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**1.0 Background**

In January 2022, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted [Resolution 4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/5022630-mtc-resolution-no-4505) (Revised dated March 23, 2022), which established the policies for selecting projects and programming available federal transportation funding. Resolution revisions were adopted in March 2022. While MTC will retain 50 percent of the funding for regional programs, the remaining 50 percent is designated for the new One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 3) County and Local Program. This OBAG 3 Program Policy focuses on MTC’s County and Local Program for Contra Costa.

MTC has utilized the OBAG program to better integrate the region’s Federal transportation program with the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Plan Bay Area 2050. Pursuant to California’s climate law (Senate Bill 375 – Steinberg, 2008), the SCS aligns regional transportation planning with land use and housing to meet state greenhouse gas reduction targets. Since 2013, MTC and ABAG have jointly adopted a SCS along with MTC’s long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) every four years, with the documents collectively known as Plan Bay Area.

Funding distribution to the counties is intended to encourage land use and housing programs and policies that support the production of housing with supportive transportation investments. Consistent with prior cycles, the OBAG 3 program framework is designed to advance the implementation of the region’s latest RTP and SCS, Plan Bay Area 2050.

**1.1 MTC Regional Purpose & Requirements for OBAG 3 Program**

[MTC Resolution 4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/5022630-mtc-resolution-no-4505) (Revised dated March 23, 2022) describes the principles that went into the OBAG 3 program:

* Strategically advance Plan Bay Area 2050 implementation through OBAG investments and policies.
* Incorporate recent MTC policy initiatives and adapt to the current mobility landscape.
* Advance equity and safety through policies and investments.
* Address Federal planning and programming requirements.
* Coordinate with complementary fund sources to develop a comprehensive regional investment strategy.
* Emphasize a shared, partnership approach to program implementation.

The purpose of the OBAG 3 program is to:

* Reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process and produce new homes,
* Promote transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs),
* Implement Plan Bay Area 2050, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) adopted by MTC in October 2021.

**1.2 Administration and Allocation**

MTC Resolutions [3606](https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/MTC_Res_3606.pdf), [4202](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/534306-mtc-resolution-no-4202), and [4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/federal-funding/federal-highway-administration-grants/one-bay-area-grant-obag-3) (Revised dated March 23, 2022) allow countywide agencies flexibility in how the OBAG 3 program will be implemented in each county regarding this discretionary funding. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (Authority), as the Countywide Transportation Agency (CTA)/Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for jurisdictions (including cities, towns, the unincorporated County, park districts, transit agencies, and other eligible applicants), throughout Contra Costa, is designated as the countywide program administrator for the OBAG 3 Program.

Each Applicant / Project Sponsor (e.g., cities, towns, and County; not required for transit agencies, utility districts, special districts, or the Authority) must meet the entirety of MTC requirements to receive program funding (See Attachment B): [Resolution 4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/5022630-mtc-resolution-no-4505), Revised dated March 23, 2022; (ABSTRACT dated January 26, 2022), Attachment A, Appendix A-1. The entirety of MTC requirements do not apply to sponsors without a General Plan or land-use authority, such as county transportation agencies (CTAs), transit agencies, a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), or special district. In addition, all recipients of OBAG 3 funding, including public agencies without land-use authority as well as federally recognized Tribal governments, are required to:

* Comply with MTC’s Complete Streets Policy, and its successor, including the requirement to complete a Complete Streets [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets) for each project applying for OBAG 3 funding; and
* Comply with MTC’s Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. [3606](https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/MTC_Res_3606.pdf)).

MTC requirement for an adopted Local Road Safety Plan is further defined by the Authority to require adequate integration of equity and a Safe Systems approach and consistency with the Countywide Transportation Safety Policy and Implementation Guide for Local Agencies.

* + Jurisdiction will electronically submit to the Authority a project list in spreadsheet format (.xlsx or Google Sheets), e.g., as an appendix to each LRSP; and mapped in GIS format.
  + Jurisdiction will submit to the Authority any relevant [GIS files](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1o3NT0G9NFYnhf0ygphjDGLrOJZ4GRtb1yEa5_JQDOK0/edit?usp=sharing) (e.g., these layers) here:
    - <https://spaces.hightail.com/uplink/cclarke>

Per MTC Appendix A-1 of [Resolution 4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/5022630-mtc-resolution-no-4505), a County and Local Program - ATS or Programmatic (e.g., SRTS-NI) project/application that is awarded funding to a jurisdiction through this process will not be programmed into MTC's regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project list until a resolution is locally adopted (each funds-recipient-eligible jurisdiction/agency/applicant not subject to an exception). After December 31, 2023, MTC will deprogram County & Local Program funds awarded to jurisdictions that have not yet adopted a resolution affirming compliance with program requirements. After this date, MTC, in coordination with the Authority/CTAs, will reprogram these funds to projects located in compliant jurisdictions. Self-certification resolutions must be adopted by local jurisdictions and submitted to MTC by December 31, 2023 to maintain eligibility for program funding.

**1.3 Funding Available**

The OBAG 3 Four-Year nomination target for Contra Costa is $56.8 million in Federal Surface Transportation and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (STP/CMAQ) funds, for Fiscal Years 2022-23 through 2025-26. This $56.8 million amount, referred to as the Authority’s nomination amount, is 120% of the available MTC estimated targeted funds for the County, which is $47.3 million. Adding a minimum local funds match of 11.47% (which equals $6.1 million) to $47.3 million will result in a total estimated targeted amount of $53.1 million. Note that the share of the target amount does not imply or guarantee specific funding award by MTC or the Authority. Adding a minimum local funds match of 11.47% (which equals $6.9 million) to $56.8 million will result in a total nomination target amount of $63.7 million for Contra Costa.

Regionally, the OBAG 3 program will fund up to a target amount for the active transportation and safety program of $200 million throughout MTC’s nine-county region, including up to a $25 million nomination target to continue ongoing commitments to SRTS-NI programming and may fund (SRTS) infrastructure projects. MTC’s County and Local Program fund:

* Focuses investments within PDAs and other select geographies
* Allows for broad range of project types to address PBA 2050 goals
* Emphasizes:
  + Bicycle/pedestrian project(s) and program(s), including Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Safe Routes to School and other safety efforts,
  + Project(s) within an Equity Priority Community (EPC) or that otherwise benefit equity, and
  + Transit access, transit priority, and other improvements to accelerate transit-oriented development.

**1.4 Priority Development Area (PDA) investment targets & Proximate Access to a PDA**

MTC requires that a minimum of 70 percent of all OBAG 3 funds allocated through this program cycle be invested in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). An eligible project/application that should be given additional weight may include locations within PDAs or Transit-Rich Areas (TRAs), identified in locally adopted plans for PDAs, or support preservation of Priority Production Areas (MTC regional PPAs). To qualify as credit toward Contra Costa’s PDA minimum investment threshold, a bundled or non-bundled project/application must be located within or connected to a PDA, or be within one-mile of a PDA boundary. Each project/application that is not physically located within one-mile of a PDA, but has a clear and direct connection to PDA implementation (as determined by MTC staff), such as transit maintenance facility improvements, may also qualify as credit toward Contra Costa’s PDA minimum investment threshold. Determinations for such a project/application will be provided by MTC staff on a case-by-case basis.

**2.0 Countywide OBAG 3 Program Policy for Contra Costa**

For this OBAG 3 funding cycle, the Authority will primarily fund three types of projects:

1. Active Transportation and Safety (ATS) Projects

* Bicycling/Rolling- and/or Pedestrian-serving projects, Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and sustainable Complete Streets

1. Contra Costa Countywide Smart Signals Project
2. Programmatic, e.g., Safe Routes to School (non-infrastructure SRTS-NI)

**2.1 Active Transportation and Safety (ATS) Program**

The ATS Program discretionary funding for Contra Costa, may fund Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and will continue existing ongoing operational commitments to SRTS-NI programming, with competition among only similar non-infrastructure programs, and will support SRTS, pedestrian, bicycling/rolling, and safety projects for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and vulnerable road users in Contra Costa (total anticipated: $23.5 million), including projects that are not solely focused on active transportation (such as sidewalk or physically separated and protected bike lane improvements included in, or bundled with, a sustainable Complete Streets project with local road preservation such as repaving and restriping to narrow each lane width). OBAG 3 funds will be programmed to projects that compete well countywide and regionwide. These funds are allocated competitively countywide and regionwide across nine-counties using the factors established by [MTC Resolution 4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/5022630-mtc-resolution-no-4505) (Attachment B - Revised dated March 23, 2022) and additional criteria established by the Authority to evaluate the benefits of the proposed projects and applications.

The countywide intent of this program is designed to implement recommendations from:

* Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP 2018);
* Countywide Transportation Safety Policy and Implementation Guide for Local Agencies to implement Countywide Vision Zero; and
* Countywide Pedestrian Needs Assessment.

ATS funds will be made available each Federal fiscal year (beginning October 1) for four years, based on input from Applicants regarding their proposed project delivery timeline and duration, and MTC funding targets per fiscal year (beginning July 1).

Any application to continue funding an ongoing commitment to a public health or safety-related topic or a SRTS-NI program, (i.e., outreach, engagement, operational or educational format) will be forwarded to each respective Regional Transportation Planning Advisory Committee (RTPC) to inform discussion before establishing funding priorities for various funding sources.

**2.2 Contra Costa Countywide Smart Signals Project**

**Project Description**

The Smart Signals project in Contra Costa County is an Authority-led countywide project to upgrade traffic signal and communication systems throughout its 19 cities/towns and unincorporated communities, and transit agencies.

The project will develop, manage, and implement Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) initiatives such as upgrading the existing legacy systems, providing interconnectivity throughout Contra Costa County signal systems and enhance the sharing of aggregated and generally anonymized real-time information between agencies and the public.

**Purpose and Need**

The existing traffic signal systems in most cities within Contra Costa are legacy systems and are outdated. They lack fiber and/or Global Positioning Systems (GPS) communication makes traffic signal synchronization and coordination between traffic signals along an arterial difficult. Most corridors lack transit priority lanes, bicycle signals/phases, and Signal Control and Prioritization (SCP) technologies to promote transit use by reducing delay and travel times for transit vehicles.

These deficiencies result in traffic congestion within the cities, often resulting in spillover on the freeways, which increases the concern for safety. There is also an increase in overall commuter travel times and delays, greenhouse gas emissions and air pollutants, fuel consumption, and collisions.

To address these deficiencies and to increase safety and improve traffic operations, among other local priorities along corridors, there is a need to upgrade the legacy traffic signal systems and implement an integrated signal technology and communication system throughout the County (incorporated and unincorporated communities) to prepare for emerging transportation technologies (including transit priority) and future Smart Cities initiatives.

