



2023 MEASURE A & W HIGHWAY PROGRAM GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) is pleased to announce the Measure A and Measure W Highway Program 2023 Call for Projects. The focus of the program is to reduce traffic congestion and improve person throughput and safety on the most critical commute corridors.

Up to \$100 million may be made available between both measures for projects that best meet the program evaluation criteria.

APPLICATION MATERIALS

The Call for Projects packet consists of the program guidelines, an application form, non-supplantation of funds certificate, and a sample resolution. These documents and other related reference materials, including template funding agreements, can be found at:

<https://www.smcta.com/whats-happening/call-projects>

SCHEDULE

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Call for Projects Issued | July 5, 2023 |
| Call for Projects Workshop: Virtual via Zoom (will be recorded) Click here to register for the workshop | July 11, 2023 |
| Notify TA of Intent to Submit | July 28, 2023 |
| Early Submittal Reviews due | August 4, 2023 |
| Project Applications due | August 25, 2023 |
| Evaluation Period | September/October 2023 |
| Informational item to TA Board on Draft Program of Projects | November 2, 2023 |
| TA Board approves proposed Program of Projects | December 7, 2023 |

Notice of Intent to Submit: Sponsors must fill out the notice of intent to submit survey using the link below with the project name and sponsor agency information by July 28, 2023. This will be used to set up a Dropbox account for submission of all materials. Additionally, sponsors should indicate any assistance needed from the Transportation Authority either related to the application or regarding the implementation of the proposed project. Please note that changes to the details provided are allowable in the submitted application from the Sponsor Agency. If a sponsor does not indicate an intent to submit by the requested timeline, sponsors may be allowed to submit an application but will need to request a Dropbox for submittal as soon as possible before the application due date.

[Click here for the Notice of Intent Survey Link](#)

Early Submittal Reviews: TA staff will provide an early submission review of application narratives and metrics from August 4-18, 2023 and will be available to meet with applicants to discuss questions relating to the review if necessary. This is not required but is being offered to help agencies respond to all TA Strategic Plan evaluation criteria.

Submitting Applications: Sponsors must submit one electronic copy of the completed application with all required attachments by uploading all materials to a specific Dropbox link that will be provided. Completed applications must be received no later than **August 25, 2023 by 4:00 PM**.

Late or incomplete applications will not be accepted. It is the sponsor's responsibility to check with TA staff to confirm the receipt of applications prior to the submission deadline.

CONTACT

For general application questions, including receipt of applications, information on prior Measure A and Measure W funding allocations and clarifications on the description of listed candidate projects, contact:

Patrick Gilster, at gilsterp@samtrans.com or (650) 622-7853

ORGANIZATION

1. Reference Information
 2. Available Funding
 3. Eligibility
 4. Roles
 5. Applications
 6. Evaluation Criteria
 7. Other Policies/Guidelines for the 2021 Call for Projects
 - Exhibit A – 2021-2030 Short Range Highway Plan and Capital Improvement Program List of Eligible Projects
 - Exhibit B – 2020-2024 TA Strategic Plan Evaluation Criteria and 2021-2030 Short Range Highway Plan Technical Evaluation Metrics
 - Exhibit C – Potential External Public Funding Sources Available for Highway Projects in San Mateo County
-

1. REFERENCE INFORMATION

In 1988, San Mateo County voters passed the original Measure A sales tax, which included funding for specific highway projects listed in the 1988 Transportation Expenditure Plan. In 2004, the voters of San Mateo County reauthorized the Measure A Program and approved an extension of the existing half-cent transportation sales tax for 25 years from 2009 through 2033. The 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) provides that 27.5 percent of the sales tax revenue be dedicated to the highway program, with 17.3 percent committed to projects on state highways known as Key Congested Areas (KCA) and 10.2 percent for Supplemental Roadways (SR) for projects on highways and other roadways.

In 2018, the voters of San Mateo County approved Measure W, a new 30-year half-cent sales tax for transportation programs and projects that took effect July 1, 2019 and expires June 30, 2049. The Measure W Congestion Relief Plan (CRP) identifies that twenty two and one half percent of Measure W be dedicated to highway congestion improvements.

