



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

Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting **AGENDA**

(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: Thursday May 23, 2013

TIME: 2:30 pm

PLACE: Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 110
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

A. CONVENE MEETING: Steve Kersevan, Chair
Note: This is a continuation of the last meeting held on May 16, 2013

CONSENT CALENDAR

None

REGULAR AGENDA ITEM

1.0 Continued Discussion: Recommendations for Allocating Funding through the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program. As Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa County, the Authority has the responsibility for recommending projects for funding available through MTC's OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) program. The Authority previously divided the \$45.2 million in OBAG funds into three parts: \$4.3 million for CMA planning, \$16.6 million for Local Streets and Roads Preservation (allocated by formula to the 20 Contra Costa jurisdictions) and the remaining \$24.3 million for TLC, bicycle/pedestrian and safe routes to school projects. The Authority received 22 applications for the latter portion of the OBAG funding, totaling \$57.8 million. Applicants were given an opportunity to appeal the initial scores received and applicants submitted appeals to the scoring of 13 of the proposed projects. In response, Authority staff, with consultant assistance, revised the project scoring accordingly. Staff contact: Brad Beck (*Attachment – Action*) **CMA Function**

2.0 Adjournment to next regular meeting on June 20, 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 Rosenbohm 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.*

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.



MEMORANDUM

Date May 22, 2013

To Technical Coordinating Committee and OBAG Applicants

From Authority Staff

RE **Second Round OBAG Scoring**

Authority staff, with consultant support, has reviewed the appeals to the initial scoring of the “competitive” OBAG applications and revised the scoring accordingly. While some projects moved up in the rankings and others moved down, in most cases, the same projects stayed in the top tier. The exceptions were the Ohlone Greenway project (El Cerrito) which moved into the top tier and the Contra Costa Boulevard project (Pleasant Hill) which moved out of it. The second round scoring and ranking (including the ranking and scoring by subregion) is included in Attachment A.

In response to the comments made in the appeals, staff made some further minor clarifications to the measures used in evaluating the criteria. The criteria and the measures used to evaluate them are contained in Attachment B.

Attachment C contains two spreadsheets. The first outlines the second round scores for each project on each criterion. The second outlines the change in scores from the initial scoring.

Attachment A

Second Round OBAG Scoring

<i>Project</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>OBAG Request</i>	<i>Cumulative</i>	<i>Initial Rank</i>	<i>Change</i>	<i>Initial Score</i>	<i>Change</i>
San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets Project	San Pablo	1	77	\$5,978	\$5,978	2	1	77	0
Detroit Avenue Complete Streets Project	Concord	2	76	\$2,154	\$8,132	1	-1	79	-3
Ohlone Greenway Station Access, Safety and Placemaking Improvements	El Cerrito	2	76	\$3,468	\$11,600	10	8	61	15
Last-Mile Bike and Pedestrian Access to BART	Concord	4	72	\$1,195	\$12,795	3	-1	70	2
Richmond BART Station Intermodal Improvement Project	BART	5	70	\$2,900	\$15,695	3	-2	70	0
Pittsburg Multimodal Transit Station Access Improvements	Pittsburg	6	68	\$1,300	\$16,995	5	-1	68	0
Golf Club Road/Old Quarry Road Enhancement Project	Pleasant Hill	6	68	\$4,770	\$21,765	6	0	67	1
Hercules Intermodal Transit Center / Hercules Bayfront Village	Hercules	8	67	\$6,000	\$27,765	8	0	65	2
Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project (Beth Drive to Harriet Drive)	Pleasant Hill	9	64	\$1,606	\$29,371	6	-3	67	-3
Downtown Pittsburg Plaza and Streetscape Improvements	Pittsburg	10	61	\$541	\$29,912	11	1	60	1
Iron Horse Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing at Bollinger Canyon Road	San Ramon	10	61	\$6,000	\$35,912	13	3	56	5
Walnut Creek BART Transit Village Multi-Modal Access Project	BART	12	60	\$4,390	\$40,302	9	-3	63	-3
Downtown East End Ped., Bike & Streetscape Improvements, Ph. 2	Lafayette	13	58	\$1,974	\$42,276	15	2	54	4
Richmond 'ROUTE' (Regional Opportunities to Unite Transit and Employment)	Richmond	13	58	\$5,236	\$47,512	22	9	46	12
Port Chicago Highway/Willow Pass Road Bike and Ped Improvement Project	Contra Costa	15	57	\$912	\$48,424	15	0	54	3
Rheem Boulevard/St. Mary's Road Roundabout	Moraga	16	56	\$476	\$48,900	18	2	52	4

