



CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS Janet Abelson, Chair • Kevin Romick, Vice Chair • Newell Americh • Tom Butt • David Durant • Federal Glover
Dave Hudson • Mike Metcalf • Karen Mitchoff • Julie Pierce • Robert Taylor

ALTERNATES Candace Andersen • John Gioia • Wade Harper • Dave Hudson • Ron Leone • Sherry McCoy • Mary Piepho
Karen Stepper • Don Tatzin

EX-OFFICIOS Amy Worth, MTC • Joel Keller, BART • Myrna de Vera, Public Transit Bus Operators

Executive Director Randell H. Iwasaki

Continuance of Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting **AGENDA**

The TCC meeting of Thursday, February 21, 2013 has been continued to the date and time indicated below:

(Full packet with attachments available at www.ccta.net)
This meeting is scheduled to be audiocast live on the CCTA website.
Visit our Meetings & Agendas page to tune in.



DATE: Wednesday, February 27, 2013

TIME: 2:30 pm

A. Continue February 21, 2013 TCC MEETING: Janice Carey, Chair

7.0 Call for Projects for the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG). As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa, the Authority has the responsibility of overseeing the allocation of certain federal funds available through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). In May of 2012, MTC adopted Resolution 4035 which, among other things, created the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) program. The purpose of the OBAG program is to fund transportation investments that reward jurisdictions that produce housing and focus transportation investments in PDAs while providing more funding and flexibility to counties. Working with the PDA Working Group, made up of local staff and representatives of development and advocacy groups, and consultants, staff has prepared a proposed process and criteria for selecting projects and programs for funding through OBAG. Staff Contact: Brad Beck (*Attachment – Action*) **CMA Function**

8.0 Adjournment to next regular meeting on March 21, 2013 at 2:30 p.m.

ANY WRITINGS OR DOCUMENTS pertaining to an open session item provided to a majority of the Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting shall be made available for public inspection at 2999 Oak Road, Suite 100, Walnut Creek, California, during normal business hours.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The public may comment on any matter on the agenda, or related matters not on the agenda, by completing a speaker card (available in meeting room), which should be provided to a CCTA staff member. Public comment may be limited to three minutes (or other such time period as determined by the Chair), in accordance with CCTA's Administrative Code, Section 103.4(b).

TRANSLATION SERVICES: If you require a translator to facilitate testimony to the Authority, please contact Danice at (925) 256-4722 no later than 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. *Si usted requiere a un traductor para facilitar testimonio a la Authority, por favor llame Danice al (925) 256-4722, 48 horas antes de la asamblea.*

Continuance Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting AGENDA

February 27, 2013

Page 2 of 2

ADA COMPLIANCE This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Govt. Code Sec. 54954.2). Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact Danice Rosenbohm (925-256-4722) during regular business hours, at least 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting.



OneBayArea Grant

Program Guidance

What is the OneBayArea Grant?

In May 2012, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted Resolution 4035, which established the policies for selecting projects and programming available federal transportation funding. While MTC retained much of this funding for regional programs, about 40 percent was designated for the new OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) program. In Resolution 4035, MTC describes the OBAG program as

...a new funding approach that better integrates the region’s federal transportation program with California’s climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Funding distribution to the counties will encourage land-use and housing policies that support the production of housing with supportive transportation investments.

The purpose of the OBAG program is to:

- 1. Reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and produce housing
2. Promote transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs)
3. Increase flexibility for counties by eliminating targets for funding programs

Available Funding

The OBAG funds are allocated to the county congestion management agencies (CMAs) for programming by formula. Contra Costa will get about \$45.2 million through the OBAG program, from three federal transportation programs:

Table with 5 columns: Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality, Transportation Alternatives Program, Total, and one row for Contra Costa with values \$20,855,000, \$21,965,000, \$2,384,000, and \$45,204,000.

MINIMUM PDA SHARE

The OBAG program also requires that at least 70 percent of the OBAG funds be spent on projects that are in, connect directly to, or provide “proximate access” to designated priority development areas, or PDAs, in Contra Costa and the other large counties in the region. In Contra Costa, this 70 percent minimum means that at least \$31,642,800 of the \$45.2 million available through OBAG must be spent on projects that are in PDAs or support PDAs.

PREVIOUS AUTHORITY COMMITMENTS

The Authority has already committed some of this funding to specific projects or sponsors. It ~~has~~ set aside about \$4.3 million for CMA planning and another \$9.5 million for local streets and roads preservation. The former will go to the CMA itself for planning, outreach and project monitoring while the latter will go, by formula, to specific jurisdictions in Contra Costa. (See Appendix 1 for the Cycle 2 commitment to specific jurisdictions for local streets and roads preservation.) In addition, the Authority committed another \$500,000 for a project in Richmond as part of a funding exchange in 2010.

With these commitments, the Authority estimates that about \$30.9 million in OBAG funding remains to be allocated to specific projects and programs.

	<i>STP</i>	<i>CMAQ</i>	<i>TAP</i>	<i>Total</i>
Available OBAG Funds	7,038,000	\$21,465,000	\$2,384,000	\$30,887,000

NEW COMMITMENTS

The TCC recommends that all the remaining STP funds – the \$7 million in STP funds shown above – be allocated, by formula, to the 20 jurisdictions in Contra Costa for LSRP projects (see Appendix 1). All of the remaining OBAG funds, which come from the federal CMAQ and TAP programs, must therefore be used only for TLC, bicycle-pedestrian and SR2S projects. (About \$3.3 million for SR2S projects will be allocated through a separate regional program. The RTPCs will be responsible for identifying projects and programs for this funding.)

Eligible Projects and Applicants

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Applicants can apply for OBAG funding for one of the four following types of projects:

1. Local streets and roads preservation
2. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements
3. Transportation for livable communities
4. Safe routes to school/transit

In addition, CMAs such as the Authority can set aside OBAG funding for planning and outreach activities that “support regional planning, programming and outreach activities.” These activities can include working with regional agencies on transportation plans and programs, establishing land use and travel forecasting models, monitoring the delivery of federal-aid projects, and programming of assigned funding and solicitation of projects. As noted above, the Authority has already committed about \$4.3 million to support CMA planning and outreach activities.

Local Streets and Roads Preservation (LSRP)

Eligible projects will help preserve local streets and roads on the federally-eligible system. To be eligible, the applicant jurisdiction must have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent). Three types of LSRP projects are eligible:

1. **Pavement Rehabilitation:** Pavement rehabilitation projects including pavement segments with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) below 70 should be consistent with segments recommended for treatment within the programming cycle by the jurisdiction’s Pavement Management Program (PMP).
2. **Preventive Maintenance:** Only projects where pavement segments have a PCI of 70 or above are eligible for preventive maintenance. Furthermore, the local agency’s PMP must demonstrate that the preventive maintenance strategy is a cost effective method of extending the service life of the pavement.
3. **Non-Pavement:** Eligible non-pavement activities and projects include rehabilitation or replacement of existing features on the roadway facility, such as storm drains, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), curbs,

gutters, culverts, medians, guardrails, safety features, signals, signage, sidewalks, ramps and features that bring the facility to current standards. The jurisdiction must still have a certified PMP to be eligible for improvements to non-pavement features.

