
Strategic Policy Initiatives
Why strategic policy initiatives? What are they?

- Identify timely or emerging areas of transportation policy need
- Set policy direction for these areas of need and recommend sector strategies and activities that can respond to needs
- Guide the Authority’s work and those of other agencies working in the transportation sector
- Suggest new opportunities for experimentation and innovation
Three strategic policy initiatives in the 2004 CWTP

1. Investments to support key land use goals

- Transit improvements to serve growth areas
  - T-Third, Central Subway, 19th Ave study, Geary BRT, Van Ness BRT, Transbay Terminal
  - New generation of developer mitigation measures

- Coordinated land use/transportation planning efforts
  - Bi-County Study, Park Merced, Treasure Island

- Transportation Sustainability Fee and CEQA reform work

Photo credit: Steve Boland
Three strategic policy initiatives in the 2004 CWTP

Streets as vital public spaces

- Better Streets Plan
- Pavement to Parks
  - Ped plazas (16th, 24th, Balboa BART)
  - Parklets
- Sunday Streets
- Streetscape improvement projects
  - Valencia, Newcomb, Leland
- Better Market Street planning/design
- Shared streets
  - Linden, planned Western SOMA alleys
Three strategic policy initiatives in the 2004 CWTP

3 Travel demand and parking management

- SFpark pilot implementation
- Mobility Access and Pricing Study
- Transportation Demand Management Partnership
- Muni Partners Program
- Continued growth of car-sharing with City support
- Bike sharing kick-off
- Strategic analysis report (SAR) on shuttles
- Guaranteed Ride Home program
- Bike parking ordinance for private buildings
The goals of the SFTP

- Strengthen the city’s regional competitiveness
- Create a more livable city
- Provide world-class infrastructure
- Ensure a healthy environment
Four proposed strategic policy initiatives for the SFTP

1. **Next-generation TDM:** Broaden and deepen TDM efforts in order to manage the demand for driving and parking more effectively.

2. **Compete Streets:** Provide more benefit with each transportation investment by improving the way San Francisco delivers complete streets.

3. **Local-to-regional connection:** Strengthen San Francisco’s connection to the region and balance the needs of residents, commuters, visitors and through travelers.

4. **Public/private partnerships:** Seek out opportunities to partner with the private sector in the delivery of projects and programs.
Next-Generation Transportation Demand Management

Vision statement and objectives

Broaden and deepen TDM activities in San Francisco through meaningful collaboration, more robust approaches, and improved monitoring

- Enhance the City’s internal capacity to implement TDM by deepening inter-agency collaboration
- Build partnerships with and among the private sector
- Pilot innovative projects and programs, to expand the number and types of people reached
- Improve monitoring and evaluation of TDM activities
Next-Generation Transportation Demand Management

Potential strategies and approaches

- Institute more coordinated and streamlined delivery and monitoring of TDM by City agencies
- Support and promote TDM activities with and among private-sector employers and institutions
- Implement robust and innovative TDM strategies, particularly pricing and technology solutions
- Advance bicycling and walking as TDM strategies
## Next-Generation Transportation Demand Management

### Potential strategies and approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-agency coordination</td>
<td>TDM Partnership Project, evaluation of pilots and of Planning Code TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private-sector engagement</td>
<td>Sector Working Groups, Muni Partners Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative strategies</td>
<td>Congestion/parking pricing, bundled transit passes, HOV studies, dynamic ridesharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling and walking</td>
<td>Bike sharing, “Commute by Bike,” public area maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide more benefit with each transportation investment by improving the way San Francisco delivers complete streets

- Consider all modes from the conceptual stages of a project to reduce the cost and time to delivery of complete streets

- Clarify expectations about the “mandatory,” “should,” and “may” components of complete streets
Complete Streets: Strategies and approaches

- Support “complete streets” through Authority funding policy
Expenditure Plan
- Three programmatic categories
  1. Street Repair and Reconstruction
  2. Pedestrian Safety
  3. Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements
- Guiding principles (e.g., quick, tangible benefits)
- $5 million annual revenue

Strategic Plan
- Policies
- Prioritization criteria
- Projects
Prop AA
Policies and priorities that support complete streets

- 50% of program revenues to street resurfacing with priority going to projects with complete street elements

- Priority to projects that have clear and diverse community support and/or were developed through a community-based planning process

- Priority to projects that include a minimal level of enhancement over previous conditions
Complete Streets: Strategies and approaches

- Support “complete streets” through Authority funding policy
- Support a stronger pedestrian sector
Pedestrian Sector
Renewed focus on improving safety and walkability