**Goals of the Project**

High-level goals of the project include:

1. Improve safety and minimize the rate of crashes between bicyclists, pedestrians, people with disabilities, and vehicles; and move toward elimination of multi-modal fatalities and severe injuries;
2. Optimize multi-modal mobility for all modes including bicyclists, pedestrians, people with disabilities, and vehicles with a focus on multi-occupancy vehicles, with priority to transit and more efficient, smaller/GHG-reducing modes of travel, and
3. Advance to Smart City and Internet of Things (IOT) solutions.

**Key Features**

Key features of the project include infrastructure to achieve the first three steps of an integrated countywide system.
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***Figure 1: Five Steps to Integrated System***

Specific elements of the project include:

* Upgrade traffic signal systems countywide,
* Upgrade Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) for each agency to provide remote control at a central Traffic Management Center (TMC),
* Install or upgrade Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) video cameras,
* Enable video detection of people walking and bicycling/rolling (e.g., to move toward Vision Zero and prioritize movement of more efficient, smaller/GHG-reducing travel modes’ crossings at intersections and trail crossings),
* Install trailblazer/arterial dynamic message signs,
* Install hardware capable of utilizing advanced bicycle-detection software,
* Shared control and operation to allow cross-jurisdictional traffic management,
* Prepare for Connected Vehicle (C2X), Vehicle-to-Everything, (V2X) and Automated Vehicle (AV) technologies,
* Enable enhancements to transit and near real-time automated data collection, analytics, and reporting, Signal Control Prioritization (SCP) for transit and emergency vehicles (preemption), and people walking & rolling/bicycling, before single-occupancy vehicles (SOVs), and
* Vehicle detection systems on designated arterials and state routes.
* Provide battery back-up.

**Expected Benefits**

The upgrades to the traffic signal system infrastructure will come with necessary safety analytics, mobility analytics to provide much needed operational and safety benefits throughout the county (incorporated and unincorporated communities) along with improvement in traffic management.

* ***Operational Improvements:***
  + Decrease in travel time,
  + Reduce public transit delay,
  + Decrease in total multi-modal delay,
  + Prioritize the movement of people walking & bicycling/rolling,
  + Reduce the number of stops at signals for transit vehicles,
  + Increase in average speed of transit, and
  + Create ability to accommodate all modes of traffic.
* ***Safety Benefits:***

Deployment of the Smart Signals Project is expected to result in multi-modal safety improvements such as:

* + Reduce secondary crashes,
  + Enable, improve, and provide enhancements for first responders,
  + Improve emergency service response time and coordination at the time of crisis,
  + Provides ability to identify close-call (also referred to as "near miss") situations and progressively take a more proactive, Safe Systems approach (toward Countywide Vision Zero adopted in September 2021) to prevent future occurrences, and
  + Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (public health)
* **Improvements in Traffic Management:**
  + Shares control and operational improvements of cross-jurisdictional traffic management,
  + Enables cities/towns and Caltrans to manage day-to-day traffic,
  + Enables local event management signal timing options,
  + Provides cities/Caltrans access to monitor all videos and signals to optimize day-to-day operations,
  + Manages arterial traffic during major incidents on freeway, and
  + Signal Control and Prioritization prioritizes transit and emergency vehicles and potential corridor clearing for emergency vehicle access.

**2.3 Programmatic, e.g., Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure (SRTS-NI)**

The Active Transportation and Safety program covers a variety of bicycling/rolling and pedestrian-related project types, including non-infrastructure (NI) – education and encouragement activities and (federally compliant) incentive programs that advance the goals of the ATS program.

The primary programmatic applications will be SRTS-NI, or a local or cross-jurisdictional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, and (as with FAS) will not count toward the maximum number of project/applications that can be submitted by each Applicant.

**2.4** **Schedule, Community Outreach, & Engagement**

The following schedule is for the development of the OBAG 3 call for projects, policy framework, application form, and review process:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Discuss Draft OBAG 3 program policy framework. | January 20, 2022 (TCC)  Technical Coordinating Committee |
| Discuss Draft OBAG 3 program policy framework. | January – May 2022  (Regional Transportation Planning  Advisory Committees’ staff-level  Technical Advisory Committees) |
| Discuss Draft OBAG 3 program policy framework. | January – May 2022  (Regional Transportation Planning  Advisory Committees: Elected Officials) |
| Countywide Transportation Plan update and Growth Management Program Action Plan updates in each of 5 subregions: virtual interactive workshops via Zoom, and  one-on-one discussions with public citizens at highly attended Pop-Up Events at Farmer’s Markets, BART stations, etc. countywide, e.g., open-endedly asking their transportation priorities. | February – April 2022  (multi-phase, multi-lingual, multi-location, multiple forums/formats,  multiple opportunities of  **Public Outreach**/Input) |
| Local Ranking/Revisions to CBPP Project List - Request for Information (RFI) emailed to  Local Agency staff. | Response due to the Authority:  March 11, 2022, 5 PM  Not Yet Submitted as of 05/20/2022:  Danville, Hercules, Martinez, Moraga, Pinole, Pittsburg, Pleasant Hill, San Pablo, Regional Transportation Planning Advisory Committees |
| Smart Signals, Countywide - Request for Information (RFI) emailed to Local Agency staff, prior to one-on-one meetings with staff, and GIS mapping screening effort. | February 24, 2022 |
| Review Draft OBAG 3 program policy call for projects, application template, and scoring criteria. | April 21, 2022 (TCC Meeting #1) |
| **Schedule** (continued) |  |
| Review & recommend approval:  Draft OBAG 3 program policy, call for projects, and application process. | April 25, 2022 (CBPAC) |
| Review & recommend approval:  Draft OBAG 3 program policy, call for projects, and application process.  Nominate four members to serve on OBAG 3 Review Panel. | May 5, 2022 (TCC Meeting #2) |
| Approve OBAG 3 program policy and release of call for projects. | May 18, 2022 (Authority Board) |
| Release OBAG 3 program and call for projects (ATS and Programmatic, e.g., SRTS-NI). | May 20, 2022 (Authority staff) |
| Nominate members to serve on OBAG 3 Review Panel. | May 23, 2022 (CBPAC) |
| Approve nomination of members to serve on OBAG 3 Review Panel. | June 15, 2022 (Authority Board) |
| Conduct Workshop for potential Applicants (attend one of the two workshops). | June 7-8, 2022 (Authority staff) |
| Authority continues coordination with jurisdictions, including transit agencies, for the Countywide Smart Signals project. | June – July 2022 (Authority staff) |
| Applications due electronically to CCTA to conduct initial screening and prioritization of projects submitted for competition within the Active Transportation and Safety Program. | July 15, 2022 (Applicants to Authority staff) |
| Review Panel review and rank ATS applications & Complete Streets [Checklists](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets): the countywide ATS list. RTPCs rank Programmatic ATS projects, e.g., SRTS-NI. | July 18 – July 29, 2022 (CBPAC/TCC Review Panel) |
| Review and recommend for approval: the countywide ATS list of application nominations for MTC scoring and consideration. | August 18, 2022 (TCC Special Meeting) |
| Review and recommend for approval: the countywide ATS list of application nominations for MTC scoring and consideration | August 22, 2022 (CBPAC Special Meeting) |
| Review and recommend for approval: the countywide ATS list of application nominations for MTC scoring and consideration. | September 7, 2022 (Planning Committee) |
| Recommend for approval: the draft final countywide ATS nominations for MTC scoring and consideration. | September 21, 2022 (Authority Board) |
| Submit draft final project nominations. | September 30, 2022 (Authority staff to MTC staff) |
| Submit the final countywide project nominations for MTC scoring and consideration, e.g., with any revisions. | October 31, 2022 (Authority staff to MTC staff) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Schedule** (continued) |  |
| Approve the Regionwide list of application and project nominations. | January 2023 (MTC) |
| Jurisdiction staff (Project Sponsor) must submit to the Authority a “resolution of local support” prior to programming (if nominated by CCTA to MTC). MTC’s template for the resolution of local support can be found [here](https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/federal-funding/federal-highway-administration-grants/one-bay-area-grant-obag-3) | February/March 2023 (Local Agency staff to Authority staff) |
| OBAG 3 funding available for expenditure. | October 2023 (MTC) |
| Latest Date for City/Town to Adopt a  Local Road Safety Plan. | December 31, 2023 (Project Sponsor) |
| Latest Obligation Date. | 01/31/2027 (Project Sponsor) |

**3.0 Call for Projects for the Countywide OBAG 3 ATS Program**

This Call for Projects describes the intent, requirements, program policies, types of projects, types of Applicants and Project Sponsors that will be eligible to compete for MTC’s discretionary OBAG 3 funding. It also includes guidance for completing the Application Form. The final web-based Application Form may be accessed on the Authority’s website at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net)

An Applicant is the lead implementing agency / project manager / recipient & processor of funding.

A Project Sponsor, and co-sponsor, is a public agency partner, non-profit organization, or private contributor/endorsement.

An Applicant or Project Sponsor may deliver the completed application and materials ([here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lW5TreCHH9ziwxcyiTiMA1wG8Gt3XAeB21HCq6QsQhs/edit?usp=sharing)) by email and online. A clear and completed:

* Application (online [here](https://forms.office.com/r/f1Rsgku84g)),
* Complete Streets [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets),
* mapping and GIS files,
* Project Information Form (Project Description guidelines [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iLGFgKib07yffCiuePqJGmS7T2f89JfvRa5gCRV6C6U/edit?usp=sharing)),
* Project Funding Plan (template [here](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1cEy8fD7z3zqy3w8VF78sYJNMu8oITgh-/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118291287617767795126&rtpof=true&sd=true)),
* supporting attachments,
* references

(e.g., Policy Resolution, similar to template [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1irBqf-Ivwf-iaPotyFKP2HkAjqwwJkLR/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118291287617767795126&rtpof=true&sd=true), that prioritizes Safety before Speed throughout scoping, project delivery, and maintenance; yellow-highlighted policy statements from General Plan excerpts) and all other required materials, in electronic format, are due and must be submitted, by the Applicant or Project Sponsor,

**before 5 PM on Friday, July 15, 2022,**

To: Contra Costa Transportation Authority

at <https://spaces.hightail.com/uplink/cclarke>

The Authority’s OBAG 3 Call for Projects, Program Policy, intent, screening requirements, and scoring criteria will be available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net) Please adhere to the information stated in the Scoring Sheet/Criteria in each Application. Each project application packet (single, combined PDF) should be no more than 20 pages. Application forms will be available online for each Project Sponsor to complete. Hardcopy applications and materials will not be accepted, in the spirit of the CCTA Paperless Policy.