TCC recommends that \$16.6 million in OBAG funds be allocated for LSRP projects, by formula, to jurisdictions within Contra Costa (see Appendix 1). Because these funds will be allocated by formula, sponsors will not need to complete the scoring section of the OBAG application. They will, however, have complete the project information and screening sections as well as the OBAG local jurisdiction and MTC Complete Streets checklists.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Eligible projects can include a wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements including Class I, II and III bicycle facilities, bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking, sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges, user safety and supporting facilities, and traffic signal actuation.

To be eligible, bicycle and pedestrian facilities must *not* be exclusively recreational and must reduce vehicle trips resulting in air pollution reductions. Also to meet the needs of users, hours of operation need to be reasonable and support bicycle / pedestrian needs, particularly during commute periods.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

The purpose of TLC projects is to “support community-based transportation projects that bring new vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high-density neighborhoods, and transit corridors, enhancing their amenities and ambiance and making them places where people want to live, work and visit.” Eligible projects include:

- **Station improvements** such as plazas, station access pocket parks, and bicycle parking
- **Complete streets improvements** that encourage bicycle and pedestrian access

- **Transportation Demand Management projects** including carsharing, vanpooling traveler coordination and information or Clipper®-related projects
- **Connectivity projects** connecting high density housing/jobs/mixed use to transit, such as bicycle/pedestrian paths and bridges and safe routes to transit.
- **Streetscape projects** including multi-modal improvements, especially those that support high density housing, mixed-use development and transit use
- **Funding for TLC projects** that encourage and support housing development in local PDAs

Safe Routes to School/Transit

Eligible projects include infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that facilitate reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. To be eligible for CMAQ funding, the project must have demonstrable air quality benefits.

ELIGIBLE SPONSORS

MTC requires local jurisdictions to meet several requirements to be eligible for OBAG funding:

1. By January 31, 2013, the jurisdiction must have received certification from HCD that the Housing Element in their General Plan complies with State law. (Jurisdictions that have not received it by that date must receive a one-year extension in which to receive HCD certification.)
2. By January 31, 2013, the jurisdiction must either adopt a complete streets resolution that complies with the elements in MTC's model resolution or have adopted a General Plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008
3. The jurisdiction must complete a "complete streets checklist" for each proposed project for which it applies for OBAG funding

In addition, other eligible sponsors, such as transit agencies and the East Bay Regional Park District, must also complete a "complete streets checklist" for any projects they apply for which they apply for OBAG funding. Also, they may not receive OBAG funding for a project in a jurisdiction that does *not* meet requirement #1 and #2, above.

Other Requirements

MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM GRANT SIZE

The OBAG program requires that grants in Contra Costa may not, on average, be less than \$500,000. While the LSRP commitments to individual jurisdictions are as low as ~~\$285,289~~,000, the average is about ~~\$681,000~~\$28,500.

For the remaining OBAG funds, the minimum grant request is \$400,000. Given the effort required to obligate and use the federal funds, allowing a lower minimum grant request could place excessive burdens on sponsors of smaller projects. [The maximum grant request is \\$6 million.](#)

MATCHING FUNDS

As required by the federal transportation programs, jurisdictions must provide 11.47 percent of the cost of each phase of the project. For example, if the construction phase of a project will cost, in total, \$1,000,000, the project sponsor must provide at least \$114,700 in non-federal funds for that phase of the project. The federal funds will provide only as much as \$885,300 for that phase.

COMPLETE STREETS

MTC's Complete Streets policy (Resolution No. 3765) created a checklist that is intended for use on projects to ensure that the accommodation of non-motorized travelers are considered at the earliest conception or design phase. The county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) ensure that project sponsors complete the checklist before projects are considered by the county for funds and submitted to MTC. CMAs are required to make completed checklists available to their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for review and comment before selecting projects for funding in Cycle 2.

In Contra Costa, the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) will review the checklists submitted for the OBAG applications and comment on the accommodations made for bicyclists and pedestrians. The CBPAC comments will be given to the PDA Working Group [and the TCC](#) along with the initial project scoring.

Appendix 2 contains MTC's description of the required process for filling out the Complete Streets Checklist. To obtain a user account that will enable them to logon and add projects, contact CMA staff.

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/routine_accommodations.htm

AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY

In the Bay Area, MTC must make an air quality conformity determination for the TIP in accordance with federal Clean Air Act requirements and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conformity regulations. MTC evaluates the impact of the TIP on regional air quality during the biennial update of the TIP. Since the 2011 air quality conformity finding has been completed for the 2011 TIP, no non-exempt projects that were not incorporated in the finding will be considered for funding in the Cycle 2 Program until the development of the 2013 TIP during spring 2013. Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for PM 2.5. Therefore, based on consultation with the MTC Air Quality Conformity Task Force, projects deemed "Projects of Air Quality Concern" must complete a hot-spot analysis required by the Transportation Conformity Rule. Generally Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) are those projects that result in significant increases in the number of or emissions from diesel vehicles.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 USC Section 4-1 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with federal funds.

MTC APPLICATION, AND RESOLUTION OF LOCAL SUPPORT

Project sponsors must submit a completed project application for each project proposed for funding through MTC's Funding Management System (FMS). The [FMS project](#) application consists of two parts: 1) an application submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff, and 2) [a](#) Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor's governing board or council. A template for the resolution of local support can be

downloaded from the MTC website using the following link:

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP_CMAQ_LocalSupportReso.doc

By July 30, 2013, the Authority must ensure that every project sponsor has submitted a completed project application for each of their projects that the Authority recommends for funding through the OBAG program. To give Authority staff time to review the FMS applications and help sponsors make any necessary corrections, sponsors must submit their FMS applications by July 19, 2013. Although the Authority will not formally adopt the recommended OBAG project list until June 19, 2013, project sponsors may begin the process of adopting their resolutions of local support and entering their projects into the FMS after the Authority’s Planning Committee recommended adoption of the project list on June 5, 2013.

ELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The OBAG funds come from three separate federal transportation funding programs: the Surface Transportation Program (STP), the Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, and the new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). To be eligible for OBAG funding, the proposed project must be eligible for one of those three funding sources. The following table outlines the general eligibility for available federal funding.