Attachment A

Second Round OBAG Scoring

<i>Project</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>OBAG Request</i>	<i>Cumulative</i>	<i>Initial Rank</i>	<i>Change</i>	<i>Initial Score</i>	<i>Change</i>
North Richmond Pedestrian Improvement Project	Contra Costa	16	56	\$1,770	\$50,670	12	-4	57	-1
Riverside Avenue Pedestrian Overcrossing Replacement	San Pablo	18	55	\$2,000	\$52,670	14	-4	55	0
Moraga Center PDA Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	Moraga	19	54	\$563	\$53,233	20	1	48	6
SF Bay Trail - Pinole Shores to Bay Front Park	EBRPD	19	54	\$3,500	\$56,733	17	-2	53	1
City of Concord's SR2S Implementation Program	Concord	21	52	\$643	\$57,376	18	-3	52	0
Crossroads Area Streetscape Improvements	Orinda	22	49	\$462	\$57,838	21	-1	47	2

Second Round OBAG Scoring: Project Ranking by Subarea

Project	Rank	Score	OBAG Request
Detroit Avenue Complete Streets Project	2	76	\$2,154
Last-Mile Bike and Pedestrian Access to BART	4	72	\$1,195
Golf Club Road/Old Quarry Road Enhancement Project	6	68	\$4,770
Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project (Beth Drive to Harriet Drive)	9	64	\$1,606
Walnut Creek BART Transit Village Multi-Modal Access Project	12	60	\$4,390
City of Concord's SR2S Implementation Program	21	52	\$643
<i>Central Total</i>			\$14,758
Pittsburg Multimodal Transit Station Access Improvements	6	68	\$1,300
Downtown Pittsburg Plaza and Streetscape Improvements	10	61	\$541
Port Chicago Highway/Willow Pass Road Bike and Ped Improvement Project	15	57	\$912
<i>East Total</i>			\$2,753
Iron Horse Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing at Bollinger Canyon Road	10	61	\$6,000
Downtown East End Ped., Bike & Streetscape Improvements, Ph. 2	13	58	\$1,974
Rheem Boulevard/St. Mary's Road Roundabout	16	56	\$476
Moraga Center PDA Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	19	54	\$563
Crossroads Area Streetscape Improvements	22	49	\$462
<i>Southwest Total</i>			\$9,475
San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets Project	1	77	\$5,978
Ohlone Greenway Station Access, Safety and Placemaking Improvements	2	76	\$3,468
Richmond BART Station Intermodal Improvement Project	5	70	\$2,900
Hercules Intermodal Transit Center / Hercules Bayfront Village	8	67	\$6,000
Richmond 'ROUTE' (Regional Opportunities to Unite Transit and Employment)	13	58	\$5,236
North Richmond Pedestrian Improvement Project	16	56	\$1,770
Riverside Avenue Pedestrian Overcrossing Replacement	18	55	\$2,000
SF Bay Trail - Pinole Shores to Bay Front Park	19	54	\$3,500
<i>West Total</i>			\$30,852
Grand Total			\$57,838

Attachment B

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Scoring Measures</i>	<i>Max</i>
1. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION AREAS		
<i>Communities of Concern</i>	In PDA (all or partially) AND in COC = 7 Not = 0	7
<i>CARE Communities</i>	In PDA (all or partially) AND in CARE = 3 Not = 0	3
2. READINESS		
<i>Consistent land use policies</i>	Ratio of capacity of PDA for new development to 2040 forecast: <50% = 0 51%–80% = 2 81%–100% = 3 >100% = 4	4
<i>TLC guidelines</i>	Consistent = 2 Partially consistent = 1 Not consistent = 0	2
<i>Market potential of PDA</i>	Significant developer interest = 1 No significant interest = 0	1
<i>Financing in place</i>	Adopted financing plan = 2 Plan being developed = 1 No formal plan = 0	2
3. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES		
<i>Parking management</i>	Adopted parking management = 2 No direct parking management = 0	2
<i>Travel Demand Management</i>	Adopted TDM = 2 No TDM = 0	2
<i>Affordable housing strategies</i>	No net loss = 1 Affordable housing policies = 1 Both policies and no net loss = 2 Else = 0	2
<i>Housing density</i>	Planned density consistent with PDA place type = 2 Planned density partially consistent with PDA place type = 1 Else = 0	2