In 2021, the TA Board adopted the Short Range Highway Plan (SRHP) and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to support future investment decisions for the Measure A Highways & Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion categories. The SRHP incorporates the Measure A goals along with the new Measure W core principles and is the policy foundation for making highway program investment decisions. The SRHP uses the adopted Strategic Plan 2020-2024 evaluation criteria to benchmark how projects align with funding priorities for Measure A and W. **To be eligible for the Call for Projects a project must be included in the CIP, listed in the Measure A or W Expenditure Plans, or receive additional approval from the TA (please contact Patrick Gilster, Director of Planning & Fund Management).**

Applicants are encouraged to review the following documents: the 2004 Measure A TEP, which identifies funding for programs and candidate projects; the Measure W CRP; the TA Strategic Plan 2020-2024, which serves as the policy framework for making investment decisions for the transportation programs; and the TA SRHP and CIP for further information about the Highway Program and eligible projects.

Measure A Transportation Expenditure Plan:

<https://www.smcta.com/about-us/funding-overview/measure>

Measure W Congestion Relief Plan:

<https://www.smcta.com/about-us/funding-overview/measure-w>

Transportation Authority 2020-2024 Strategic Plan

<https://www.smcta.com/about-us/funding-overview/strategic-plan-2020-2024>

2021-2030 Short Range Highway Plan and Capital Improvement Program

<https://www.smcta.com/projects-programs/highway>

Definitions

The following terms are used throughout the application materials:

- i. Overall project: The entire project ultimately to be constructed.
- ii. Project scope: The specific project phases or elements for which Measure A and W funds are being requested in this application/cycle. The project scope may be a subset of the overall project.
- iii. Sponsor Agency: The applicant for Measure A and W funds for the project scope, the public and political champion, solidify funding plan, coordinate with the TA to identify appropriate implementing agency, submit monitoring reports, sign funding agreements .
- iv. Implementing Agency: The agency implementing the project scope (see Table 3 for sample roles).

2. AVAILABLE FUNDING

The Measure A and Measure W 2023 Highway Program Call for Projects is based on the guidance adopted in the 2021-2030 SRHP and CIP. This includes a set aside of up to 40% of available funds specifically for projects of countywide significance which can be split between both Measure A and Measure W fund sources.

This Call for Projects has two funding tracks as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Available Funding Tracks

| Funding Track | Available funds | Eligible Projects |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Measure A: (KCA & SR) | \$80 million <ul style="list-style-type: none">• KCA: \$50.4m• SR: \$29.6m | KCA and SR projects identified in the 2004 TEP. Additional SR projects not included in the 2004 TEP may also be added (see eligibility section). |
| Measure W | \$20 million | Eligible candidate projects will be focused on highway and interchange facilities, including Highway 101, Highway 280, and other highways and their interchanges. Eligible candidate projects can include bicycle and pedestrian components or facilities that are incorporated into and enhance safety for a larger highway or interchange project. |
| Total | \$100 million | |

Projected revenues are not expected to be adequate to fund all the projects included for consideration in the 2021-2030 SRHP and CIP. To leverage funds as best as possible across a multitude of projects, the TA will only fund up to 50 percent of a project's total cost. Therefore, sponsors requesting right of way and construction funding must provide a reasonable funding plan that demonstrates how the remaining funding gap will be closed with additional local, regional, state, or federal sources. The TA Board may consider exceptions to this guideline for applicants that demonstrate they have exhausted all possible external grant funding opportunities.

- ***Set Aside for Projects of Countywide Significance***

As part of the 2021-2030 SRHP and CIP, the TA Board approved a set aside of up to 40 percent of funds from each Call for Projects to be dedicated toward advancing projects of countywide significance. The larger 60 percent of available funds can be awarded to the remaining projects (including projects of countywide significance) based on their evaluation rankings. For this Call for Projects, the set aside equates to \$40 million dedicated to projects of countywide significance.

3. ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for the Measure A and Measure W Highway Program Call for Projects, projects must be listed in the 2021-2030 SRHP and CIP (see Exhibit A). Additionally, any project listed specifically in the Measure A TEP or Measure W CRP will be accepted. Any highway project not listed as a KCA in the Measure A TEP is automatically designated as SR for Measure A funding.

- ***Eligible Projects***

Sponsors may only submit projects for the phase of work that is scheduled to commence within one year of the TA's final action to program and allocate funds from the 2023 Highway Program Call for projects. Final Board action is tentatively scheduled to take place

at the TA's December 2023 meeting, which means the schedule for the requested phase(s) of work should show all work commencing no later than December 2024.