<i>Project Type</i>	<i>STP</i>	<i>CMAQ</i>	<i>TAP</i>
Local Streets and Roads Preservation	✘		
CMA Planning and Outreach	✘		
Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	✘	✘	✘
Transportation for Livable Communities	✘	✘	✘
Safe Routes to School	✘	✘	✘

Surface Transportation Program (STP)

Eligible project types include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration and operational improvements for highway and bridge projects
- Transit capital projects

- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities, bicycle facilities and non-construction projects, pedestrian walkways, and modification of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- Highway and transit safety infrastructure projects
- Surface transportation planning
- Transportation enhancement activities

Roadway projects, other than bicycle and pedestrian facilities, must be located on parts of the federal-aid system.

[STP funds will be programed only for the two following purposes:](#)

1. [Local streets and roads preservation \(\\$16.6 million\)](#)
2. [CMA planning and outreach \(\\$4.3 million\)](#)

Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) Program

The CMAQ program supports two important goals of the federal Department of Transportation: improving air quality and relieving congestion. Eligible project categories that meet this basic criteria include: Transportation activities in an approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), alternative fuels, traffic flow improvements, transit expansion projects, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, travel demand management, outreach and rideshare activities, telecommuting programs, intermodal freight, planning and project development activities, inspection and maintenance programs, magnetic levitation transportation technology deployment program, and experimental pilot projects.

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation; recreational trail program projects; safe routes to school projects; and projects for the planning, design or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

Application and Review Process

The process for selecting projects for OBAG funding includes three general stages: application and screening of projects, scoring and ranking of projects, and approval of the recommended program of projects.

SCREENING

In the first stage, Authority staff will review the submitted applications for OBAG funding to ensure the projects and the applicants are eligible.

1. **Matching Funds** – has the applicant identified non-federal funding for at least 11.47 percent of the cost of each phase of the project requesting OBAG funds?
2. **Applicant Type** – is the applicant eligible to receive the requested funding?
3. **Project Eligibility** – is the project eligible for OBAG funding?
4. **Certified Housing Element Adopted** – has HCD certified that the jurisdiction in which the project has a Housing Element complies with State law?
5. **Complete Streets General Plan or Resolution** – has the jurisdiction in which the project is located adopted a General Plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 or has it adopted a complete streets resolution that incorporates elements predefined by MTC?
6. **Complete Streets Checklist** – has the applicant completed a "complete streets checklist" for the proposed project?
7. **Minimum Request Size** – is the funding request at least \$400,000?
8. **Maximum Request Size** – is the funding request no more than \$10 million?
9. **~~A Clear Pathway to Project Completion~~Fatal Flaw** – has the applicant demonstrated that the project can be implemented within the time limits imposed by MTC and federal regulations?

The detailed screening criteria are listed in Appendix 3.

SCORING

Once Authority staff has confirmed that an application meets all nine of the preceding criteria, staff will evaluate it against the scoring criteria. (The scoring criteria are listed in Appendix 4.) Based on that technical review and scoring, staff will develop a preliminary list of funding priorities. It will present that preliminary list to the PDA / OBAG Working Group along with any comments from the CBPAC on the submitted

Complete Streets Checklists for those projects. The [TCC Working Group](#) will [then review the preliminary priorities and any comments from the PDA / OBAG Working Group](#) to determine whether certain types of projects or locations are underrepresented. To address any perceived imbalances or to recognize the limitations imposed by federal or MTC requirements, the [TCC Working Group](#) may suggest adjusting the technical scoring. The principles for making these adjustments to the scoring are outlined in Appendix 5.

As noted above, at least 70 percent of the OBAG must be allocated to projects that are in or provide “proximate access” to PDAs. Appendix 6 outlines how a project will be determined to provide “proximate access”.

Application

The application — available as a separate download from the Authority’s website at www.ccta.net — comes in ~~three~~ [four](#) parts:

1. **General project information**, including project name, project description, project cost, funding plan, and contact information
2. **Screening information**, including information that demonstrates that the applicant and project meet the nine screening criteria
3. **Scoring information**, including information necessary to evaluate the application against the scoring criteria
4. **[Complete Streets Checklist](#)**, submitted through the form on the MTC website

[Sponsors of LSRP projects, which will receive funding through a formula, will not need to complete the scoring section \(part 3\) of the application.](#)

[If the Authority recommends a project for funding through the OBAG program, the project’s sponsor will need to enter the project information into MTC’s FMS and adopt a resolution of local support.](#)

APPENDIX 1

~~Prior~~ Commitments for Local Streets and Roads Preservation

The Cycle 1 CMA Block Grant, the predecessor to the OBAG program, included a LSRP program that allocated funds to jurisdictions by formula. To minimize the number of grants required and thus reduce the amount of work required to carry out the program, the Authority agreed to split the LSRP between Cycles 1 and 2. In Cycle 1, about \$10.5 million in LSRP funds was allocated to seven jurisdictions. At the same time, the Authority also committed about \$9.5 million in LSRP for Cycle 2, now known as the OBAG program.

The following table shows the allocations for both Cycle 1 and 2. [The following table shows the LSRP funds that the Authority committed for LSRP projects as part of the Cycle 1 CMA Block Grant. Jurisdictions may apply for additional LSRP funds beyond the amounts shown in the table but must compete against other project types for the approximately \\$7 million in STP funding not yet allocated.](#)

	<i>Cycle 1 (FY 2009–12)</i>	<i>Cycle 2 (FY 2013–16)</i>	<i>Total</i>
Contra Costa County	\$2,121,000	\$882,000	\$3,003,000
Antioch	\$1,907,000	\$0	\$1,907,000
Brentwood	\$823,000	\$0	\$823,000
Clayton	\$0	\$285,000	\$285,000
Concord	\$2,147,000	\$0	\$2,147,000
Danville	\$0	\$690,000	\$690,000
El Cerrito	\$0	\$466,000	\$466,000
Hercules	\$0	\$519,000	\$519,000
Lafayette	\$0	\$432,000	\$432,000
Martinez	\$0	\$756,000	\$756,000
Moraga	\$0	\$524,000	\$524,000
Oakley	\$0	\$762,000	\$762,000
Orinda	\$0	\$408,000	\$408,000
Pinole	\$0	\$335,000	\$335,000
Pittsburg	\$848,000	\$0	\$848,000
Pleasant Hill	\$0	\$591,000	\$591,000
Richmond	\$0	\$2,545,000	\$2,545,000
San Pablo	\$0	\$336,000	\$336,000
San Ramon	\$825,000	\$0	\$825,000
Walnut Creek	\$1,856,000	\$0	\$1,856,000
TOTAL	\$10,527,000	\$9,531,000	\$20,058,000

As noted elsewhere in this guidance, about \$7 million in federal STP funds remain after setting aside funds for the LSRP commitment and CMA planning activities. To address the continuing need in Contra Costa for local streets projects, TCC recommends that those remaining STP funds be committed to LSRP projects. Using the MTC formula, these funds will be allocated to all 20 jurisdictions in the county. The following table shows the previous Cycle 1 allocations, the proposed Cycle 2 allocations with the additional \$7.0 million in STP funds, and the total for the two cycles of federal funding.