An Applicant Workshop will be held for OBAG 3 in June 2022 (date(s) to be confirmed and will be announced on the [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net) website). A portion of the agenda will include a roundtable discussion, and small group breakouts to encourage and discuss multi-jurisdiction project bundling, with representatives from planning, public works, and maintenance personnel, emergency services (e.g., fire department), bikeway design professionals, people with disabilities, and advocacy groups.

Please contact CCTA Associate Transportation Planner Colin Clarke at 925-256-4726 and [cclarke@ccta.net](mailto:cclarke@ccta.net) for questions on the eligibility or application process.

**3.1 Instructions for Applicants and each Project**

**Minimum Grant Size**

A submitted project/application must have a Complete Streets [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets) reviewed by the Authority’s Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) and presented by the Applicant or Project Sponsor. The minimum grant amount request is set at $500,000 in Contra Costa. Each jurisdiction or eligible entity, e.g., WCCTAC or BART, may submit up to two applications each, with the exception of the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) and the unincorporated County of Contra Costa, as each agency may submit up to four applications, one for each subregion. Programmatic (e.g., SRTS-NI) and FAS applications are excluded from the maximum number of applications that are counted toward / considered eligible by the Authority for each jurisdiction or eligible entity. The Authority encourages a single, coordinated countywide application for Programmatic SRTS-NI. However, eligible applications include individual stand-alone (SRTS-NI) Program applications/locations for which a curriculum is already in operation in a location in California. Projects can be bundled across jurisdictions, including infrastructure agencies otherwise indirectly related or unrelated to transportation (e.g., utilities; water district, sanitary district), and should be scalable and replicable throughout the nine-county region. Creative, unique cross-jurisdictional applications (that include a smaller jurisdiction) are encouraged to maximize the efficiency and use of taxpayer dollars, and limit the administrative staff time of each public agency.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposal Type** | **Maximum Grant Amount**  **per Application/Project** | **Minimum Grant Amount**  **per Application/Project** |
| Capital (or Programmatic, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM) | Unlimited | $500,000 |

*Example 1:*

ATS-only project scope with minimum federal match of 11.47%.

If the total project cost is $700,000, the maximum grant request amount is $619,710 in OBAG 3 funds, while providing the minimum required 11.47% match ($80,290).

*Example 2:*

If the project cost includes ATS and non-ATS (or indirectly-ATS-related) components such as preventive maintenance, sustainable street(s) & Complete Streets pavement rehabilitation, lane narrowing by restriping, & streetscape improvements (e.g., bioswale-protected bikeway), and the total cost is $1,000,000, and the project includes Active Transportation and Safety (ATS) program at a cost of $250,000, the jurisdiction can apply for two times (2x) the amount of ATS portion of the scope ($500,000 application toward paving). Because the minimum grant size is $500,000, a project with an ATS component with a cost less than $250,000 (including multi-jurisdiction corridor Quick-Build) will not qualify for OBAG 3 funds. In addition, as stated below, the cumulative total scope related to preventive maintenance, repaving, restriping, and streetscape “shall not exceed 50% of the total project cost (either construction phase or total cost of all phases).”

**Project Site Visit**

In lieu of a project site visit, each Applicant or Project Sponsor is encouraged to submit a field video (up to 5-minute maximum) with the grant application at the link above, and after construction is complete. This field video may help inform a project/application evaluation. The field video should show the project location, highlight issues, and how the project/application will address those issues. This video will not take the place of the project presentation to the CBPAC (for its review of each Complete Streets [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets)) and can optionally be included in the Project Sponsor’s presentation to CBPAC, with guidelines [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/14355c1gRQ9tSVYysXNMXjt8N1h616m75vqwSlQmp7RI/edit?usp=sharing).

**Active Transportation and Safety Program Policy Requirements**

* Every recipient of funds must identify on its website a current single point of contact (SPOC) for the implementation of all FHWA-administered funds within that jurisdiction. This person should have sufficient knowledge in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out after complete and open for public use.
* Each Project Sponsor that is granted OBAG 3 funds must be able to obligate OBAG 3 funds no later than January 31, 2027, and complete projects in accordance with MTC’s Regional Project Delivery Policy (available at <https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/federal-funding/project-delivery>).
* Jurisdiction must be in compliance with [Caltrans Complete Streets Policy](https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/sustainability/documents/dp-37-complete-streets-a11y.pdf) and [MTC Policy Resolution 4493](https://mtc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5518024&GUID=F0D771EA-EEBF-4080-A9FE-303DF0DF3100&Options=&Search=), including CCTA’s CBPAC review of a [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets) for each project, prior to CCTA’s nomination of prioritized projects to MTC.
* Jurisdiction (with some exceptions described below) must meet MTC regionwide eligibility requirements no later than December 31, 2023, for the California Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Cycle 11 [here](https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/highway-safety-improvement-program), i.e., a locally adopted Local Road Safety Plan that adequately includes equity and a Safe Systems Approach.
* Jurisdictions with operations/maintenance or land-use authority must have an adopted town, County, or citywide policy resolution (template [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1irBqf-Ivwf-iaPotyFKP2HkAjqwwJkLR/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118291287617767795126&rtpof=true&sd=true)), no later than December 31, 2023, with a (staff report-) stated intent to adopt a jurisdiction-wide (administrative/transportation/zoning/public works &) municipal code reform ordinance, that adapts Authority’s model policy template for local context, adopts the Safe Systems Approach for consistency with the USDOT National Roadway Safety Strategy, and explicitly will prioritize, in all jurisdiction work (including planning, design, construction, operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement), the **safety** of people traveling in modes that are most efficient for vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction, and person-throughput – before **speed** and **throughput** of vehicles.
* Applicant and Project Sponsor(s) must have jurisdiction-wide adopted regulations, no later than December 31, 2023, that allow, or at least avoid any (un)intentional ban of, electric micromobility devices (e.g., scooters, e-bikes) to be used for transportation access (enabling reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and air pollutants; economic access and improving equity and public health).
* Jurisdiction, no later than December 31, 2023, proposal must have a publicly (staff report-) stated commitment toward annual operations & maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial (provision of an application’s final deliverable) or construction of a capital project.
* Jurisdiction should include a geospatial information system (GIS) “open data” library on its website, with any necessary disclaimer. An online consent electronic signature may be requested if instant access is granted immediately afterward. GIS layer files should include existing vs. proposed streets, trails, and bikeways (publicly accessible) categorized by Level of Traffic Stress (LTS 1 through 4, consistent with the adopted CBPP), data layers from any Systemic Safety Analysis Report Program (SSARP), Vision Zero, or Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) efforts, adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) proposed project boundaries and timing.

**Funding Acknowledgements, Project Website, Videos, Images, and social media**

Project Sponsors that receive a grant are encouraged to create a webpage and content created by the Jurisdiction and submitted to the Authority for review two weeks prior to desired publication date. Each draft and final deliverable, and related presentation slides, will include a high-resolution “Contra Costa Transportation Authority” logo from Authority staff. Social-media posts are encouraged to include clickable links to the funding sources’ username/accounts, e.g., Twitter @ FHWA @California\_CTC @MTCBATA @CCTA and any appropriate hashtag such as #OBAG3CCTA to enable future searches and publicly recognize how and where taxes are spent to benefit communities in Contra Costa. Invitations to the groundbreaking, major milestone(s), ceremonial ribbon cutting, or other grand opening celebration prior to public access, and announcement events are encouraged. For (plan) outreach, engagement, and community participation, please feel free to email Authority staff well in advance with the social media content for CCTA, 511 Contra Costa, and Street Smarts Diablo accounts (as appropriate), e.g., on LinkedIn and Twitter, to amplify information and events. Each construction project must have its Project Sponsor electronically submit to the Authority: high-resolution color-photos before, during, & after the construction phase, in near real-time, uploading and sharing all files and attachments, as they become available.

**Eligible Applicants**

Application/project funding recipients are defined generally by MTC Resolution [4202](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/534306-mtc-resolution-no-4202), Resolution [4505](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj3gqy85rT3AhUXIUQIHWgUDVUQFnoECAkQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fmtc.ca.gov%2Ffunding%2Ffederal-funding%2Ffederal-highway-administration-grants%2Fone-bay-area-grant-obag-3&usg=AOvVaw2eBGll61BIBZ-RPVmzK91H) (Revised dated March 23, 2022), and the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) to Caltrans-recognized Local Public Agencies (LPA) in Contra Costa, which are defined as jurisdictions/local governments (e.g., cities, towns, County of Contra Costa, transit agencies such as BART), county congestion management agencies (CMAs), joint powers authorities such as State Route 4 Bypass Authority, JPA Regional Transportation Planning Advisory Committee (RTPC WCCTAC), tribal governments, public school districts, water/utility districts, resource conservation districts, park and/or open space districts, land trusts and other land/resource protection nonprofit organizations in the nine-county region, with a Master Agreement in place with Caltrans and on-file with the Authority no later than December 31, 2023, are invited to nominate or sponsor projects.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate and partner with other entities on the nomination of projects, and partnerships that leverage additional funding (other sources) will be given higher priority in the grant award process. A partnership is necessary only for a co-sponsor (e.g., utility or special district) that requires a different lead agency/funds recipient that is a city, county, transit agency, park district, or Congestion Management Agency (CMA), to access Federal funds. Each federally funded (OBAG 3) project must have a lead implementing agency (project manager) that is able to receive a federal-aid grant (formal master agreement active with Caltrans’ Office of Local Assistance).

The Authority adds to the list of eligible entities: Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), public transit agencies, special districts, a locally resolution-adopted cooperative agreement or Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) such as WCCTAC, the Authority, and fully public utilities districts and providers. A co-sponsor (any organization(s) different from the lead Applicant) may include an individual school or Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), school district, childcare facility, public health agency, Bike East Bay, Regional Transportation Planning Advisory Committee (RTPC), the Bay Area Regional Trails Collaborative, local park or playground owner, any citizen resident, and the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) should retain a local agency to partner as an Applicant and Project Sponsor. Project Sponsors are responsible for project management and implementation.

A not-for-profit special district, including Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS), East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD), a fully public water, communications (e.g., fiberoptic), sanitation, or sewer district (e.g., Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) canal rights-of-way, East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)), and a Priority Conservation Area (PCA) with plans to enhance transit and non-vehicular access to open space or parks or retail or health facilities, is eligible to serve as both Applicant and Project Sponsor. Any public utility or water district, canal, or flood channel project, that primarily serves people walking or bicycling, does not count toward the total number of applications allowed for the County.