- ***Ineligible Projects:***

Maintenance and rehabilitation projects and routine operations of highways and roadways are not eligible.

Separate pedestrian and bicycle overcrossings and tunnels across highways and roadways are not eligible under Measure A but are eligible as part of a larger highway project under Measure W.

- ***Eligible Sponsors***

Eligible sponsors are as follows:

- i. Key Congested Areas (KCA)

Eligible sponsors for KCA funds are limited to Caltrans or the appropriate jurisdiction for the identified KCA project as noted in the Measure A TEP. The TA is an eligible sponsor project projects of countywide significance listed in the SRHP.

- ii. Measure A Supplemental Roadways (SR) and Measure W

Cities in San Mateo County, San Mateo County, Caltrans and C/CAG. The Express Lanes JPA and Commute.org are also eligible sponsors. The TA is an eligible sponsor project projects of countywide significance listed in the SRHP.

4. ROLES

- ***Sponsor and Implementing Agency Roles***

While funding applications must be submitted by eligible sponsors for Measure A and Measure W funding, there is flexibility in terms of the agency that will be implementing the project scope. A sponsor may implement the project scope itself; or partner with an implementing agency.

Sponsors that intend to partner with another agency for implementation must coordinate with that agency in submitting applications for this cycle.

The roles and responsibilities of a sponsor-implementing agency partnership will need to be defined and documented as part of the Measure A and Measure W Highway Program memorandum of understanding. The sponsor and the implementing agency may be different for different phases of a given project. Table 3 provides a model of how the responsibilities could be divided between a sponsor and implementing agency.

Table 2. Example of a Sponsor Agency – Implementing Agency Partnership

| Sponsor | Implementing Agency |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political champion • Provide local input for project (policy/oversight) • Public spokesperson • Advocate for funding • Submit Governing Board resolutions and applications for Measure A funds • Signatory to Measure A funding agreements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of project scope • Coordination with Caltrans • Coordination with regulatory/review agencies • Invoicing and progress reporting to TA • Technical project oversight/ management |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

- **TA Role**

The TA will work closely with C/CAG, Caltrans, local jurisdictions and regulatory agencies on the implementation of Measure A and Measure W highway projects. The TA has and may make available the resources and expertise for highway project delivery upon request. The TA may become an implementing agency if requested by a sponsor.

Mandatory consultation with the TA:

Sponsors must consult with the TA before submitting applications if they are requesting that the TA be the implementing agency for the project (either as the lead implementer or to support implementation.) The TA's willingness to be an implementing agency for a project does not imply that the project will receive Measure A or Measure W funding. This should also be indicated in the initial "Intent to Submit" email due to the TA by July 28, 2023 (see schedule).

Applicants are encouraged to consult the TA for the following during the application process for:

a. An assessment on the:

- i. level of resources and expertise that will be needed to deliver the project scope to better ensure they are in place at the start of the project, and
- ii. credibility of projected costs and schedules to better manage project delivery:

The projected project cost should reflect the most recent planning level cost estimate or design level cost estimate. For planning level cost estimate (Preliminary Planning Study, Project Initiation Document, Environmental Document/Project Report and Plans, Specification and Estimate (PS&E)), the project costs should be adjusted from the date of the estimate to the projected year of expenditure. For construction cost estimate prepared during the PS&E phase, the projected project cost is to be escalated to the mid-point of construction. The project sponsor establishes the escalation rate based on the construction cost indices and market conditions.

Preparation of cost estimates should be consistent with the standard approach and guidelines provided in Chapter 20 – Project Development Cost Estimates of the **Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual (PDMP)**.

<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/manual-project-development-procedures-manual-pdpm>

- b. Requests for technical assistance or existing data for completing the application forms: To expedite the processing of data requests, please be as specific as possible. The TA will provide requested data in an electronic format.
- c. Requests for multi-agency coordination: The TA can help with stakeholder coordination for project scopes which involve multiple agencies.

The TA contact for both the mandatory and encouraged sponsor consultation for project implementation is Patrick Gilster, Director of Planning & Fund Management at gilsterp@samtrans.com. Final approval for receiving technical assistance will come from Peter Skinner, Executive Officer, Transportation Authority.