	<i>Cycle 1 (FY 2009–12)</i>	<i>Cycle 2 (FY 2013–16)</i>	<i>Total</i>
Contra Costa County	\$2,121,000	\$1,936,000	\$4,057,000
Antioch	\$1,907,000	\$669,000	\$2,576,000
Brentwood	\$823,000	\$289,000	\$1,112,000
Clayton	\$0	\$385,000	\$385,000
Concord	\$2,147,000	\$753,000	\$2,900,000
Danville	\$0	\$932,000	\$932,000
El Cerrito	\$0	\$630,000	\$630,000
Hercules	\$0	\$701,000	\$701,000
Lafayette	\$0	\$584,000	\$584,000
Martinez	\$0	\$1,021,000	\$1,021,000
Moraga	\$0	\$708,000	\$708,000
Oakley	\$0	\$1,029,000	\$1,029,000
Orinda	\$0	\$551,000	\$551,000
Pinole	\$0	\$453,000	\$453,000
Pittsburg	\$848,000	\$298,000	\$1,146,000
Pleasant Hill	\$0	\$798,000	\$798,000
Richmond	\$0	\$3,438,000	\$3,438,000
San Pablo	\$0	\$454,000	\$454,000
San Ramon	\$825,000	\$289,000	\$1,114,000
Walnut Creek	\$1,856,000	\$651,000	\$2,507,000
TOTAL	\$10,527,000	\$16,569,000	\$27,096,000

At least \$4.3 million of the \$16.6 million allocated for LSRP projects must be in, connect to or provide “proximate access” to PDAs. If no more than \$4.3 million in LSRP projects can be counted in this PDA share, then all remaining OBAG funds must allocated to projects that meet the PDA eligibility criteria.

APPENDIX 2

MTC Complete Streets Process

The following guidance describes the process for responding to MTC's Complete Streets Checklist.

The information can be downloaded from MTC's website at:

www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/routine_accommodations.htm

This page also links to the website where the checklist can be filled out and submitted.



COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST GUIDANCE

<http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov>

1. Checklists can be entered online by the complete streets webpage
2. Checklists are only visible on the webpage for public viewing after MTC has approved the checklists.
3. To edit the checklist for your project please login to the website using your username and password (this information can be obtained from your CMA)

Projects

4. When completing the checklist for the first time, a project must be created. Projects will cover a program of capital improvements. "citywide curb ramp enhancements" would describe the title of the project.
5. **Sponsors** - Select the name of the sponsoring agency from the pull down list. This is the name of the agency that will be implementing the project. If you don't see your agency listed please contact MTC staff to add your agency.
6. **Name** - Add the title of the project. In some cases projects will cover a program of capital improvements such as "citywide curb ramp enhancements" In other cases this will be the title of a project that covers one location.
7. **Description** - In this field add a short description of the type of project and scope of work.

Checklists

8. For each location under the project, a checklist needs to be completed. Checklists provide details for the location of the improvements such as "8th and Oak St." If a project has four different locations one checklist is required for each physical location. This will give the project sponsor as well as member of a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), details of the location and types of improvement proposed.
9. **Name** - Add the title of the project. This will be the title of a project that covers one location.
10. **Description** - In this field add a short description of the type of project and scope of work.
11. **Project Status** - There are two options *In Progress* and *Submitted*. *In Progress* allows projects to be saved and edited. *Submitted* indicates the checklist is complete and is awaiting review and approval by MTC staff.
12. **Project** - Please select the project from the pull down list. You will be able to select the project that you previously created.
13. **Location** - This is the city or county where the project is located. If you do not see your city or county on this list please contact MTC staff. This may be different from your contact address.
14. **Contact Name, phone, e-mail, address** - Provide the information for the contact for more information on the specific details of the project. This information will be displayed along with the project checklist.

I. Existing Conditions

1 PROJECT AREA

- a. What accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians are included on the current facility and on facilities that it intersects or crosses?
- b. If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?
- c. Please indicate any particular pedestrian uses or needs along the project corridor that you have observed or have been informed of.
- d. What existing challenges could the proposed project address for bicycle and pedestrian travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?

Examples include: Class I bicycle paths; Class II bicycle lanes; Bicycle Boulevards; Class III bicycle routes; bike parking; sidewalks on both sides of street; frequent crosswalks; pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle; high visibility crosswalks (e.g., ladder or zebra); pedestrian-level lighting; ADA-compliant ramps, push buttons and green time; median safety islands on roadways with three or more traffic lanes; shade trees; benches; way-finding or directional signage; and water fountains.

Please provide distance to nearest parallel bicycle and pedestrian facilities, in blocks, miles or kilometers.

Examples include: schoolchildren; nighttime pedestrian activity, including sidewalk use or roadway crossings; mid-block crossings; and large numbers of elderly or disabled pedestrians.

Examples of existing challenges include: traffic signals that are unresponsive to bicycles; freeway on- and off-ramps; narrow curb lanes; choke points; railroad crossings; lack of bicycle racks on buses (for bus replacement projects); lack of secure bicycle parking; gaps in bicycle facilities; existing bicycle or pedestrian routes that require significant out-of-direction travel; infrequent opportunities for pedestrians to cross roadways; wide roadway crossings; long signal cycles, which require pedestrians to wait long periods of time; narrow undercrossings and overcrossings; missing sidewalks; sidewalk obstructions; lack of adequate sidewalk clear path of travel for current and projected pedestrian volumes; free right turns for vehicles (which can discourage drivers from observing pedestrian right-of-way); lack of pedestrian-level lighting; and non-ADAAG-compliant facilities.

2 A DEMAND

What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?

Examples of generators include: educational institutions; transit stations; senior centers; high density land uses; downtowns; shopping areas; medical centers; major public venues; government buildings, and parks. Worn paths through unpaved

surfaces (“goat paths”) are also an indication of pedestrian activity.

3 A COLLISIONS

In the project design, have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility? If so, what resources have you consulted?

Resources consulted could include: SWITRS (specify queries); local police data; history of complaints from pedestrians and cyclists; anecdotal reports; etc. Please refer to MTC’s Safety Toolbox for examples of collision countermeasures. (www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians)

II. Plans, Policies and Process

4 PLANS

- a. Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project? If yes, list the applicable plan(s).
- b. Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?

Please cite all plans in which bicycle or pedestrian facilities are identified for the project or its corridor, such as: local and countywide bicycle plans, pedestrian plans, and combined bicycle/pedestrian plans; ADA transition plans; general plans; specific plans; neighborhood plans; station area access plans; park master plans; trails plans; short range transit plans; San Francisco Bay Trail plan; and the Regional Bicycle Plan. For each plan cited, please provide adoption date and URL or staff contact.