**Applications Eligible to Compete for Discretionary ATS Funds**

MTC’s OBAG program is intended to address air pollution reduction by reducing vehicle trips and supporting bicycle/pedestrian commuter needs. Projects must not be exclusively recreational in scope as they should be commute-oriented as required for eligibility for federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds and reduce vehicle trips and maximize greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution reduction.

CMAQ Funds are typically used for projects or programs that will contribute to attainment or maintenance of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM).

STP funds are considered the most flexible funding source and can be applied toward many different types of projects including transit, carpool/vanpool, bicycle/pedestrian, safety, traffic monitoring/management, and roadway and bridge/overcrossing projects.

The ATS Program may fund a variety of projects, using any of the priority criteria in the CBPP (Table 7-1), such as gap closures, with a focus on building out a safer, contiguous countywide Low-Traffic-Stress Network (mainly Class I and Class IV bicycle facilities), with connectivity to, from, and between residential, parks and recreational destinations or routes, outdoor open spaces, transit, shopping, and employment locations.

OBAG 3 may fund a variety of proposals including Class I and IV bikeways; cycle tracks; sidewalks, curb ramps, and raised crosswalks; driveway or curb-cut narrowing/removal; safety improvements; and bicycle- or pedestrian-actuated traffic signals. Because OBAG 3 includes CMAQ funds, these projects will also need to demonstrate air quality improvement.

Bicycle and pedestrian projects may be located on or off the federal-aid highway system.

The OBAG 3 program is intended to address air pollution reduction by reducing vehicle trips and supporting bicycle/pedestrian commuter needs. Projects must not be exclusively recreational in scope as they should be commute-oriented as required for eligibility for federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds and reduce vehicle trips and maximize greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution reduction. To meet the needs of users, hours of operation need to be reasonable and support the needs of vulnerable road users (VRUs), people walking, people bicycling/rolling, children, people with disabilities, and seniors – particularly during commute periods and hours of darkness. Shorter trips and remote work.

OBAG 3 will fund 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. Improvements may include transit stations and transit access improvements; transit operations serving Priority Development Areas (PDAs); sustainable multi-modal complete streets improvements; operational management improvements; and TDM programs. Planning that supports transit-oriented PDA development is also allowed as part of the TLC category.

Each ATS-eligible Project type or Application type includes:

* Construction phase of a project scope that includes planning, environmental, design, or engineering work
* Recommendations from the adopted 2018 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, especially a project that contributes to construction of a contiguous low stress network; Class I bikeways; two-way cycle tracks.
* Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements for infrastructure or facilities projects that primarily benefit people walking or bicycling/rolling (micromobility) or accessing transit.
  + typically not intended to primarily serve recreational trips (because these competitive funds regionally prioritize air quality improvement)
  + “Access to transit” may include reliable and modernized elevators and fare gates is crucial to linking people to their destinations by active transportation modes.
* Local street or road maintenance (or pavement overlay) project bundled with any of the other project types listed here, if a minimum of 80% of each grant is expended on the other scope (project types) listed here.
* Transit agency project that supports people walking or bicycling who travel countywide or throughout the region.
* New pedestrian walkway, and modification of a public sidewalk to comply with (or exceed the minimum requirements of) the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990; curb ramps within one mile of a public school or childcare facility (serving any ages from birth until age 18 adulthood).
* A safety project, especially a new roundabout, or turbo roundabout, that is known to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution, severity of each collision, kinetic energy transfer, and individual & regional economic costs per repair/recovery; and
* A project that integrates multiple recommendations from the Authority’s Safe Systems Toolbox actions (link [here](https://ccta.net/planning/countywide-vision-zero/)), Curb Data Specification tool, or ‘daylighting’ projects (ensure that zero on-street vehicle parking is designated within at least the first 10 feet along each corner street frontage), that systemically will reduce fatal or severe-injury incidents involving pedestrians or bicyclists, reduce speed, or reduce the severity of each collision by replacing an intersection with a new roundabout or protected intersection, for example.
* Innovative transportation planning to move more quickly toward Countywide Vision Zero by reducing fatalities and severe injuries, using a Safe Systems approach.
  + e.g., application of systemic speed reduction methods near multiple highway interchanges, trail crossings, transit, facilities for seniors & youth, and

removal of channelized right turns and unprotected left turns.

* Quick-Build materials design & construction / temporary demonstration
  + May include projects that serve as a temporary or interim version of the long-term solution CBPP project list in Appendix-D.
  + Temporary is defined as no fewer than 90 days.
  + Minimum community outreach requirements from MTC should be met.
* Safe routes to school non-infrastructure programs and infrastructure projects.
* Continuation of an established Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure (SRTS-NI) program already in operation for three or more years at one or more schools or districts, including expansion and/or enhancement of an existing program in California.
* Safe Routes to School walk audits, pick-up & drop-off operations/management plans associated with restriping, Quick-Build materials, or other physical modifications that primarily serve people walking, bicycling, and using family- and cargo-sized bicycles (e.g., with trailers), Complete Streets, and multi-modal corridor and intersection safety assessment studies that result in locally adopted project lists and cost estimates, and
* Safe Routes to School (SRTS). Infrastructure projects and non-infrastructure programs that support Safe Routes to School (SRTS-NI) programs and facilitate the reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. Access to school. Because this sub-program is funded with federal Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, justification within the application must be included regarding how projects or programs funded improve air quality. Within one mile of a school.
* Create a publicly accessible land-use map online where the community can designate a drop-off (& pick-up) location for perishable and non-perishable packages, before last-mile deliveries are made using electric cargo tricycles.
* Curb management; vehicle parking reduction; parking lot retrofit project (e.g., public school) that improves safety, separates vehicle queues & circulation from and (a loading zone that) accommodates electric bicycles or cargo bicycles/tricycles or family-oriented bicycle trailers or accessories on-street or off-street, e.g., during drop-off and pick-up peak times for meaningful mode shift.
* Accommodations of loaded electric cargo bicycles/tricycles, bicycle trailers, electric bicycles, electric personal mobility devices including scooters.
* Projects that create safer shoulders and/or widen an existing trail,
  + e.g., for passing slower traffic, such as people traveling, standing, sitting, community-building, neighborly communication, parenting, bicycle, or mobility device repair, and otherwise replacing gravel or significantly uneven surface(s) that could result in injury.
* Mobility Hub implementation.
* Bikeshare capital projects (or scooters or other micromobility devices).
* A project that is not solely focused on active transportation (such as sidewalk or physically separated and protected bike lane improvements included in, or bundled with, a sustainable streets & Complete Streets local road preservation project such as repaving and restriping to narrow lane widths), if Complete Streets, Quick-Build, and Vision Zero are appropriately addressed.
  + Screen projects with MTC Regional Active Transportation, LRSP project lists.
  + Streetscape projects to encourage bicycling, walking, and transit use.
  + The cumulative total scope related to (indirectly-ATS-related scope) preventive maintenance, repaving, restriping, and streetscape shall not exceed 50% of the total project/application cost (either construction phase or total cost of all phases, as applicable). MTC criteria requires that any of these types of projects/applications that include existing pavement with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating of 70 or above, must have its Project Sponsor refer the Authority’s Review Panel to a specific section of the jurisdiction’s Pavement Management Program’s needs analysis (report) highlighting any specific need/proposal; and must have its Project Sponsor demonstrate, in the application narrative language and in imagery, how the proposed preventive maintenance strategy is a cost-effective method to extend the service life of the final scope’s pavement.
    - Refer to Example 2 above. Non-ATS-related (or indirectly-ATS-related) costs and scope items include, but are not limited to, project component(s) that will primarily serve vehicles; on-street asphalt outside of a bike lane (bike boulevard can be considered an exception, upon discretion of the Review Panel, on a case-by-case-basis). ATS-related scope items, such as traffic-calming, with more direct benefits to people walking or bicycling/rolling include the “example project components” listed above.
  + Eligible non-pavement activities include rehabilitation or replacement of existing features on the street or roadway facility, such as bridge structures, storm drains, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), curbs, gutters, culverts, medians, guardrails, safety features, signals, signs, sidewalks, ramps, sustainable streets and Complete Streets elements, and features that bring the facility to current standards.
* Example project components include bulb-outs, sidewalk widening, gap closures, special emphasis (continental) and raised crosswalk enhancements, all-way / diagonal crossing / Barnes Dance / pedestrian scramble, driveway or curb-cut narrowing, bicycle- or pedestrian-actuated traffic signals, audible signal modification, mid-block crossing and signals, advanced stop line, bike box, “sharks teeth,” road reconfiguration (sometimes referred to as a road diet), new striping for lane reconfiguration (narrower lane widths; narrower lanes designated for motorcycles, mopeds, and golf-cart-sized “middle modalism” vehicles; fewer lanes) and separated & physically protected bicycle lanes, raised planters, planters, pedestrian street lighting and trail lighting, medians, pedestrian crossing islands, wayfinding signs, tree grates, bollards, permanent bicycle racks or secure covered bicycle parking, signal modification for detection and priority movement of pedestrians and people bicycling/rolling, street trees (with Sponsor-provided justification of shade provision, low maintenance, and minimal potential to (trip) create hazards), costs associated with on-site stormwater retention, permeable paving, removal of impermeable paving, replacement with cooler materials or surface treatments, and pedestrian-scaled street furniture including bus shelters, benches, electric mobility device charging stations, drinking water, interactive placemaking & public art, and solar-powered garbage and recycling compaction bins.
* Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) rural streets and highways improvements. FAS funding amounts are determined by California’s Federal-Aid Secondary Highways Act (California Code § 2200-2214).
  + Rural roadway improvements on the federal aid system are eligible for OBAG 3, based on the latest guidance from (MTC and) Caltrans on FAS, as of March 25, 2022. These changes will be incorporated into a future proposed revision to MTC’s OBAG 3 County and Local Program Call for Projects Guidelines. The amount is not yet determined at this time.

Any FAS application will not count toward the maximum number of project/applications that can be submitted by the County/Applicant.

* Applications, projects, and programs prioritized in Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) and Participatory Budgeting (PB) processes through MTC’s Regional Programs, which may include any of the above project types and project elements, as well as a variety of transit capital improvements.
* Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) and Participatory Budgeting (PB) processes in Equity Priority Communities (in addition to CBTP and PB processes administered through the MTC Regional Programs).

Application types that are \*not\* eligible, include:

* Quick-Build materials application/project with a total cost less than $500,000.
* Project scope that includes a single application phase of only one of any of the following: design, environmental review & documentation, permitting/approvals, planning, a plan, or a study.
* Any Class III or “paint only” project with a final scope that lacks physical barriers that can minimize the impact of a vehicle from the perception / perspective of a person bicycling/rolling or walking (all ages and abilities).
* Application scope that primarily includes establishment of a new, stand-alone (SRTS-NI) Program for which its curriculum is not already in operation in a location in California.