- **Completed/Recent Initiatives**
  - Better Streets Plan – design guidelines for the pedestrian realm
  - WalkFirst – collaborative citywide planning effort
  - 2010 Pedestrian Safety Directive and Task Force

- **Current/Upcoming Planning Efforts**
  - Pedestrian Strategic Action Plan
  - Traffic Calming Program – Re-visioning process
  - Pedestrian Master/Modal Plan
2. Complete Streets: Strategies and approaches

- Support “complete streets” through Authority funding policy
- Support a stronger pedestrian sector
- Strengthen tools that enable complete streets planning (e.g., multi-agency and public projects database)
- Identify the next-generation network vision (e.g., revised modal plans; “core” circulation network)
Core Network Circulation Study

SFTP CAC and TAC Meeting #7

www.sfcta.org/MoveSmartSF  |  twitter.com/SanFranciscoTA  |  www.facebook.com/MoveSmartSF

May 30, 2012
Study Purpose

1. Understand cumulative network-level transportation performance of many plans that affect the Core (ENTRIPS, TCDP, Better Mkt St, Central Corridor, etc.)

2. Recommend network changes that enable livability improvements while maintaining economic competitiveness and improving system performance

3. Inform development of a long-range core network circulation concept
Map of Projects Affecting the Core
Study Outcomes

1. **Projects/policies** that improve circulation in Core
   - To be included in the San Francisco Transportation Plan Preferred (financially constrained) or Vision scenarios.

2. **Next steps/future studies** to enable longer-term promising network concepts
   - E.g. Transit/HOV access limitations on freeway on-/off-ramps

3. **Identify network classification for SoMa streets** to inform city decision-making about future transportation projects proposed in the Core and potentially to help refine existing plans
### Analysis Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speeds</td>
<td>(auto/transit)</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capacity Utilization (volume to capacity ratio v/c ratio)</td>
<td>(person miles travelled/vehicle miles travelled)</td>
<td>Reported/Under Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Person Trips, Vehicle Trips (by mode and market)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. System Efficiency (person miles travelled/vehicle miles travelled)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Delay</td>
<td>(auto, transit)</td>
<td>Under Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Connectivity</td>
<td>(presence or gaps in bicycle, pedestrian, transit networks)</td>
<td>Under Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-motorized infrastructure provision</td>
<td>(street compliance with BSP recommendations)</td>
<td>Under Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2011 Base</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2035 Baseline</td>
<td>Committed transportation projects and expected growth in housing and jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2035 Baseline Prime</td>
<td>Additional land use and transportation changes proposed for the core including Better Market Street, Transbay Center District Plan, EN TRIPS, Central Corridor Plan and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Core Network Alt. Scenario 1</td>
<td>To be defined based on analysis of 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Core Network Alt. Scenario 2</td>
<td>To be defined based on analysis of 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Core Network Alt. Scenario 3</td>
<td>To be defined based on analysis of 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Potential Core Preferred Scenario</td>
<td>To be defined based on analysis of 1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Do We Get There?

**Study Goals/Purpose**
Gap + Overlap Analysis

**Baseline Conditions**
Baseline “Prime”

**Baseline Circulation Networks**

**Preferred Scenario/Network**

**Timeline**
- **PRE-APRIL**
- **APRIL**
- **MAY**
- **JUNE**
- **JULY**
- **AUGUST**
- **SEPTEMBER**

**Events**
1. Core Circ TAC Meetings
2. SFTP TAC/CAC Meetings
   - CHAMP and Synchro analysis
   - CHAMP analysis only

**Meeting Series**
- **Core Circ TAC Meetings**
- **SFTP TAC/CAC Meetings**
Overview of Findings

1. We have a problem – today **Core streets are congested, auto and transit speeds are slow** and it’s going to get worse in the future.

2. What’s changing? An increase in trips to/from SoMa is driving an increase in overall trips and auto trips to/from the Core.

3. Who is the problem? **Multiple markets contribute to both auto trip origins/destinations and auto pass-through trips in SoMa.**

4. Are we solving the problem? In the Baseline Prime scenario, street space is used more efficiently than today, but transit performance does not improve significantly.
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Today, most transit on Core streets operates below 10mph (pm peak)
And most private vehicles travel below 15mph in Core areas (pm peak)
These streets are expected to be further burdened by growth and capacity reductions proposed in Baseline Prime (pm peak)
Which could have a significant impact on transit speeds, reliability, unless transit streets are fully protected.
Core streets are forecast to be at or above capacity just in Baseline

North-South Screenlines (2030/2035, pm peak)

Source: Fehr + Peers, 2011
Core streets are forecast to be at or above capacity just in Baseline

East-West Screenlines (2030/2035, pm peak)

Source: Fehr + Peers, 2011
Overview of Findings

1. We have a problem – today Core streets are congested, auto and transit speeds are slow and it’s going to get worse in the future.