5 POLICIES, DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

- a. Are there any local, statewide or federal *policies* that call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project? If so, have these policies been followed?
- b. If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, have all applicable *design standards* or *guidelines* been followed?

In addition to locally-adopted policies, examples include Caltrans Deputy Directive 64 and Policy Directive 22, ACR 211, MUTCD 2003 and MUTCD California supplement. In addition, please see guidance for question #4, above, for examples of plans which may contain applicable policies.

Examples of design standards and guidelines include: locally adopted standards; Caltrans *Highway Design Manual* (Chapter 1000) and *Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities in California*; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Green Book, Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, *Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities*; *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD); MTC *Pedestrian Districts Study*, *Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines* (ADAAG) and applicable countywide CMA, transit agency and regional agency standards.

6 A REVIEW

If there have been BPAC, stakeholder and/or

Although this checklist may be completed prior to

public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed, what comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations?

BPAC, stakeholder or public review of the proposed project, some projects may have been presented to reviewing bodies and/or the public at this stage. For these projects, please summarize comments received that seek to influence project design with respect to accommodating bicyclist and pedestrian travel.

III. The Project

7 PROJECT SCOPE

What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?

Have you considered including the following?

- **Bicycle facilities:** Class I bicycle path; Class II bicycle lane; Class III bicycle route; bicycle boulevard; wide outside lanes or improved shoulders; bicycle actuation at signals (loop detectors and stencil or other means); signs, signals and pavement markings specifically related to bicycle operation on roadways or shared-use facilities; long term bicycle parking (e.g., for commuters and residents); and short term bicycle parking.
- **Bicycle amenities:** Call boxes (for trail projects) and water fountains (also for trail projects).
- **Pedestrian facilities:** Sidewalks on both sides of the street; frequent crosswalks; geometric modifications to reduce crossing distances; pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or automatic pedestrian cycles; pedestrian signal heads; lead pedestrian intervals; high visibility crosswalks (e.g., ladder or zebra); pedestrian-level lighting; and median safety islands for roadways with three or more traffic lanes.
- **Pedestrian amenities:** Shade trees; benches; water fountains; and planter or buffer strips.
- **Facilities for disabled persons** as required by US DOT, as of 11-29-06: Curb ramps, including truncated domes; accessible signal actuation; adequate sidewalk width; acceptable slope and cross-slope (particularly for driveway ramps over sidewalks, overcrossings and trails); and adequate green signal crossing time.

8 HINDERING BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIANS

- a. Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement? If yes, please describe situation in detail.

Examples of projects that could inadvertently worsen conditions for bicyclists and/or pedestrians include: removal of existing roadway shoulder; narrowing of existing curb lane; creating large corner radii; right turn slip lanes; multiple right or left turn lanes;

b. If the proposed project does not incorporate both bicycle and pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project is being proposed as designed.

- Cost (What would be the cost of the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility and the proportion of the total project cost?)

- Right-of-way (Did an analysis lead to this conclusion?)

- Other (Please explain.)

9 CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?

10 ONGOING MAINTENANCE

What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility and how will this be budgeted?

roadway widening, which increases pedestrian crossing distance; increasing green time for one direction of traffic, which increases delay for pedestrians waiting to cross; crosswalk removal; redirecting bicyclists or pedestrians to routes that require significant out-of-direction travel; and elimination of an existing bicycle and/or pedestrian facility.

The Federal Highway Administration recommends including up to 20 percent of the project cost to address non-motorized access improvements; MTC encourages local agencies to adopt their own percentages. Therefore, please provide estimated cost of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements as a percent of total project cost. Has your jurisdiction adopted a threshold? If so, please provide percent and attach adopted threshold policy.

If lack of adequate right-of-way precludes the accommodation of bicyclists and/or pedestrians, please describe limitations. Please make distinction between absence of right-of-way, and trade-offs between various transportation modes. For instance, does existing curb/gutter/sidewalk prevent striping of a new bicycle lane? (If so, please attach intersection LOS data and existing travel lane configuration and widths.) Would curb extensions (to shorten street crossing distance for pedestrians) require eliminating on-street parking spaces?

No guidance

Specify or attach applicable policies and construction permit conditions.

No guidance

Complete Streets Checklist Process

Background

MTC Resolution 3765 calls for all projects funded through MTC's programs and fund sources to consider the accommodations of bicyclists and pedestrians in planning, design and construction. The resolution specifies that project sponsors complete the Routine Accommodations/Complete Streets Checklist when the project is submitted to MTC for funding. The checklist is intended for use on projects at their earliest conception or design phase so that any pedestrian or bicycle consideration is included in the project budget. The guidance is attached to this document as Attachments A, the complete streets checklist can be found online:

Use of the Checklist

The Complete Streets checklist is intended for project sponsors to disclose information about how they have considered bicyclists and pedestrians in the planning and design of transportation projects and to provide a vehicle for discussion about specific accommodations. The countywide Bicycle/ Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs) will be responsible for reviewing the reported accommodations. Answers to questions on the checklist will not affect eligibility for MTC programs. The checklist is designed to be used as follows:

1. MTC recommends the complete streets checklist be completed at the earliest stage of project development and made available to BPACs no later than the time at which a project is recommended to MTC for programming.
2. For funding programs for which CMAs recommends projects to MTC (such as local street and road rehabilitation), the checklist will be required to be submitted to MTC at the time which the CMA submits a list of projects to MTC.
3. For regionally competitive funding programs that do not go through the CMAs (such as MTC's regional TLC program), the checklist will be completed at the time at which the review panel has developed a recommended list of projects based on funds available for programming
4. Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) are responsible for ensuring that local agencies have submitted completed checklists for those programs for which CMA's are responsible.
5. CMAs will make completed checklists available for review by countywide BPACs as described below.

6. MTC will compile checklists and will periodically review how Bay Area transportation projects are considering the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians.

The specific roles and responsibilities of each entity are described below.

Programs and Fund Sources to Which Checklist Applies

The checklist applies to all projects funded through the MTC programs and fund sources listed in Table 1. (See footnote for exceptions.) Projects are not limited to the list below.

Table 1: Programs and Fund Sources*

MTC Programs	Fund Source
Federal	
Capital Improvements, Clean Air, Regional Operations, Regional Streets and Road Rehabilitation, Transit Capital Shortfall, TLC, Regional Bicycle, Climate Initiative	Transportation Enhancement (TE)
	Surface Transportation Program (STP)
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
Fixed guideways improvements, bus earmarks, new starts and transit capital rehabilitation	FTA 5309
	FTA 5307
State	
Capital Improvements (Highway and transit)	Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
Local	
Funds projects identified in SB 916 for capital programs	RM2 Funds – Safe Routes to Transit

* A checklist is not required for projects and planning efforts that do not impact the traveled way (e.g., emergency communications equipment).