**OBAG 3 Active Transportation and Safety (ATS) Program**

**Review and Ranking of each OBAG 3 ATS Application/Project**

The Scoring Sheet for the Active Transportation and Safety (ATS) Program

is included below, as an attachment, to be used by each evaluator of each (application or) project. The Scoring Sheet provides a consistent framework by which review and evaluation will occur, prior to ranking, and should ensure that applications are evaluated on the same standards and criteria.

**Competitive Process**

Any application that is submitted should be done so while keeping in mind that the application must compete well at both the countywide scale and regional scale.

A Review Panel consisting of members from the Authority’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and CBPAC, will be formed to provide input on the final program policy and serve as the project evaluation, scoring, and ranking panel. The CBPAC will review each OBAG 3 Application’s Complete Streets [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets) for completeness. Each numbered item in the online and attached Application Form must be completed clearly for evaluation.

***Conflict of Interest Form***

Each evaluator is required to sign a Conflict of Interest form before receiving an application(s) to review. The Conflict of Interest form, as in the state’s Active Transportation Program, requires the potential evaluator to certify that they can and will review each project/application objectively, and will list any project/application(s) that could present a potential conflict. An individual with a potential conflict, whether stated or not, is responsible for nominating and securing an Authority-approved commitment from a different individual from the TCC or CBPAC (including alternate members), as applicable. The Review Panel members will agree on consensus scores for each criterion for each application based on the Authority-approved Scoring Sheet. Evaluators will submit consensus score forms to Authority staff. Evaluators must include meaningful comments on each consensus score form that explain the given consensus scores. Any consensus score forms without meaningful comments will be returned to the Review Panel evaluator for completion. Simultaneously with Review Panel scoring, Authority staff will read and score applications, as appropriate, to provide a check score for evaluators. Every consensus score will be compared to the check score. This process allows for the Authority’s representatives to identify errors or discrepancies with scoring. Authority staff can meet with each Review Panel member to discuss their scores, even if there are no issues.

***Review and Ranking of Applications (ATS Program and Programmatic, e.g., SRTS-NI)***

The Application Form and Scoring Sheet, and each of their details that should be reviewed by each Applicant prior to submittal of any application, is included in the Call for Projects or Appendix, for each evaluator on the Review Panel.

This section details how the Authority will evaluate benefits of the proposed projects (to consist of 75% of each project’s total score) before nomination to MTC. MTC will evaluate all nominated projects/applications for the remaining 25% score.

Authority staff will conduct the initial review of submitted applications to ensure that each application is consistent with all eligibility screening criteria. An application that is deemed eligible will be forwarded to the Review Panel. The Review Panel will score the applications against the more qualitative (than quantitative) criteria, such as how well the project scope will improve safety for people bicycling or walking, and by utilizing a Safe Systems Approach, e.g., using FHWA’s Safe Systems Intersection (SSI) method of intersection analysis, or removes constraints to future development. These latter criteria include whether the project/application is:

* within or near a Priority Development Area (PDA),
* within an Equity Priority Community as defined by MTC,
* past and forecast residential development to meaningfully address the legally and state-declared state of emergency (through Fiscal Year 2030), with a lack of “missing middle”-sized and below-market-rate homes, commonly referred to as the affordable housing crisis.
* whether the project will serve a dense job center within three miles of homes or any transit, and
* whether the geographic project boundary limits will be served by high-quality transit service defined as service frequency that occurs at least every 15 minutes for any length of time between 6:00 AM and 12:00 AM.

The Review Panel and Authority staff may conduct a site visit as part of application review, with the option of a virtual tour led by the Applicant via the Zoom or Microsoft Teams application with video and audio enabled.

After the screening and initial scoring is complete, Authority staff will coordinate with the Review Panel to review both the qualitative and quantitative scoring to ensure consistency and, from this review, develop a proposed list of recommended, and ranked, projects/applications.

Authority staff will present this adjusted recommendation list, including each application with its Complete Streets [Checklist](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets) for compliance with the 2008 Complete Streets state law and [MTC Policy Resolution 4493](https://mtc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5518024&GUID=F0D771EA-EEBF-4080-A9FE-303DF0DF3100&Options=&Search=), to the Authority’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), followed by review and recommendation of a list by the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC), followed by review and recommendation of a list by the Planning Committee (PC). Authority approval of a countywide list of nominated projects to MTC is anticipated in September 2022.

***Evaluation and Scoring of Projects***

Projects will have a maximum score of 75 points by the Authority’s Review Panel. Up to 25 points will be added by MTC after the project is evaluated on the regional level (up to 35 points for applications eligible for CMAQ funding). All scoring at the Authority’s countywide level will be completed by a panel of members of CBPAC and TCC.

If the Local Agency funding match percentage exceeds the minimum 11.47% match amount, the countywide score (total number of points) will increase along with the percentage at which the Local Agency or Project Sponsor commits as total match funds. The minimum local match is 11.47% of the total *federally participating* project cost. Refer to the Scoring Sheet.

Because the program is focused on funding Safe Routes to School (programmatic SRTS-NI) and infrastructure (SRTS) projects, there will not be a “Set-Aside” category of funding specifically toward Plans or Studies. There is no “Maximum Limit” per application, e.g., $2 million per project, including any application that bundles multiple projects within or across jurisdictions.

After the final project/application ranking is completed, an evaluation will be performed to take into account equity among subregions, with regards to number of projects/applications funded and the amount of funding requested and recommended. Final consideration will be made to assure that the top-ranked projects/applications in the final countywide list recommended for OBAG 3 funding are the most competitive at the regional level.