2. What’s changing? An increase in trips to/from SoMa is driving an increase in overall trips and auto trips to/from the Core.

3. Who is the problem? Multiple markets contribute to both trip origins/destinations and pass-through trips in SoMa.

4. Are we solving the problem? In the Baseline Prime scenario, street space is used more efficiently than today, but transit performance does not improve significantly.
We’re going to look at two different types of trips: trip ends and pass-through trips.

Examples of SoMa trip ends
We’re going to look at two different types of trips: trip ends and pass-through trips.
Increase in core trips ends are predominantly from new trips to/from/within SoMa/Mission Bay

But Downtown still generates the most auto trips in absolute terms.

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
SoMa/Mission Bay trips are also associated with the greatest increase in auto trips ends in Core

- 75% of new core trips will have a SOMA trip end
- Majority of Core trips are still to Downtown, but share declining from 67% to 56%
- New auto trips nearly all to/from SoMa/Mission Bay (+35,000)
- Downtown holds the line on auto trips

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
Now let’s focus only on vehicle trips, but add in pass-throughs as well.

SOMA Vehicle Trips, pm peak trip ends and pass-through

+24,000

+2,000

= + 26k more vehicle trips to manage in SoMa during pm peak

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
Trip starting and/or ending in SoMa are forecast to make up an increasingly significant share of total SoMa trips.

SOMA Vehicle Trips, pm peak
Trip ends vs. Pass-through trips

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
And of trips to/from SoMa, the majority (about 80%) are local trips.
Pass-through trips are a more significant share of overall SoMa travel, but their share is forecast to decrease.

Although share of pass-through trips declines, pass-throughs are still 60% of the total.

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth

= estimated share that stays on highway (doesn’t touch local SoMa streets)
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Where are SoMa auto trip ends coming from/go to? (East Bay, South Bay, Downtown, Mission, Bayview)

- For auto trips, largest markets and largest growth markets are the same
- Exception is growth in internal SOMA auto trips (an opportunity!)

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
Where are SoMa pass-through trips headed to/from?

Distribution of SoMa auto pass-through auto trips, baseline prime, pm peak

Distribution of increase in SoMa pass-through auto trips: 2011 vs. baseline prime, pm peak

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
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How can we measure efficiency with which we use our limited street space?

Overall Vehicle Occupancy or System Efficiency =

\[
\frac{\text{People Miles Traveled (in cars, on transit, on bike/on foot)}}{\text{Car Miles Travelled}}
\]
System efficiency is improving and is better than average for Core districts

- A value of 2 means for every 1 mile a car moves, 2 people move 1 mile.
- Higher number = more people moving for ~same street space “cost”

System Efficiency (PMT/VMT): Core Districts (PM Peak)

Source: SF CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
Core Circulation Network: Potential Strategies

Maximize the Grid
- Carefully consider sidewalk expansion, new bike lanes
- Prioritize transit lanes
- Identify circulation routes internal to the Core (e.g., Downtown to Mission Bay)

Manage Demand
- Cordon and Parking Pricing
- Employer and resident TDM (e.g., bikeshare)
- SOV alternatives to/from SOMA and Downtown, Mission, Bayview, South Bay

Rationalize Regional Access
- Re-organize freeway access ramps
- Dedicate transit space on freeway access routes
- HOV on 101 and 280
- HOV approaches to freeways
Questions? Comments?

- Are these the right analysis metrics?
- Are these findings expected/surprising?
- What strategies (projects, policies) do you think are most important to test in the Network Alternatives?
Thank You. Questions?
SFTP Status & Next Meeting
Remaining project timeline

Summer 2012
- Complete project assessment
- Develop draft Preferred and Vision scenarios
- Core Network circulation study
- Strategic initiatives
- Public outreach round

Fall 2012
- Identify core network preferred alternative
- Evaluate SFTP Preferred scenario
- Institutional recommendations
- Draft SFTP (Internal)

Nov / Dec 2012
- Draft SFTP (administrative)
- Public outreach round
- Final SFTP + plan adoption
Additional Questions?

Thank you!

Next Meeting:
July 18th, 1 p.m.