Roles and Responsibilities

Project Sponsors

1. The project sponsor is responsible for completing the checklist. The checklist will be posted on MTC’s hosted website <http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov>
2. First time users will need to obtain a user account that will enable them to logon and add projects. This account information is available from your CMA.
3. Once the checklist is completed online, MTC will post the projects two times per month on the Complete Streets website. Note – you do not need to be logged on to the website to see the checklists. On the first and third Tuesday, the checklists

will available to view or download. If there are time constraints please contact MTC staff to expedite review.

4. The project sponsor is encouraged to submit the completed checklist to the CMA or MTC, as appropriate, early in the project conception process.

CMAs

Please note: In counties where an agency other than the CMA staffs the countywide BPAC, some of these responsibilities may be shared with the other agency.

1. CMA staff will be given a login and password for the application by MTC staff. This account will allow CMAs to create login and password for sponsor agencies if so desired.
2. The CMA will forward completed checklists to countywide BPACs as early as possible and notify the BPACs when the checklists are available on the web.
3. Projects that have completed a checklist will be posted on MTC's webpage. Projects can be searched by name, description, sponsor and county. The CMAs will provide a link to the MTC page from the CMA webpage.
4. CMAs are responsible for ensuring project sponsors have completed the online checklists and have made them available through their websites and to the countywide BPACs for review and discussion.
 - a. Each completed checklist will be linked from MTC's page to the applicable CMA's website.
 - b. Checklists for specific projects can be placed on the agenda for BPAC meetings, although they do not require BPAC approval.
 - c. BPACs may choose to review online or by e-mail, especially when there is short time between posting and MTC program adoption.
5. CMAs are encouraged to set their own process as to when project sponsors submit completed checklists but are encouraged to request the checklist be completed as early as possible so project sponsors may consider bicyclist and pedestrian needs during the development of the project and its budget.
 - a. The CMAs will determine when to make the projects available to BPACs for timely review before submittal to MTC for programming.
 - b. CMAs can require the checklist be completed as part of the project application if it fits within their review process.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Committees (BPACs)

Countywide BPACs, in consultation with CMA staff, are responsible for defining procedures for reviewing checklists posted by the CMAs. Please note that each BPAC's membership shall be consistent with MTC Resolution 875.

1. BPACs may choose to review some or all of the completed checklists at a regular meeting or electronically.

2. In cases where the MTC timeline is especially short BPAC staff and/or chair, may need to establish an expedited process using web and e-mail.
3. BPACs should direct questions or concerns arising during checklist review to the project sponsor.
4. MTC and CMA staff will not be expected to participate in discussions about checklist content any more or any less than their current responsibilities allow (unless also the project sponsor).

MTC

1. MTC will revise program guidelines and project solicitations to reflect requirements related to the checklist.
2. MTC staff will verify that a completed checklist has been submitted for each project forwarded to MTC for programming.
3. For programs where sponsors submit projects directly to MTC, MTC will ensure the sponsor has completed the checklist.
4. MTC will conduct a periodic audit of selected checklists in detail to determine whether the checklist and other provisions in the MTC resolution are encouraging routine consideration of non-motorized travel needs.

J:\PROJECT\Ped and Bike\Routine Accommodations Checklist\complete streets Checklist Process v6.doc

APPENDIX 3

Screening Criteria

The following criteria will be used to screen project applications. An application must pass all of the screening criteria before being considered for funding.

DRAFT Table 1 — OBAG Project Screening Criteria

<i>Criteria Category</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Basis</i>	<i>Proposed Value</i>
Matching Funds	Matching Funds are any and all funding the applicant has previously secured or obligated for the proposed project from local, state, or other non-federal sources.	Federal Requirement	11.5% minimum
Applicant Type	Is the applicant an entity eligible to receive federal funding?	Federal Requirement	yes/no
Project Eligibility	The proposed project is eligible for the available federal funding	Federal Requirement	yes/no
Certified Housing Element Adopted	Does the jurisdiction in which the project is located have a HCD-certified Housing Element of their General Plan?	MTC Required	yes/no
Complete Streets General Plan or Resolution	Has the jurisdiction in which the project is located adopted a General Plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 or has it adopted a complete streets resolution that incorporates elements predefined by MTC?	MTC Required	yes/no
Complete Streets Checklist	Has the applicant completed a "complete streets checklist" for the proposed project?	MTC Required	yes/no
Minimum Request Size	Project funding request should be of a sufficient size to justify effort and promote effectiveness.	MTC Required	\$400,000
Maximum Request Size	Project funding request should not exceed a given amount to assure that a diversity of projects is funded in the current funding cycle.	CCTA Policy	\$ 106 ,000,000
<u>A Clear Pathway to Project Completion</u> <u>Fatal Flaw</u>	<p>Has project applicant demonstrated that the project can be implemented within the time limits imposed by MTC and federal regulations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is design and engineering work complete at least to the 35 percent level? ▪ Does the project have a stand-alone capital project, ideally with a complete budget, funding plan, and schedule? ▪ Does the sponsor have a feasible plan to acquire needed right-of-way issues? ▪ Has the sponsor secured needed permits? ▪ Has the sponsor completed necessary environmental review? <p><u>Has the sponsor prepared a project study report or PSR-equivalent that identifies the scope, cost, schedule and environmental analysis required to implement the project?</u></p>	CCTA Policy	yes/no

APPENDIX 4

Scoring Criteria

The OBAG project scoring process as proposed will provide an objective numerical ranking for the proposed transportation projects being considered in the current OBAG funding cycle. The scoring process has the following steps:

1. Applicants submit a project application that describes the proposed project and includes information needed to screen and score the project.
2. CCTA staff reviews the applications based upon “screening criteria” (see Table 1 in Appendix 3) and rejects those projects deemed inconsistent with these criteria.
3. Those projects that meet the screening criteria are then subjected to a preliminary scoring process that will create a numerical score for each project and “rank order” of the proposed projects being considered. The scoring and ranking will be based upon a set of scoring criteria (see Table 2 below) to which a predetermined “weight” is applied; the weight reflects the importance of each criterion in relation to the other criteria. Weighting usually runs from 1 to 4 with a “4” connoting “most important”. The “metric” for each criterion is used to create its numerical score. The metric refers to some technical consideration associated with the criterion, often simply a “yes” or “no” but in some cases a wider ordinal scale. CCTA staff will rely on the information submitted by the applicant but may verify this information independently.
4. Once the rank order of projects has been established the highest ranking projects will be considered for funding. This funding priority process will consider certain allocation criteria (see Table 3) and also whether a given project will be fully funded (as requested) or partially funded.
5. Subsequently, the staff will review the scoring ~~process, both on a project by-project basis and~~ as a whole, with the PDA / OBAG Working Group and in greater detail with the TCC. This review may lead to recommendations ~~by the Working Group~~ for changes to the initial project scoring and ranking and also the project priorities.