5. APPLICATIONS

- ***Governing Board Resolutions (Attachment A)***

An adopted governing board resolution from the project sponsor in support of the project application is required. The resolution will affirm the sponsor's support for the project scope, the sponsor's role for the project scope, confirm the commitment of matching funds and the ability to commence project scope within 12 months of receiving TA Board funding award. If the sponsor will not be able to obtain a governing board resolution prior to the August 25, 2023 application deadline, the application will be accepted on an interim basis with a copy of the draft resolution and an indication of which governing board meeting the resolution is planned for adoption. *If the application is to be considered for the programming and allocation of Measure A or Measure W funds, an adopted governing resolution must be submitted to the TA no later than October 27, 2023 prior to the draft recommendations presentation to the TA Board.*

- ***Cover Letter & Non-Supplantation of Funds Statement (Attachment B)***

In addition to the required signatures in the application, a cover letter should be provided by the sponsor agency's City Manager or Executive Director attesting to accuracy of the project cost estimate, schedule, and funding provided in the application along with a brief description of project benefits to the applicable community. The cover letter must also state attest to non-supplantation of funds if awarded highway program funding.

- ***Letters of Support (Attachment F)***

Sponsors are encouraged to provide letters of support from stakeholders but this is not a requirement. However, project sponsors with letters of support from community-based or private sector organizations will receive more points during the evaluation process. Descriptions of stakeholder support and community involvement will still be required as part of the application.

- ***Applications for multiple phases***

Except for a concurrent request to fund the plans specifications and estimates (PS&E) and Right of Way (ROW) phases of work, sponsors may only apply for one new phase of work in the application project scope. However, if there is a compelling case requesting more than one phase(s) that is also projected to be underway within one year of the TA action to program and allocate funds for the project than that may be considered but is not guaranteed for funding with the potential awards.

- ***Applications for ROW and Construction***

Sponsors requesting Measure A and Measure W Highway Program funds for the ROW and Construction phases of work will need to provide a credible funding plan for the delivery of the project through construction as part of the application. The costs associated with ROW can be significant. The TA will assess the reasonableness of the funding plan to better manage the risk it undertakes making significant capital outlays with respect to the sponsor's ability to fully deliver the project through construction. As noted previously, the TA generally funds up to 50 percent of a projects total cost. Therefore, sponsors must provide a credible funding plan that demonstrates how the remaining funding gap will be closed with additional local, regional, state, or federal sources.

- ***Funding Agreements/Memorandums of Understanding***

The TA's standard funding agreement and memorandum of understanding (MOU) will be used for any 2023 Highway Program awards. A funding agreement is used between the TA

and an outside agency implementing the project. An MOU will be used when the TA is the implementing agency on behalf of an outside agency project sponsor. Awarded project sponsors will be asked to review the appropriate template following adoption of the final program.

- **Exhibit A Scope of Works (Attachment E)**

The TA will also require each applicant to fill out the TA’s standard Exhibit A Scope of Work template that accompanies every Funding Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding. This will help expedite the funding agreement execution process. All projects should assume an earliest start date of December 8, 2023 after the final program adoption.

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA

All potential candidate projects submitted for funding consideration will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria as listed below. Note that planning studies and environmental phase requests will be evaluated solely based on the Need, Readiness, and Funding Leverage categories given the lack of technical analysis likely not completed until the completion of the more detailed environmental document. However, point values will be re-weighted for comparison with all projects. Exhibit B from the 2020-2024 TA Strategic Plan contains the complete list of evaluation criteria and the potential technical metrics associated with the criteria from the 2021-2030 SRHP.

Table 3. Evaluation Criteria Weightings

| Strategic Plan Evaluation Categories | Pre-Environmental Phases | Post-Environmental Phases |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Need | 60% | 22% |
| Effectiveness | N/A | 37% |
| Sustainability | N/A | 16% |
| Readiness | 20% | 15% |
| Funding Leverage | 20% | 10% |

Additional Considerations

While the TA Strategic Plan mentions that geographic and social equity are not criteria for evaluating the merit of individual projects, the Measure A and Measure W programs represent countywide efforts that should take into consideration a relatively equitable distribution of investments. As such, the Call for Projects evaluation committee will proactively monitor geographic and social equity and may take this into account as it develops funding recommendations for the TA Board’s consideration for the final adopted program.

6. OTHER POLICIES/GUIDELINES FOR THIS CALL FOR PROJECTS

- ***Sponsors in Good Standing***

As part of the application review process, TA staff will review and provide an overview individual sponsor or implementing agency past records on meeting the terms and conditions of current or past Funding Agreements or MOUs to the scoring evaluation committee. If a sponsor or implementing agency has a poor record, the readiness category score may be reduced or the scoring evaluation committee may elect to recommend additional terms and conditions or reject the application.