**Table 3-1. Scoring Categories and Assigned Weights** (Maximum Points per Criterion)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Description** | **Maximum Points** |
| 1 | Safety and Injury Prevention | 12 |
| 2 | Public Health Outcomes | 7 |
| 3 | Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant | 8 |
| 4 | Bundled Projects | 4 |
| 5 | Deliverability, Readiness, and Feasibility | 8 |
| 6 | Improve Connectivity | 7 |
| 7 | Range and number of users | 7 |
| 8 | Latent Demand | 6 |
| 9 | Local Community and Policy Support | 5 |
| 10 | Focus on MTC & Plan Bay Area 2050 objectives | 6 |
| 11 | Prioritizing Public Space | 3 |
| 12 | Increase Transit Ridership | 2 |
|  | **Authority Total** | **75** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Information** | |
| 1. Countywide  **Grant Application/**  **Project Name:** | *Project name* |
| **2. Countywide**  **Grant Application/**  **Project Phase(s):** | e.g., (Design &) Construction;  or Years # of Total # Funded Years (if Programmatic) |
| **3. (2018) CBPP Project Number(s):** | \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan |
| **4. Project Sponsor / Applicant Agency (Recipient/Processor of Funding)** | *Project sponsor* |
| **5. Partner Agency/Agencies** | e.g., East Bay Regional Park District, Contra Costa Water District (canals’ public rights-of-way), County of Contra Costa Public Works’ jurisdiction (flood control channel public rights-of-way) |
| **6. Sponsor Single Point of Contact:** | *Contact name* |
| *Contact phone* (desk/office vs. remote work vs. mobile) |
| *Contact email* |
| **7. Supervisor:** | *Contact name* |
| *Contact phone* (desk/office vs. remote work vs. mobile) |
| *Contact email* |
| **8. RTPC region for geographic location of site** |  |
| **9. Project Location and Boundaries** | *Project location* |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **10. Brief Project Description:**  **Guidelines** [**here**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iLGFgKib07yffCiuePqJGmS7T2f89JfvRa5gCRV6C6U/edit?usp=sharing) | *Project description* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Eligibility** | |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Federal Fund Eligibility**  *Is the final scope eligible for federal transportation funds?* | **11.** Select the OBAG 3 federal fund source(s) for which the project is eligible: |
| Surface Transportation Block Grant (STP) Program (See [FHWA fact sheet](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/stbg.cfm))  Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program (See [FHWA fact sheet](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/cmaq.cfm) and tools [here](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/))  *Note: projects eligible for CMAQ funding must provide inputs for air quality improvement calculations, using templates provided on the* [*OBAG 3 webpage*](https://mtc.ca.gov/obag3). |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Eligible Project Type**  *Is the final scope an eligible proposal type?*  *(Select all final scope components that apply)*  *Criterion 6*  *Criterion 12*  *Criterion 4* | **12.** Select the eligible project type(s) below (refer to the Authority’s OBAG 3 Program policy (Attachment A), [MTC Complete Streets Policy Resolution 4493](https://mtc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5518024&GUID=F0D771EA-EEBF-4080-A9FE-303DF0DF3100&Options=&Search=), and [MTC Resolution No. 4505](https://mtc.ca.gov/digital-library/5022630-mtc-resolution-no-4505) (Revised dated March 23, 2022) for detailed eligibility guidelines): |
| ***Growth Framework Implementation***  PDA Planning Grant  Local Planning Grant: *Plan Bay Area 2050* Growth Geographies [here](https://www.planbayarea.org/sites/default/files/documents/PBA2050_Growth_Geographies_Oct2021_0.pdf); open data [here](https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/plan-bay-area-2050-growth-geographies/explore?location=37.985450%2C-122.000287%2C12.00)  ***Complete Streets, Sustainable Streets, & Community Choice***  Quick-Build (materials or method)  net new Class I bicycling facility  net new Class IV bicycling facility  Pedestrian Infrastructure  Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure (Programmatic SRTS-NI)  SRTS Infrastructure or Walk Audit (that will result in Project List)  Safety project  Complete Streets improvements  Sustainable Streets improvements (e.g., stormwater management, low-impact development techniques)  Streetscape improvements  Local Streets and Roads Rehabilitation or Maintenance (e.g., repaving)  Gap closure (e.g., bikeway or walkway)  net new Curb Ramp  net new Wayfinding sign(s) or pavement marking(s), etc.  Rural Roadway Improvement (or FAS: Federal-Aid Secondary)  Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) or Participatory Budgeting (PB) Process in an [Equity Priority Community](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/access-equity-mobility/equity-priority-communities) (EPC)  CBTP/PB Project Implementation  ***Climate, Conservation, & Resilience***  Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program or Bicycle/Pedestrian program  Mobility Hub  Parking or Curb Management  Bike Share capital improvement  Improvements to access Open Space, Park(s), or (Passive or Active) Recreation  Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP)  ***Multi-modal Systems Operations & Performance***  Transit capital improvement  Transit station improvement  [Bay Area Transit Transformation Action Plan](https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2021-09/Transit_Action_Plan_1.pdf) implementation  Active Operational Management  Mobility Management and Coordination  Bundled project/application (final scope in two or more jurisdictions) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Policy Alignment** | |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Federal Performance Goals**  *How will the final scope support federal performance measures?*  *Criterion 6*  *Criterion 11*  *Criterion 1*  *Safety and Injury Prevention*  *and*  *Criterion 2*  *Public Health Outcomes*  *Criteria 1 & 2 (continued)* | **13.** Select the [federal performance measures](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/federal-performance-targets) that are supported by the project: |
| Safety: Significantly reduce traffic fatalities and severe injuries for all users on all public roads and improve the safety of all public transportation systems. [select this option for Public Health outcomes or Programmatic, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM]  Which of the FHWA “proven countermeasure(s)” or “crash modification/reduction factor(s)” ([here](https://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/)) will be included in the final scope to reduce maximum potential vehicle Speed during construction and future operation?  Infrastructure Condition: Improve the pavement condition on the Interstate and National Highway System (NHS) and NHS bridges and maintain the condition of public transit assets in a state of good repair.  Congestion Reduction: Significantly reduce congestion on the NHS in urbanized areas.  System Reliability: Improve the reliability of the Interstate system and NHS.  Freight Movement and Economic Vitality: Improve the reliability of the Interstate system for truck travel.  - Will the final scope improve access to jobs, or the reliability of, Freight/Goods Movement by cargo bicycle, electric bicycle, and improve Economic Access/Vitality?  - How many family- & cargo-sized bicycle parking spaces will be added?  Environmental Sustainability: Maximize emission reductions from CMAQ-funded projects. [Select this option for Programmatic or Public Health outcomes]  To which extent will the application reduce air pollution & greenhouse gas emissions? (tools [here](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/)) State whether application/project is in an area of Non-Attainment status, Air Quality Conformity Analysis, or Community Air Risk Evaluation program status, or Air Pollution Cancer Risk status, or Area Highly Impacted by Air Pollution. |
| **14.** In one to three paragraphs per selection above, describe how the application/project supports the selected federal performance measure(s):  *Please describe*  To which Level of Traffic Stress (1 through 4) will the project construct a segment that is part of a future safer, more contiguous countywide Low-Traffic-Stress Network (mainly Class I bicycle facilities)  To which extent is the systemic / Safe Systems approach (e.g., SSI intersection analysis) integrated into the final scope? e.g., a specific crash type addressed in multiple locations via careful site selection/planning.  To which extent will the final scope reduce the maximum potential Speed (observed/actual instead of “posted speed limit”) of vehicles?  To which extent will the severity of each potential collision be reduced by way of kinetic energy transfer that will result from the project?  Will the final scope add a new roundabout?  To which extent will the individual & regional economic costs (2020) per incident (e.g., including repair/recovery) be reduced by the proposal? (e.g., refer to MTC “BayViz” regional safety data webtool)  To which extent will the cumulative “Plan Countermeasures” (e.g., Leading Pedestrian Interval) be effective after the final scope is completed, to move toward Countywide Vision Zero? (e.g., refer to MTC “BayViz” regional safety data webtool)  Quantify the estimated reduction in severity of each collision.  Which of the Countywide Vision Zero toolbox actions are included in the proposal?  Is the proposal located along or within a particular proximity of a High-Injury Network corridor, High-Risk (or -Exposure) Network segment, emergency evacuation route, and/or a CTP or GMP Action Plan-designated Regional Route of Significance? (latest) moving toward more proactive, Safe Systems approach, such as road characteristics  Which of the FHWA “proven countermeasure(s)” or “crash modification/reduction factor(s)” ([here](https://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/)) will be included in the final scope to reduce maximum potential vehicle Speed during construction and future operation?  How has the City Attorney committed to using the law known as Assembly Bill 43?  Which of the Common Countywide Collision Pattern(s) from 2008 – 2017 SWITRS data will be eliminated or reduced as a result of the final proposal scope?   * Speeding * Driving under the Influence * Contraflow bike riding * Seniors (vulnerable population) * Youth (vulnerable population) * Highway interchange(s) * Trail crossing(s) * Channelized right turn slip-lanes * Skewed intersection(s) * Unprotected left turns at signal * Red light violation   Will the final scope significantly reduce bicycling or pedestrian fatalities and/or severe injuries?  Will the final scope improve the pavement condition on an off-street trail or walkway and maintain the condition of public transit assets in a state of good repair?  To which extent has and/or will the program address the topics above? |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Plan Bay Area 2050 Strategies**  *How does the project align with* Plan Bay Area 2050 and Outcomes such as  Public Health*?* | **15.** In two or three paragraphs, describe how the project supports [*Plan Bay Area 2050*](https://www.planbayarea.org/finalplan2050) Strategies and/or [Implementation Plan](https://www.planbayarea.org/2050-plan/final-plan-bay-area-2050/chapter-7-final-implementation-plan):  *Please describe* |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Regional Policy Alignment**  *How does the project align with other regional policies and plans?* | **16.** Select the regional plans and policies with which the application/project is aligned: |
| MTC’s [Regional Safety/Vision Zero Policy](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/bicycle-pedestrian-micromobility/regional-safetyvision-zero)  MTC’s [Equity Platform](https://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/what-mtc/equity-platform)  MTC’s [Regional Active Transportation Plan](https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/investment-strategies-commitments/climate-protection/regional-active-transportation-plan)  MTC’s [Transit-Oriented Communities](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/land-use/transit-oriented-development-tod-policy) Policy  Bay Area [Transit Transformation Action Plan](https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2021-09/Transit_Action_Plan_1.pdf)  County Climate Action Plan  Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (adopted)  Locally adopted Plan  Locally adopted Project List |
| **17.** In two or three paragraphs total, describe how the project aligns with the selected regional plans and/or policies:  *Please describe* |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Regional Growth Geographies**  *Does the project support PBA 2050 Growth Geographies?*  *Definitions* [*here*](https://www.planbayarea.org/sites/default/files/pdfs_referenced/2019_Regional_Growth_Framework_Update_-_Whats_Changed_1.pdf)  *(select all that apply)*  *Criteria 6, 10 & 12* | **18.** Indicate the application/project’s relationship to *Plan Bay Area 2050* [Growth Geographies](https://www.planbayarea.org/sites/default/files/documents/PBA2050_Growth_Geographies_Oct2021_0.pdf): |
| ***Priority Development Area (PDA)***  Meets MTC’s definition of PDA-supportive (within [one mile or less of a PDA boundary](https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/pba-2050-priority-development-areas-one-mile-buffer/explore))  Does not meet definition of PDA-supportive, but otherwise has a clear and direct connection to implementation of a Priority Development Area(s)  **19.** *Please describe*  Included in a locally adopted PDA plan (e.g., Specific Plan, PDA Investment and Growth Strategy)  **20.** *Locally-adopted PDA plan reference* |
| ***21. PDA type: Transit-Rich Area (TRA) or Connected Community***  Within a TRA or otherwise supportive of a TRA (see [Growth Geographies](https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/plan-bay-area-2050-growth-geographies/explore) map)  Within a Connected Community PDA or otherwise supportive  **22.** *Please describe* |
| Transit priority areas were identified by the Authority as a Common Countywide Collision Pattern in 2008 – 2017 SWITRS data.  ***23. Priority Production Area (PPA)***  Supports the preservation of industry, region-essential business, or middle-wage jobs, within a PPA (see [Growth Geographies](https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/plan-bay-area-2050-growth-geographies/explore) map)  **24.** *Please describe* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Equity Priority Communities**  *Criteria 4, 7, & 8* | **25.** Indicate how the application/project will invest in historically underserved communities, including *Plan Bay Area 2050* [Equity Priority Communities](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/access-equity-mobility/equity-priority-communities) (EPCs): |
| Located within and supportive of an EPC (see [Equity Priority Communities](https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/equity-priority-communities-plan-bay-area-2050/explore) map)  Not located within an EPC, but is otherwise supportive of an EPC or other historically underserved community  **26.** *Description of how project supports an EPC or other historically underserved community* |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Local Housing Policies**  *Criterion 10* | **27.** Indicate if the project is located in a jurisdiction that has adopted policies which support the [“3Ps” approach to affordable housing](https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/investment-strategies-commitments/housing-solutions/housing-protection-preservation) by listing the relevant adopted policies for each element of the 3Ps. Additional guidance and resources on affordable housing policies are provided on the [OBAG 3 webpage](https://mtc.ca.gov/obag3). |
| Protect current residents from displacement (with emphasis on policies that have demonstrated effectiveness in community stabilization and anti-displacement).  **28a.** *List of applicable policies*  Preserve existing affordable housing (with emphasis on policies that have demonstrated effectiveness in community stabilization and anti-displacement).  **28b.** *List of applicable policies*  Produce new housing at all income levels.  **28c.** *List of applicable policies* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Local and Community Support** | |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Community Support**  *Criterion 9*  *Which* [*tools*](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1PzOzOgj5T1e7_iuNjSrPOKRjhEVDtpxL/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=118291287617767795126&rtpof=true&sd=true) *were used for outreach and engagement?*  *Which* [*tools*](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/) *were used to demonstrate community benefits?* | **29.** Indicate if the application has demonstrated community support through one or more of the following, particularly if located in a conventionally underserved community:  Public outreach responses specific to this project, including comments received at public meetings or hearings, feedback from community workshops, or survey responses.  **30.** *Summary of public outreach responses*  Project is consistent with an adopted local transportation plan.  **31.** *Description of project consistency with local plan* |
| **32.** Indicate if the project has demonstrated support from communities disproportionately impacted by past discriminatory practices, including redlining, racial covenants, codes, & restrictions, urban renewal, and highway construction that divided low income and communities of color. Resources for identifying impacted communities are available on the [OBAG 3 webpage](https://mtc.ca.gov/obag3). Community support may be demonstrated through one or more of the following:  Prioritization of the project in a Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) or Participatory Budgeting (PB) process.  **33.** *CBTP or PB reference*  Endorsement(s) from a Community-Based Organization (CBO) representing historically underserved and potentially impacted community/ies.  **34.** *Description of CBO endorsement*  Proposal is in an adopted Complete Streets Safety Assessment study  Proposal is consistent with a State, County, or Local Public Agency Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan  Proposal is in an [Equity Priority Community](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/access-equity-mobility/equity-priority-communities) (EPC)  Proposal is in an adopted Area Plan / Specific Plan |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverability & Readiness** | |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Project Readiness**  *Criterion 5* | **35.** Describe the readiness of the project, including right-of-way (acquisition) impacts and the type of environmental review document/clearance required:  *Project readiness, right-of-way, environment*  To which extent has the applicant committed annual operations & maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial construction? e.g., At which frequency is the jurisdiction proposing to commit to maintenance of the new or improved facility, such as sweeping? (e.g., for safety)  Is any necessary right-of-way already acquired?  **36.** If the project touches Caltrans right-of-way, include the status and timeline of the necessary Caltrans approvals and documents, the status and timeline of Caltrans requirements, and approvals such as planning documents (PSR or equivalent) environmental approval, encroachment permit.  *Caltrans approvals status and timeline*  Which month & year will the proposed project (realistically) begin construction? |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Deliverability**  *Criterion 5* | **37.** Describe the project’s timeline and status, as well as the sponsor’s ability to meet the January 31, 2027, obligation deadline:  *Project timeline, status, and obligation deadline*  Will the final scope be consistent with the minimum criteria required in the state law effective since January 1, 2021 known as Senate Bill 288? (to streamline CEQA review and documentation, per guidelines [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yvhkGGsWwojJo27DH9KfoODBHEkhOpq0MZ0tKwkJV0M/edit?usp=sharing)).  **38.** Identify any known barriers or risks to on-time project delivery and schedule, and how the Project Sponsor will mitigate and respond to those risks:  *Project risks and mitigation strategies*  Which issues could arise before project implementation?  Has a single jurisdiction committed to ensuring complete implementation of the final scope across multiple jurisdictions? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Cost & Funding** | |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Grant Minimum** | **39.** Does the application/project meet the minimum grant size requirements? Projects must be a minimum of $500,000 for a County with a population over 1 million (Contra Costa).  *Exception request to minimum grant size* |
| Eligibility Screening Criteria  **Local Match**  Criterion 3 | **40.** To which extent will the Project Sponsor meet or exceed in providing a local match of at least 11.47% of the total federally participating project cost?  *Notes on local match, optional* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Cost & Funding** |