Following any changes to the project scoring and recommended funding priorities, ~~CCTA~~ staff will prepare take these OBAG project funding recommendations to the ~~CCTA~~ Board.

DRAFT

Table 2 — OBAG Project Scoring Criteria

Table 2a — Context Criteria

<i>Proposed Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
1. Location of PDA within or partially within "special consideration areas"						
a) Community of Concern (COC)	Is the project located in a PDA and one of MTC's COCs? MTC created this label from a metric including transportation availability and choices, accessibility, affordability, safety and environment.		Out = 0 In = 1			
b) BAAQMD Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Area	Is the project located within a PDA and one of BAAQMD Air Risk Evaluation Areas or adjacent to a corridor with a relatively high concentration of freight traffic?		Out = 0 In with approved BAAQMD mitigations = 1 In without approved mitigations = -1			
2. Readiness of PDA for Development						
a) Are land use planning and regulations consistent with regional PDA development policies and growth targets?	Estimate of new development capacity of PDA as percentage of the 2040 One Bay Area Regional Plan housing forecast		< 50% = 0 51% - 80% = 1 81% - 100% = 2 > 100% = 3			
b) Consistency with TLC Guidelines	Has the jurisdiction adopted design standards and guidelines that are consistent with MTC's TLC guidelines?		Yes = 2 Partially = 1 No = 0			

Table 2a — Context Criteria

<i>Proposed Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
c) Local government and community support for PDA development	Have there been expressions of support from community or stakeholders?		Yes, written expressions of support = 2 Council support = 1 None = 0			
d) Market potential of PDA	1. Percentage growth between 2000 and 2012 in housing units and square feet of commercial space , or 2. The ratio of approved and currently active development (pipeline) projects to existing development in the PDA.		0 -- 5 % = 0 6% -- 10% = 2 > 10% = 3			
e) Presence of major obstacles to development	Are there major physical impediments to development including hazardous materials sites or environmental constraints?		Yes = 0 No = 1			
f) Public and private financing in place	Is there a financing plan in place that demonstrates funding sources for the full range of major public improvements required in the PDA (beyond funding for the proposed project)?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
3. Supportive Policies in Place within PDA						
a) Parking Management	Has applicant adopted parking management policies within the PDA? (Policies could include reduced off-street parking requirements, parking management program, and pricing.)		Yes = 1 No = 0			

Table 2a — Context Criteria

<i>Proposed Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
b) Travel Demand Management	Has applicant adopted travel demand management policies? (e.g., adopted ordinance to implement transportation demand management (TDM) policies that encourage balanced multimodal access to the priority development area)		Yes = 1 No = 0			
c) Affordable housing preservation and creation strategies	Has the applicant adopted the appropriate range of affordable housing programs (inclusionary zoning, density bonus incentives, financial incentives, etc.)? And will there be a net loss of housing due to redevelopment?		Yes = 1 No but no project-related affordable housing demolition = 0 Net loss of housing = -1			
d) Housing Density (current and future) within PDA	Are PDA housing densities allowed under existing planning and zoning regulations consistent with the density ranges indicated for the “place type” of the subject PDA?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
e) Job Density (current and future) within PDA	Is PDA employment capacity allowed under existing planning and zoning regulations consistent with the employment density ranges indicated for the “place type” of the subject PDA?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
PDA Score Total						

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
1. General Project Criteria						
a) Community Involvement	Does the project have council approval and support from identified stakeholders and the community (e.g. letters of support)?		Yes =1 No = 0			
b) Ability to meet applicable deadlines and funding requirements	Does the Applicant have a demonstrated track record of meeting deadlines set in the federal aid process and to actual delivery of projects similar to the proposed project as defined in the application?		Yes =1 No = -1			
c) Removal of development constraint(s)	Does the proposed project remove an identified transportation deficiency or identified development constraint in the PDA?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
d) <u>Project readiness</u>	<u>Does the project have:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Design and engineering work complete at least to the 35 percent level?</u> ▪ <u>Does the sponsor have all right-of-way or a feasible plan to acquire needed right-of-way?</u> ▪ <u>Has the sponsor secured needed permits?</u> ▪ <u>Has the sponsor completed necessary environmental review?</u> 		<u>For each bullet:</u> <u>Yes = 1</u> <u>No = 0</u>			

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
2. Matching Funds (over federal minimum) --deleted by consensus						
a)						
3. Connectivity and Improvement Benefits						
a)	Streets and roadway network		Does project address an operational deficiency on the local street network?	Yes =1 No = 0		
b)	Transit network		Does project expand or improve the transit system or service?	Yes =1 No = 0		
c)	Bicycle and pedestrian networks		Does project expand or improve bicycle or pedestrian facilities?	Yes =1 No = 0		
d)	Regional significance (provide service to variety of users from multiple jurisdictions?)		Does project connect to or complete the regional transportation network?	Yes =1 No = 0		
4. Proximity Benefits						
a)	Public Transit Station		Is the project proximate to a public transit station?	1/8 mi =2 1/4 mi= 1 N/A = 0		
b)	Affordable housing / Senior housing / Disabled housing		Is the project is proximate to existing or planned affordable senior, or disabled persons housing?	1/8 mi =2 1/4 mi= 1 No = 0		

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
c)	Employment centers / Educational centers	Is the project proximate to existing or planned employment center or educational center? (A center is equal to or greater than 1,000 employees or students and staff.)	1/8 mi = 2 1/4 mi = 1 No = 0			
5. Safety Benefits						
a)	Does project increase public safety (reduction of accidents and risk of accidents for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians?)	<p><i>High:</i> Project will address a demonstrated safety issue with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure.</p> <p><i>Medium:</i> Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed.)</p> <p><i>Low:</i> Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians.</p>	High = 3 Medium = 2 Low = 1 None = 0			
b)	Safe Routes to Schools	Does the project improve safety for school children accessing their schools by walking and bicycle or improve vehicle safety and performance?	Yes, bike/ped = 2 Yes, vehicle = 1 No = 0			
6. Regional Benefits						
a)	Air quality improvement	Is the project expected to result in a measurable reduction in air pollutants?	Yes, substantial = 2 Yes, moderate = 1 No = 0			

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
b)	Reduction in vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and/or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	Does the project result in absolute and measurable reductions in VMT (reduced vehicle miles) and/or GHG emissions (tons of CO2 reduction)?	Yes, substantial = 2 Yes, moderate = 1 No = 0			
c)	Congestion management	Is the project expected to result in a measurable reduction in vehicle congestion on local streets or the regional routes serving the PDA?	Yes =1 No = 0			
Project Score Sub-total						
7. Cost Effectiveness						
a)	Measure of cost effectiveness in a manner that is independent of project size	Calculate cost effectiveness by dividing raw score for “project scoring criteria” by total project funding request.				
Composite Score for Proposed Project						

APPENDIX 5

Principles for Adjusting Initial Scoring

After reviewing the technical scoring of the applications for OBAG funding and the priorities that result from it, the ~~Working Group TCC~~ may suggest that certain types of projects or locations are underrepresented. To remedy these perceived imbalances or to recognize the limitations imposed by federal or MTC requirements, the ~~Working Group TCC~~ may recommend that the technical scoring be adjusted to increase the priority for these particular purposes.

