

OBAG 3 (Fiscal Years 2022-2023 through 2025-26)

OBAG 3 Scoring Sheet Instructions

The following scoring sheet constitutes 75% of the total application score for evaluation of each grant application (or proposed project) in Contra Costa

The points possible per project are as follows, with an application maximum of 100 points:

- 75 points maximum from this scoring sheet (Authority)
- 25 points maximum assigned by MTC (to be determined separately)
- *An additional 10 points may be awarded for projects eligible to compete for both STP & CMAQ only funded 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 and assign projects using the process outlined in the guidelines, which 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, CMAW only funding source)*

The adoption deadline for a Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) is December 31, 2023 (except for ongoing requirements). Each jurisdiction is required to adopt a LRSP or equivalent, as defined by Caltrans guidelines for Cycle 11 of the HSIP. 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 CBPAC and 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.

Glossary

Acronym	Term	Acronym	Term
LRSP	Local Road Safety Plan	SRTS-NI	Safe Routes to School, Non-Infrastructure
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program	TDM	Travel Demand Management
CBPAC	Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	PROW	Public Right-of-Way
TCC	Technical Coordinating Committee	EBRPD	East Bay Regional Park District
GIS	Geospatial Information System	VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
LTS	Level of Traffic Stress	EPC	Equity Priority Community
SSARP	Systemic Safety Analysis Report Program	HCD	California Housing and Community Development Department
CIP	Capital Improvement Program	PPA	Pedestrian Priority Area
		TRA	Transit Rich Area

OBAG 3 (Fiscal Years 2022-2023 through 2025-26)

Program Eligibility Screening

To determine competitiveness Regionwide, MTC's 9-counties

Scoring Range for all: Pass or Fail

Maximum Points: Not Applicable

<p>1 of 7: <u>Clear and Complete Proposal</u></p> <p>To which extent is the proposal clean and complete?</p>	
<p>2 of 7: LRSP date of adoption: _____ - LRSP date of adoption and whether the date is 'actual' or 'anticipated' before 12/31/2023 (for an equity and Safe Systems approach plan adoption).</p> <p>Would the final proposed application/project scope be within an adopted local plan or LRSP list of recommendations, actions, projects, and/or policies?</p> <p>(Numbered appendix spreadsheet submitted electronically to the Authority)</p>	
<p>3 of 7: Resolution of Local Support (here)</p> <p>Date of adoption: _____ and state whether date is 'actual' or 'anticipated' before 12/31/2022. Does the agency have a jurisdiction-wide adopted resolution of local support?</p>	
<p>4 of 7: Does the agency have jurisdiction-wide adopted regulations that allow, or at least avoid any (un)intentional ban of electricity micromobility devices (e.g., scooters, e-bikes) to be used for transportation access (no later than 12/31/2023)?</p>	
<p>5 of 7: If the application/project is granted funds, does the jurisdiction have a stated commitment (publicly or staff report) toward annual operations and maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial completion (no later than 12/31/2023)?</p>	
<p>6 of 7: If the application is granted funds, does the jurisdiction have a publicly accessible GIS "open data" library on its website?</p> <p>GIS layer files should include existing vs. proposed streets, trails, and bikeways categorized by LTS 1 through 4 (consistent with the adopted CBPP), data layers from any SSARPs, Vision Zero, or LRSP efforts, adopted CIP proposed project boundaries and timing.</p>	
<p>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).</p>	

All questions in the section above are pass or fail, and a failure of one or more of the questions will result in a failure of the section

Completion of Section: _____

OBAG 3 (Fiscal Years 2022-2023 through 2025-26)

Each evaluator will assign points within the prescribed range below:

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
<p>Criterion 1 of 12: Safety and Injury Prevention <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #13-14 (online form #13-14)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To which LTS (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) 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 – 2017SWITRS data will be eliminated or reduced because of the final proposal scope? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Speeding ○ Driving under the Influence ○ Contraflow bike riding ○ Seniors (vulnerable population) ○ Youth (vulnerable population) 	<p>Maximum Points: 12</p> <p>0 - 4 • Minimal Safety Improvement</p> <p>5 - 9 • Moderate Reduction of Risk of Severe Crash/Injury</p> <p>10 - 12 • Significant Reduction of Risk of Severe Crash/Injury <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p>	<hr/>

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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? 		
<p>Criterion 2 of 12: Public Health <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #11, 13-14 (online form #11, 13-14)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To which extent (tools here) will the final scope reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution? (<i>Refer to response from Application Form #11</i>) ▪ 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 v. Tree Equity Score (here). ▪ 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? 	<p>Maximum Points: 7</p> <p>0 - 1 • Minimal</p> <p>2 - 4 • Moderate <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p> <p>5 - 7 • Significant</p>	<hr/>
<p>Criterion 3 of 12: Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant <i>e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #27 (online form #40)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <p>Percent applies to federally participating project costs</p> <p><i>(Eligible to count toward match: applicants, co-sponsors, other</i></p>	<p>Maximum Points: 8</p> <p>8 • 60% Match</p> <p>7 • 50% Match</p> <p>6 • 40% Match</p> <p>4 • 30% Match</p> <p>2 • 20% Match</p>	<hr/>