**OBAG 3 Grant Request:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Grant Request** | $ |

Percent of total final scope in, or supporting, a PDA: \_\_\_\_\_%\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Application/Project Cost (all funding sources) & Delivery Schedule:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Phases** | **Total Cost** | **Secured Funds** | | **Unsecured Funds** | | **Schedule**  (Start dates: Planned, Actual) |
| **Amount** | **Fund Sources** | **OBAG 3 Grant Request** | **Remaining Funding Needed** |
| Planning/ Conceptual | $ | $ | *Secured fund sources, notes* | $ | $ | Month/Year |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED) | $ | $ | *Secured fund sources, notes* | $ | $ | Month/Year |
| Design Engineering (PS&E) | $ | $ | *Secured fund sources, notes* | $ | $ | Month/Year |
| Right-of-way | $ | $ | *Secured fund sources, notes* | $ | $ | Month/Year |
| Construction | $ | $ | *Secured fund sources, notes* | $ | $ | Month/Year |
| **Total** | **$** | **$** |  | **$** | **$** |  |

**Total Project (vs. Grant) Investment by Mode:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mode** | **Share of application/project investment** |
| Vehicle | % |
| Transit | % |
| Bicycling or Rolling | % | (minimum  50% of total project cost) |
| Pedestrian | % |
| Other | % |
| **Total** | **100%** |  |

**For 75% of Total Application Score for Evaluation of each Grant Application (or Proposed Project) in Contra Costa**

Maximum points possible per project: 75 points in Contra Costa

(+25 points maximum, MTC-assigned, in region)

100 points total maximum per Application

(110 points instead for projects that are eligible to compete for both STP- & CMAQ-only fund sources)

The Application Form will address the minimum eligibility screening criteria that the Authority must consider as part of their county screening and evaluation, but CTAs have discretion over relative criteria weighting and the potential addition of further criteria (consistent with program guidelines).

On the regional 9-county level, MTC staff will evaluate projects, and assign using the process outlined in the guidelines (see PDF pages 20-21 of the document linked below). This section details the regional criteria, relative weighting, and program balancing process. Briefly, the criteria and associated points are:

* CTA prioritization (75 points)
* MTC Regional impact (15 points)
* MTC Deliverability (10 points)
* MTC Regional Air Quality improvement (10 points) for CMAQ-only funding source

The adoption deadline for a Local Road Safety Plan is December 31, 2023 (with the exception of ongoing requirements). Each jurisdiction is required to adopt a LRSP or equivalent, as defined by Caltrans guidelines for Cycle 11 of the Highway Safety Improvement (HSIP) program. This requirement is intended to ensure that all jurisdictions are eligible to apply for OBAG 3, HSIP Cycle 11, and subsequent cycles, and the maximum amount of potential funding sources.

The Authority, with review by its panel comprised of members from the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC), and Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), both of which include representatives from a Regional Transportation Planning Advisory Committee (which include transit agencies), may assign points within the tables and numbered ranges below. Proposed applications will be evaluated, scored, and ranked based on the proposed final scope, intent, reasonably foreseen results, and applicant responses to the scoring topics below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Eligibility Screening to Determine**  **Competitiveness Regionwide: MTC’s 9-Counties** | **Scoring Range** | **Score Assigned** |
| 1 of 7: **Clear and Complete Proposal**  To which extent is the proposal clear and complete? | Pass or  Fail. |  |
| 2 of 7: LRSP date of adoption: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Local Road Safety Plan** & state whether date is ‘actual’ or ‘anticipated’ before 12/31/2023 for (an equity- & Safe Systems-approach) plan adoption.  Would the final proposed application/project scope be within an adopted local plan or Local Road Safety Plan list of recommendations, actions, projects, and/or policies? (Numbered appendix spreadsheet submitted electronically to the Authority). | Pass or  Fail. |  |
| 3 of 7: Resolution of Local Support ([here](https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/federal-funding/federal-highway-administration-grants/one-bay-area-grant-obag-3))  date of adoption: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  & state whether date is ‘actual’ or ‘anticipated’ before 12/31/2022. Does the agency have a jurisdiction-wide adopted resolution of local support? | Pass or  Fail. |  |
| 4 of 7: Does the agency have jurisdiction-wide adopted regulations that allow, or at least avoid any (un)intentional ban of, electric micromobility devices (e.g., scooters, e-bikes) to be used for transportation access? (no later than December 31, 2023) | Pass or  Fail. |  |
| 5 of 7: If the application/project is granted funds, does the jurisdiction have a (publicly / staff report-) stated commitment toward annual operations & maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial completion? (no later than December 31, 2023) | Pass or  Fail. |  |
| 6 of 7: If application is granted funds, does jurisdiction have a (publicly accessible) geospatial information system (GIS) “open data” library on its website?  GIS layer files should include existing vs. proposed streets, trails, and bikeways categorized by Level of Traffic Stress (LTS 1 through 4, consistent with the adopted CBPP), data layers from any Systemic Safety Analysis Report Program (SSARP), Vision Zero, or Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) efforts, adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) proposed project boundaries and timing. | Pass or  Fail. |  |
| 7 of 7: The cumulative total scope related to (indirectly-ATS-related scope) preventive maintenance, repaving, restriping, and streetscape shall not exceed 50% of the total project/application cost (either construction phase or total cost of all phases, as applicable). | Pass or  Fail. |  |

**Total:** Pass (if all rows Pass) or Fail (if at least one Fail)

Each Review Panel evaluator will assign points within the prescribed range below.