<i>Job density</i>	Planned density consistent with PDA place type = 2 Planned density partially consistent with PDA place type = 1 Else = 0	2
4. PROXIMITY		
<i>Transit station</i>	Within 1/2 mile of a transit station = 2 Within 1 mile of transit station or 1/2 mile of bus transit center = 1 Else = 0	2
<i>Affordable/senior housing</i>	Within 1/2 mile = 2 Within 1 mile = 1 Else = 0	2
<i>Employment/educational centers</i>	Within 1/2 mile = 2 Within 1 mile = 1 Else = 0	2
TOTAL CONTEXT SCORE		35
1. GENERAL PROJECT CRITERIA		
<i>Community involvement</i>	Council support = 2 Council support plus letters of support = 3 Council support plus community involvement in design of project = 4 Else = 0	4
<i>Meet deadlines and requirements</i>	Within last 4 years: No failures = 4 1 failure = 2 More than 1 failure = 0	4
<i>Removes constraints</i>	Removes significant constraint (development would not occur without project) = 4 Removes moderate constraint (provides improvement that might otherwise be required of developers of infill projects) = 2 Part of project removes constraint (a component of the project provides improvement that might otherwise be required of developers of infill projects) = 1 Else = 0	4

<i>Project readiness</i>	Project has NEPA clearance or alternative environmental clearance and 35% = 4 Project has 35% design = 2 Project has preliminary engineering or conceptual design = 1 Else = 0	4
2. CONNECTIVITY		
<i>Street network connectivity</i>	Reduces vehicular delay or improves vehicular safety = 4 Else = 0	4
<i>Transit network connectivity</i>	Adds transit service or multimodal station or connections = 4 Improves transit service or connections between transit providers or service = 2 Else = 0	4
<i>Bike-ped network connectivity</i>	Fills gaps or improve bike/ped network = 4 Else = 0	4
<i>Regional significance</i>	Completes link in regional network = 4 Connects directly to regional network = 2 Else = 0	4
3. SAFETY		
<i>Public safety</i>	Addresses demonstrated safety issue demonstrated with accident/collision data with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure = 4 Improves a situation with some safety issues significant design deficiency = 2 Generally improves safety by reducing exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians = 1 Else = 0	4
<i>Safe routes to school</i>	Project adjoins school and benefits students = 4 Within half mile of school and benefits students = 2 Else = 0	4
5. REGIONAL BENEFITS		
<i>Air quality</i>	Projects that connect directly to transit stations and improve ped/bike access = 4 Ped/Bike Improvements = 2 Else = 0	4
<i>Vehicle miles traveled</i>	Same as above	4
<i>Congestion management</i>	Same as above	4

6. COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Calculated cost-effectiveness 13

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE 65

GRAND TOTAL 100

Number	Maximum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Sponsor		BART	BART	Concord	Concord	Concord	Contra Costa	Contra Costa	EBRPD	El Cerrito	Hercules	Moraga	Moraga	Orinda	Pittsburg	Pittsburg	Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill	Richmond	San Pablo	San Ramon	Lafayette	San Pablo
		Richmond BART Station Intermodal Improvement Project	Walnut Creek BART Transit Village Multi-Modal Access Project	Detroit Avenue Complete Streets Project	Last-Mile Bike and Pedestrian Access to BART	City of Concord's SR25 Implementation Program	North Richmond Pedestrian Improvement Project	Port Chicago Highway/Willow Pass Road Bike and Ped Improvement Project	SF Bay Trail - Pinole Shores to Bay Front Park	Ohlone Greenway Station Access, Safety and Placemaking Improvements	Hercules Intermodal Transit Center / Hercules Bayfront Village	Moraga Center PDA Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	Rheem Boulevard/St. Mary's Road Roundabout	Crossroads Area Streetscape Improvements	Downtown Pittsburg Plaza and Streetscape Improvements	Pittsburg Multimodal Transit Station Access Improvements	Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project (Beth Drive to Harriet Drive)	Golf Club Road/Old Quarry Road Enhancement Project	Richmond 'ROUTE' (Regional Opportunities to Unite Transit and Employment)	Riverside Avenue Pedestrian Overcrossing Replacement	Iron Horse Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing at Bollinger Canyon Road	Downtown East End Ped., Bike & Streetscape Improvements, Ph. 2	San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets Project
Criteria																							
1. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION AREAS																							
Communities of Concern	7	7	0	7	7	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	7
CARE Communities	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
2. READINESS																							
Consistent land use policies	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	0	4	2	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
TLC guidelines	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2
Market potential of PDA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Financing in place	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
3. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES																							
Parking management	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2
Travel Demand Management	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Affordable housing strategies	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Housing density	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
Job density	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2
4. PROXIMITY																							
Transit station	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	1
Affordable/senior housing	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2
Employment/educational centers	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
TOTAL CONTEXT SCORE	35	32	19	32	33	16	21	18	20	31	25	17	16	12	26	27	19	21	32	15	23	18	33
1. GENERAL PROJECT CRITERIA																							
Community involvement	4	2	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4
Meet deadlines and requirements	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4
Removes constraints	4	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	2	2
Project readiness	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2
2. CONNECTIVITY																							
Street network connectivity	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4
Transit network connectivity	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bike-ped network connectivity	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Regional significance	4	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	4	2	4	2	0	2	0	2	4	0	2	0	4	4	4
3. SAFETY																							
Public safety	4	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	2	4	1	2	2	1	1	1	4	4	4	2	2	4	4
Safe routes to school	4	0	0	4	0	4	4	2	0	4	0	0	4	0	2	0	2	4	0	4	2	2	4
5. REGIONAL BENEFITS																							
Air quality	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	2
Vehicle miles traveled	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	2
Congestion management	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	2
6. COST-EFFECTIVENESS																							
Calculated cost-effectiveness	13	9	7	10	11	12	10	12	7	9	6	12	12	12	12	11	11	8	3	10	5	10	6
TOTAL PROJECT SCORE	65	38	41	44	39	36	35	39	34	45	42	37	40	37	35	41	45	47	26	40	38	40	44
GRAND TOTAL	100	70	60	76	72	52	56	57	54	76	67	54	56	49	61	68	64	68	58	55	61	58	77

Contra Costa Transportation Authority
 Comparison of Second Round Scoring of Applications for “Competitive” OBAG Funding to Initial Scoring



	Maximum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
Number		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
Sponsor		BART	BART	Concord	Concord	Concord	Contra Costa	Contra Costa	EBRPD	El Cerrito	Hercules	Moraga	Moraga	Orinda	Pittsburg	Pittsburg	Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill	Richmond	San Pablo	San Ramon	Lafayette	San Pablo	
Criteria																								
1. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION AREAS																								
Communities of Concern	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CARE Communities	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. READINESS																								
Consistent land use policies	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TLC guidelines	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market potential of PDA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financing in place	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES																								
Parking management	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel Demand Management	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affordable housing strategies	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing density	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job density	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. PROXIMITY																								
Transit station	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Affordable/senior housing	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Employment/educational centers	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL CONTEXT SCORE	35	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	
1. GENERAL PROJECT CRITERIA																								
Community involvement	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meet deadlines and requirements	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Removes constraints	4	0	0	0	-2	0	2	2	-2	1	-3	0	0	2	1	-1	-1	2	2	-4	0	2	0	0
Project readiness	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
2. CONNECTIVITY																								
Street network connectivity	4	0	-2	0	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0
Transit network connectivity	4	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	-2	0	0	0	-2	0	0
Bike-ped network connectivity	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regional significance	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
3. SAFETY																								
Public safety	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
Safe routes to school	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
5. REGIONAL BENEFITS																								
Air quality	4	0	0	-2	2	0	-2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0
Vehicle miles traveled	4	0	0	-2	2	0	-2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0
Congestion management	4	0	0	-2	2	0	-2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0
6. COST-EFFECTIVENESS																								
Calculated cost-effectiveness	13	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	-1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT SCORE	65	0	-3	-7	1	0	-1	3	-2	13	-1	4	4	2	1	-2	-3	1	9	0	5	3	0	
GRAND TOTAL	100	0	-3	-3	2	0	-1	3	1	15	2	6	4	2	1	0	-3	1	12	0	5	4	0	