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
<p><i>cities/towns, project sponsors' contributions and all other fund sources excluding Measure J)</i></p> <p>How-To Resources from FHWA, including Training from May 24-25, 2022</p>	<p>0 • 11.47% Match (of federally participating project cost)</p>	
<p>Criterion 4 of 12: Bundled Projects <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #12, 18 (online form #12, 25, 26)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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 EBRPD. 	<p>Maximum Points: 4</p> <p>0 • Minimal</p> <p>1 - 2 • Moderate</p> <p>3 - 4 • Significant</p> <p><i>Each range above also applies to a SRTS-NI program, (e.g., multiple geographic locations across school districts or other jurisdiction boundaries)</i></p>	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
<p>Criterion 5 of 12: Deliverability, Readiness, and Feasibility <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #22-25 (online form #35-38)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 law effective since January 1, 2021, known as Senate Bill 288 (to streamline CEQA review and documentation, per guidelines here)? 	<p>Maximum Points: 8</p> <p>0 • Design < 35% complete at application submittal</p> <p>1 - 2 • Minimal, additional design necessary & minimal environmental review doc timeline (e.g., not eligible for SB-288)</p> <p>3 - 5 • Moderate, design < 65% complete at application submittal, and/or SB-288-eligible scope</p>	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
	<p>6 - 8 • Significant, mostly/entirely Quick-Build materials or method and/or SB-288-eligible final scope <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p>	
<p><u>Criterion 6 of 12: Improve Connectivity</u> <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #12-13, 17 (online form #12-13, 18-24)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 Regional Active Transportation Plan, pr 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) 	<p>Maximum Points: 7</p> <p>1 - 2 • Minimal</p> <p>3 - 5 • Moderate</p> <p>6 - 7 • Significant <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p>	<hr/>
<p><u>Criterion 7 of 12: Range and Number of Users</u> <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #18 (online form #25-26)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 [attracting seniors & children to travel/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: 	<p>Maximum Points: 7</p> <p>1 - 2 • Minimal</p> <p>3 - 5 • Moderate</p> <p>6 - 7 • Significant</p>	<hr/>

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seniors ○ Youth, children ▪ To which extent will the final scope reduce congestion or 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, <u>Freight/Goods Movement by cargo bicycle, electric bicycle, and improve Economic Access/Vitality?</u> 		
<p>Criterion 8 of 12: Latent Demand <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #18 (online form #25-26)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 EPC, or relative lack of on-street & off-street vehicle parking. ▪ Will the final scope be located within an EPC (map here) in Plan Bay Area 2050? ▪ To which extent has and/or will the programmatic application address the topics above, and historically underserved community groups? 	<p>Maximum Points: 6</p> <p>0 - 1 • Minimal</p> <p>2 - 3 • Moderate</p> <p>4 - 6 • Significant</p>	<hr/>
<p>Criterion 9 of 12: Local Community and Policy Support <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #20-21 (online form #29-34)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p>Maximum Points: 5</p> <p>0 • Minimal</p> <p>1 - 2 • Moderate</p> <p>3 - 5 • Significant, or partially/entirely Quick-Build materials</p>	<hr/>

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? ▪ 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? 		
<p>Criterion 10 of 12: Focus on MTC and Plan Bay Area 2050 Objectives <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #15-17 (online form #15-28)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the application/project able to be scalable & replicated by a jurisdiction(s) in other counties or transit agencies? <p>Housing Policies' Compliance with State Law, Policy & Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The application notes that the jurisdiction is an approved member of the HCD's Prohousing Designation Program, describes how local policies align with prohousing criteria. ▪ If applicable, describe 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. <p>Housing Anti-Displacement Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Maximum Points: 6</p> <p>0 - 1 • Minimal</p> <p>2 - 3 • Moderate</p> <p>4 - 6 • Significant <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p>	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range & Max Points	Points Assigned
<p>Criterion 11 of 12: Prioritizing Public Space <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #13 (online form #13)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 (or resources here & here) 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 LTS) ▪ Has the jurisdiction planned, designated, adopted, and implemented a car-free commercial central area(s)? ▪ How many families- & 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) 	<p>Maximum Points: 3</p> <p>0 • None</p> <p>1 • Minimal</p> <p>2 • Moderate <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p> <p>3 • Significant</p>	<hr/>
<p>Criterion 12 of 12: Increased Transit Ridership <i>e.g., refer to responses from Application Form #12, 17 (online form #12, 18-24)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 PPA? ▪ To which extent will the final scope be located within two miles (or 15 minutes of travel time) of a TRA or Connected Community? 	<p>Maximum Points: 2</p> <p>0 • Minimal</p> <p>1 • Moderate</p> <p>2 • Significant <u>or</u> a program (e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM)</p>	<hr/>

END OF SCORING SHEET, TOTALS ON NEXT PAGE

OBAG 3 (Fiscal Years 2022-2023 through 2025-26)

Scoring Sheet Totals and Recommendations**Total Score (Authority):** _____ / 75**Nominate Applicant for MTC Consideration in OBAG 3** Yes _____ / No _____**Subtotal Score (MTC):** _____ / 25
*(assigned separately)***Subtotal Score (MTC if CMAQ-eligible):** _____ / 10
*(assigned separately)***Total Score (Authority + MTC):** _____ / 100 (STP)
(totals will auto-populate using scores above)

_____ / 110 (CMAQ)

Applicant Requested Grant Amount: _____**Date:** _____**Authority Recommended Grant Amount:** _____**Date:** _____**MTC Recommended Grant Amount:** _____**Date:** _____**Applicant:** _____**Project Sponsor:** _____**Partner Agency 1:** _____**Partner Agency 2:** _____**Letter of Support 1:** _____**Letter of Support 2:** _____