| **Ranking Criterion** | **Scoring Range** | **Points Assigned** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1 of 12: Safety and Injury Prevention**  e.g., refer to responses for Application Form #13-14.  To which Level of Traffic Stress (1 through 4) will the project construct a segment that is part of a future safer, more contiguous countywide Low-Traffic-Stress Network (mainly Class I bicycle facilities)  To which extent is the systemic / Safe Systems approach integrated into the final scope? e.g., a specific crash type addressed in multiple locations via careful site selection/planning.  To which extent will the final scope reduce the maximum potential Speed (observed/actual instead of “posted speed limit”) of vehicles?  To which extent will the severity of each potential collision be reduced by way of kinetic energy transfer that will result from the project?  Will the final scope add a new roundabout?  To which extent will the individual & regional economic costs (2020) per incident (e.g., including repair/recovery) be reduced by the proposal? (e.g., refer to MTC “BayViz” regional safety data webtool)  To which extent will the cumulative “Plan Countermeasures” (e.g., Leading Pedestrian Interval) be effective after the final scope is completed, to move toward Countywide Vision Zero? (e.g., refer to MTC “BayViz” regional safety data webtool)  Quantify the estimated reduction in severity of each collision.  Which of the Countywide Vision Zero toolbox actions are included in the proposal?  Is the proposal located along or within a particular proximity of a High-Injury Network corridor, emergency evacuation route, and/or a CTP or GMP Action Plan-designated Regional Route of Significance? (latest)  Which of the FHWA “proven countermeasure(s)” or “crash modification/reduction factor(s)” ([here](https://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/)) will be included in the final scope to reduce maximum potential vehicle Speed during construction and future operation?  How has the City Attorney committed to using the law known as Assembly Bill 43?  Which of the Common Countywide Collision Pattern(s) from 2008 – 2017 SWITRS data will be eliminated or reduced as a result of the final proposal scope?   * Speeding * Driving under the Influence * Contraflow bike riding * Seniors (vulnerable population) * Youth (vulnerable population) * Highway interchange(s) * Trail crossing(s) * Channelized right turn slip-lanes * Skewed intersection(s) * Unprotected left turns at signal * Red light violation   Will the final scope significantly reduce bicycling or pedestrian fatalities and/or severe injuries?  Will the final scope improve the pavement condition on an off-street trail or walkway and maintain the condition of public transit assets in a state of good repair?  To which extent has and/or will the program address the topics above? | 12 max points.  0–4 = minimal safety improvement  5–9 = moderate reduction of risk of  severe crash/injury  10–12 = significant reduction of risk of  severe crash/injury (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM) |  |
| **Criterion 2 of 12: Public Health**  e.g., refer to responses for Application Form #11, 13 – 14.  To which extent (tools [here](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/)) will the final scope reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution?  Refer to response for Application Form #11.  Number of trees (excluding plants/shrubs) that will be added (excluding number to be retained) in the final scope to address climate adaptation, equity, low maintenance, carbon sequestration, shade, and reduce the urban heat island effect and increasing average temperatures vs. Tree Equity Score [here](https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/37.9285/-121.9731).  To which extent will the final scope enhance to bicycling/pedestrian “trail standards” the conditions of easements, driveways, paths, streets, and roads intended for maintenance access?  To which extent will the final scope improve Public Health? e.g., physical health and mental health at the individual level.  Has a qualified Public Health professional committed in writing to any amount of participation in design and construction scope development/review, ongoing operation, etc.?  To which extent has and/or will the program address the topics above? | 7 max points.  0–1 = minimal  2–4 = moderate  (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)  5–7 = significant |  |
| **Criterion 3 of 12: Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant**  e.g., refer to response to Application Form #27.  To which extent/percentage will funds be leveraged from other sources that already are, or will be, committed to the final scope and secured by the applicant? (eligible to count toward match: applicants, co-sponsors, other cities/towns, and project sponsors’ contributions and all other fund sources excluding Measure J)  How-To Resources from FHWA [here](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovation/everydaycounts/edc_5/project_bundling.cfm), including Training May 24-25, 2022 | 8 max points.  8 = 60% match  7 = 50% match  6 = 40% match  4 = 30% match  2 = 20% match  0 = 11.47% match of Federally participating project cost |  |
| **Criterion 4 of 12: Bundled Projects**  e.g., refer to response to Application Form #12.  Explain any Collaborative Governance and to which extent the Project Sponsor will partner with a different (or smaller or more resource-limited) jurisdiction that is optionally designated an Equity Priority Community (EPC) or limited-staff government, and the percentage of the final scope that will be in each jurisdiction that is within an EPC.  Describe an existing or proposed partnership across departments and across agencies, e.g., County Public Health or non-profit, non-governmental organization, park district, canal water public right-of-way (PROW) or flood control channel district, utility provider, or an application with multiple proposed protected intersections at locations in multiple jurisdictions, for example.  Will the project adequately improve Safety for people walking/biking/rolling at or near a Trail Crossing with collaborative participation from a City/County/District jurisdiction and East Bay Regional Park District? (EBRPD) | 4 max points.  0 = minimal  1–2 = moderate  3–4 = significant  (each range above applies also to a SRTS-NI program, e.g., multiple geographic locations across school districts or other jurisdiction boundaries) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 5 of 12: Deliverability, Readiness, and Feasibility**  e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #22 – 25.  To which extent has the applicant committed annual operations & maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial construction? e.g., At which frequency is the jurisdiction proposing to commit to maintenance of the new or improved facility, such as sweeping? (e.g., for safety)  Which issues could arise before project implementation?  Has a single jurisdiction committed to ensuring complete implementation of the final scope across multiple jurisdictions?  Is any necessary right-of-way already acquired?  Which month & year will the proposed project (realistically) begin construction?  Will the final scope be consistent with the minimum criteria required in the state law effective since January 1, 2021 known as Senate Bill 288? (to streamline CEQA review and documentation, per guidelines [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yvhkGGsWwojJo27DH9KfoODBHEkhOpq0MZ0tKwkJV0M/edit?usp=sharing)). | 8 max points.  0 = Design is less than 35% complete at application submittal.  1–2 = minimal additional Design is necessary & minimal environmental review documentation timeline, e.g., not eligible for SB-288.  3–5 = moderate: Design is less than 65% complete at application submittal, and/or SB-288-eligible scope.  6–8 = significant, or (mostly or entirely) Quick-Build materials/ method, and/or SB-288-eligible final scope  (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 6 of 12: Improve Connectivity**  e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #12 – 14.  Will the final scope eliminate a gap(s)? in an existing pedestrian or bikeway(s), remove barrier(s) to access, and increase the directness or capacity of the bicycling/pedestrian network (including alternatives to trails that are closed/unlit during hours of darkness/ overnight), where they facilitate connections to work, school, health facilities, or transit.  Will the final scope create an opening in a gate, fence, retaining wall, or barrier of any kind to enhance access from an adjacent trail for people bicycling, rolling, or walking? e.g., to access shopping & retail, especially a grocery store, restaurant, or other food & drink establishment.  Is the proposal included in MTC’s Active Transportation Plan, or CBPP Low-Stress Network? (Network map)  To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above? (select the highest points range) | 7 max points.  1–2 = minimal  3–5 = moderate  6–7 = significant  (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 7 of 12: Range and number of users**  e.g., refer to response to Application Form #.  Will the final scope serve a wide range of users? e.g., all ages and abilities, females, people riding transit, electric and pedal bicycle commuters, shoppers, people with disabilities — and increase the number of pedestrians and bicyclists within the geographic boundary limits. Will an Equity Priority Community be served?  To which extent will the final scope expand access, travel choices, and increase the rate of bicycling and walking? e.g., contiguous route through engaging landscapes, connecting local neighborhoods or natural areas, parks, or elevated viewsheds, improving community interaction, integrated interactive public art by local artists, all ages and abilities (e.g., attracting seniors & children to travel (& even explore) via active transportation), mental/overall wellness, community survey input.  Which of the Common Countywide Collision Pattern(s) vulnerable population from 2008 – 2017 SWITRS data will be eliminated or reduced in the final scope?   * Seniors * Youth, children   To which extent will the final scope reduce congestion or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in an urbanized area?  To which extent are any groups of people under-represented in the available data? SWITRS: race data for people involved in a crash are typically reported only based on an officer’s anecdotal observation, assumption, or best guess.  Will the final scope improve access to jobs, or the reliability of, Freight/Goods Movement by cargo bicycle, electric bicycle, and improve Economic Access/Vitality? | 7 max points.  1–2 = minimal  3–5 = moderate  6–7 = significant |  |
| **Criterion 8 of 12: Latent Demand**  e.g., refer to response to Application Form #.  Will the final scope be likely to encourage more people to use pedestrian, bicycling, or rolling trips? e.g., greater population density, employment density, mix of land uses, percentage of zero-vehicle ownership households, location in an Equity Priority Community (EPC), or relative lack of on-street & off-street vehicle parking.  Will the final scope be located within an Equity Priority Community ([EPC map here](https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/equity-priority-communities-plan-bay-area-2050/explore?location=37.878639%2C-122.370881%2C8.95)) in Plan Bay Area 2050?  To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above, and historically underserved community groups? | 6 max points.  0–1 = minimal  2–3 = moderate  4–6 = significant |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 9 of 12: Local Community and Policy Support**  e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #20 – 21.  Is the proposal part of the future low-stress network or otherwise included in the adopted Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan’s future network?  Is the proposal in a locally adopted plan, Caltrans, MTC, BAAQMD, CCHS, AARP Livable Communities Plan, League of American Bicyclists’ evaluation or metrics for Bike-Friendly City (or businesses’) designation, and/or not yet formally submitted to CCTA for consideration at the countywide level for inclusion in a CBPP update?  Will the final scope include bundled or similar projects across jurisdictions with multiple participating agencies?  Does the jurisdiction(s) have a locally adopted Policy Resolution that adopted a jurisdiction-wide Vision Zero goal to eliminate fatalities and severe injuries (first) of people bicycling and walking, that includes a Safe Systems approach that is both proactive/systemic and reactive (collision analysis) and prioritizes Safety before Speed, and an emphasis on planning for people (not vehicles); and prioritizes the safe movement of people.  To which month/year/date does the jurisdiction state a commitment to eliminate fatalities and severe injuries?  Does the jurisdiction’s locally adopted Policy Resolution explicitly require that staff and each project prioritize Safety before Speed?  In which adopted plan(s), adoption dates, and ranked project lists, was the proposal included?  Which Design Guidelines and standards documents were used for each component of the proposal? ([here](https://spaces.hightail.com/space/F8ZxW8POkN))  Is the proposal consistent with any specific policies in the adopted General Plan?  CCTA Countywide Pedestrian Needs Assessment?  MTC Complete Streets Policy?  Caltrans Complete Streets Policy?  Caltrans Safe Systems approach?  From which organization(s) has the applicant provided a Letter of Support? | 5 max points.  0 = minimal  1–2 = moderate  3–5 = significant, or (partially or entirely) Quick-Build materials |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 10 of 12: Focus on MTC & Plan Bay Area 2050 objectives**  e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #15 – 18.  Is the application/project able to be scalable & replicated by a jurisdiction(s) in other counties or transit agencies?  **Housing Policies’ Compliance**  **with State Law, Policy & Programs**  The application notes that the jurisdiction is an approved member of the California Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department’s Prohousing Designation Program, describes how local policies align with prohousing criteria, and  (If applicable) describes if and why the affordability of homes in the community is not an issue or concern for the jurisdiction. <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/prohousing/index.shtml>  Relationship to future (and entitled) homes.  **Housing Anti-Displacement Policies**  Which local housing policies has the jurisdiction [in which the final scope will be entirely (or mostly) located in], adopted that effectively limit or prevent the displacement of vulnerable populations?  Explain why they are effective within the context of the jurisdiction.  The application addresses the potential for the project to support existing, planned (General Plan), entitled, or permitted homes, especially below-market-rate residential uses, and how the project will advance local transportation and land-use goals. | 6 max points.  0–1 = minimal  2–3 = moderate  4–6 = significant  (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 11 of 12: Prioritizing Public Space**  e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #12 – 13.  To which extent will the final scope Right-Size the amount of available Vehicle Parking and Parking Density within the public right-of-way?  Which techniques/technologies will be used (e.g., to provide demand-based pricing of vehicle parking) within the public right-of-way to maximize public benefit from this public asset?  Which policies from MTC’s [Parking Policy Playbook](https://abag.ca.gov/technical-assistance/parking-policy-playbook) (or resources [here](https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/driving-congestion-environment/smart-parking) & [here](https://parkingpolicy.com/reduced-requirements/)) have been adopted to reform the local agency’s (municipal) code or let the market forces lead? e.g., zoning code adopted parking maximums or removed ‘provision of parking’ mandatory minimum ratio(s).  Walkway/bikeway proximity to, and relationship to (separated, protected, etc.) on-street or off-street vehicle parking (which can affect Level of Traffic Stress)  Has the jurisdiction planned, designated, adopted, and implemented a car-free commercial central area(s)?  How many family- & cargo-sized bicycle parking spaces will be added?  To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above? (select the moderate points range) | 3 max points.  0 = None  1 = Minimal  2 = Moderate (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)  3 = Significant |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 12 of 12: Increase Transit Ridership**  e.g., refer to response to Application Form #12.  To which extent will the proposal increase the use of public transit? e.g., transit station, bus stop, bus stop shelter (shade for hotter weather), shared mobility hub, bicycle parking or covered and secured mobility device storage.  To which extent will the final scope be located within a CBPP-designated Pedestrian Priority Area? (PPA)  To which extent will the final scope be located within two miles (or 15 minutes of travel time) of a Transit Rich Area or Connected Community? (TRA) | 2 max points.  0 = minimal potential  1 = moderate  2 = significant (\*or\* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM) |  |
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