The following lists the potential adjustments that could be considered.

~~LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS PRESERVATION~~

~~*Question:* Should all or a portion of the remaining \$7 million in STP funds be set aside exclusively for local streets and roads preservation projects?~~

~~After subtracting the Authority's earlier commitments for CMA planning and local streets and roads preservation projects, about \$7 million if federal STP funds remain to be allocated. Local streets and roads preservation projects can *only* be funded with these STP funds, and not the other funding programs.~~

EMPHASIZING PDA AREAS

Question: Should projects within or immediately adjacent to PDAs be given a specific share of the OBAG funds as opposed to those that only provide "proximate access"?

The Authority could set aside a specific amount of funding or increase the priority for projects that are within — or mostly within — PDAs.

NON-PDA AREAS

Question: Should ~~30 percent~~ the maximum amount of ~~the~~ OBAG funds be reserved exclusively for non-PDA projects?

The Authority may use up to 30 percent of the available OBAG funds — or \$6.6 million of the remaining \$30.9 million — on projects and programs that are not in, directly connect to or provide "proximate access" to PDAs. To meet the 70 percent PDA rule, at

least \$4.3 million of the \$16.6 million set aside in Cycle 2 must meet the PDA requirements. If more than \$4.3 million meets the PDA requirement, then some of the remaining funds could be used outside of PDAs. It is likely that the majority of the LSRP projects cannot be counted in the PDA share. Only 41 percent of the LSRP projects in the initial commitment of \$9.5 million met the PDA eligibility criteria. Should all of the remaining funds that could be used outside of PDAs be dedicated for that purpose?

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

Question: Should the Authority set aside a portion of the OBAG funds exclusively for bicycle and pedestrian projects?

The Authority could set aside a portion of the OBAG funds for projects that expand, improve or close gaps in the network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

GEOGRAPHIC EQUITY

Question: Should the Authority revise the technical scoring of the projects to provide a more balanced allocation of funding to the different areas of Contra Costa?

Contra Costa is divided into four distinct sub-areas, each represented by a Regional Transportation Planning Committee that informs CCTA transportation policy and funding. Some projects could be given a higher priority to reduce the unevenness in the distribution of funds resulting from the technical scoring.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECTS

Question: Should the Authority set aside a portion of the OBAG funds exclusively for Safe Routes to School projects?

The Authority could set aside a portion of the OBAG funds for projects that provide safe access for children walking, bicycling, carpooling or taking transit to get to and from their schools. (Projects funded would need to show an air quality benefit if funded through the CMAQ program.)

APPENDIX 6

Defining Proximate Access

Resolution 4035, which outlines MTC's approach to the next round of federal transportation funding, requires that the Authority must direct at least 70 percent of the funds available to Contra Costa through the OBAG program to PDAs. The resolution does allow a project that is outside the limits of a PDA to count towards the minimum provided if it "directly connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA."

MTC does not define what "proximate access" means. Instead, the CMAs must determine what projects will count towards the PDA minimum and which will not. Resolution 4035 notes that:

For projects not geographically within a PDA, CMAs are required to map projects and designate which projects are considered to support a PDA along with policy justifications. This analysis would be subject to public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG programming decisions. This should allow decision makers, stakeholders, and the public to understand how an investment outside of a PDA is to be considered to support a PDA and to be credited towards the PDA investment minimum target. MTC staff will evaluate and report to the Commission on how well this approach achieves the OBAG objectives prior to the next programming cycle.

We are suggesting a three-step process for determining whether a project will be counted in the PDA share or not, and what the "policy justifications" are for including them. The first step is the simplest: is the project in a PDA or does it directly connect to one? This is the criterion in Resolution 4035. The second step sets "bright-line" tests for whether a project can be counted in the PDA share. These criteria, because they rely on direct measurements, can be easily evaluated. The third step allows the project applicant to make the case for counting the project in the PDA share even though it meets none of the criteria in steps 1 and 2. Because this criterion does not rely on clear measures, it will require professional judgment in its evaluation.

1. IN OR DIRECTLY CONNECTS TO

The proposed project is wholly or partially within the limits of a PDA or directly connects to a PDA

2. “BRIGHT-LINE” TESTS

- a) ~~Does not~~The project improves access to the PDA and is ~~it~~:
 - a. within ½ mile of a PDA, or
 - b. within 1 mile of a PDA and within a designated community of concern (COC), or
 - c. within 2 miles of a PDA and is a project that improves transit access, including bicycle or pedestrian access to transit, on a transit route that serves and connects a PDA

- b) The project improves or completes a gap on the Countywide Bikeway Network designated in the Authority’s *Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*, ~~and~~ is within the designated Contra Costa Urban Limit Line, and improves bicycle and pedestrian access to one or more PDAs.

- c) The project connects a PDA either to a transit station or transit center or to a significant concentration of jobs, either of which is within 1 mile of the PDA

3. OTHER JUSTIFICATION

The Project is greater than ½ mile from any PDA and does not meet any of the above criteria, but does provide critical improvements in access to a PDA, such as removing a barrier in gaining access to a PDA and providing substantially more direct bicycle or pedestrian access to the PDA

Results of Survey on Weighting of Scoring Criteria

	<i>Respondents</i>								<i>Average</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>
	<i>#1</i>	<i>#2</i>	<i>#3</i>	<i>#4</i>	<i>#5</i>	<i>#6</i>	<i>#7</i>	<i>#8</i>		
CONTEXT										
Location of PDA within or partially within "special consideration areas"	30	10	20	5	15	5	10	—	13.6	9.0
Readiness of PDA/Project Area for Development	5	5	10	5	10	20	10	—	9.3	5.3
Extent of Supportive Policies in Place within PDA or Project Area	20	5	20	10	20	5	20	—	14.3	7.3
Total: Context	55	20	50	20	45	30	40	70	41.3	17.5
PROJECT										
Connectivity Benefits	10	25	15	20	5	5	15	—	13.6	8.2
Proximity Benefits	10	15	15	20	5	5	10	—	11.4	6.1
Safety Benefits	20	5	5	20	10	5	25	—	12.9	7.4
Regional Benefits	5	20	10	10	25	5	10	—	12.1	8.2
Cost Effectiveness	5	15	5	10	10	50	10	—	15.0	17.2
Total: Project	50	80	50	80	55	70	70	30	60.6	17.4