- ***Timely Use of Funds***

Projects must remain active to retain allocated funding. There must be substantial progress on a project within two years of receiving a funding award, including demonstrating expenditures on the project. If there is no substantial progress on the project after two years or more, re-programming and re-allocation of funds may be considered. Allocated Measure A and Measure W funds are expected to be expended on the project within the following time horizons:

| <i>Phase</i> | <i>Upper Duration (months)</i> |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <i>Preliminary Planning Study</i> | 12 |
| <i>Project Initiation Document</i> | 18 |
| <i>Project Approval/Environmental Document</i> | 30 |
| <i>Design</i> | 36 |
| <i>Construction</i> | 42 |

If the scope of work can't be completed within the time of performance for the phases specified above, sponsors must submit a request in writing to the TA no later than six months before the end of the time for performance to request a time extension. The TA will review the request and grant an extension if it is deemed to be justified at the TA's discretion.

Sponsors are expected to have funding agreements or memorandum of understanding fully executed within 6 months of receiving a funding allocation.

- **Matching funds**

A minimum of 10% funding match is required with each phase of work for all projects. A cash match is required for all phases of work except for right of way acquisition. Note that the TA will only fund up to half of a projects total cost for all phases. A sponsor may contribute the fair market value of new property dedicated for the project as approved by the TA at its discretion, pursuant to Caltrans appraisal standards per the Caltrans Right of Way Manual, as part of the required match for the right of way phase of work. Eligible sources of matching funds may consist of federal, state, regional and/or local sources, including those from private development as well as Measure A Local Streets and Transportation Program or Measure W Local Safety, Pothole, and Congestion Relief funds.

- **Specific Funding Tracks**

Since some projects may qualify for either Measure A or Measure W funds, TA staff will assign specific projects to specific funding tracks. Both funding tracks will have the same funding agreement, invoicing and reporting requirements.

- **Eligible Costs**

Measure A and Measure W Highway Program funds shall be used for direct eligible costs to complete the scope of work. Expenses incurred for the development of project applications and the review of funding agreements are not eligible for reimbursement. The TA, or its authorized agents, reserves the right to audit the sponsor's performance to ensure compliance with the terms of the sponsor's funding agreement or memorandum of agreement.

Eligible costs are detailed in Exhibit D of the Highway Program template funding agreement or memorandum of understanding.

- ***Under-subscription and Right to Change Funding Amounts***

If the Call for Projects is undersubscribed this funding cycle, the TA may elect not to fund all eligible project applications. Only the projects that best meet the project evaluation criteria may be funded. Inclusion in the 2021-2030 SRHP and CIP does not guarantee funding from Measure or Measure W. The TA also reserves the right to increase or decrease the amount of available funding depending on the project applications submitted.

- ***Cost increases***

The Project Sponsor shall immediately notify that TA at the time it is discovered that the allocated funding is not sufficient to complete the funded scope of work. It is the responsibility of the sponsor to take the lead in identifying and securing any additional funds to complete the scope of work. The TA has no obligation to allocate additional Measure A or Measure W Highway Program funds to address a cost increase. Sponsors can work with the TA, C/CAG and other funding entities to secure additional funds or explore and implement scope modification to align the project with the available funding.

- ***Non-supplantation of funds***

Sponsors are required to certify that Measure A and Measure W funds awarded in this cycle will not replace existing funds. This should be provided as a statement in the cover letter. (Form)

- ***Reimbursement***

Project costs must be incurred and paid for by the sponsor or implementing agency prior to requests for Measure A and Measure W funding reimbursement. Project costs incurred prior to the execution of the funding agreement may not be eligible for reimbursement. Documentation must accompany all requests for reimbursement such as, but not limited to, copies of vendor invoices, timesheets, backup documentation, checks, and payment advice.

- ***Scope changes***

Project sponsors seeking a change in project scope after the TA Board approval of the Measure A and Measure W allocation must obtain approval from the TA staff?, or risk losing the associated measure funds. Costs incurred that are not part of the Measure A/W-funded project scope will be ineligible for reimbursement.

- ***Construction and Landscape/Close-out Requests***

Project sponsors should note that all landscaping and close-out costs should be included with the request for construction funds. Future requests for only landscaping and other close-out costs will not be considered separately, except under limited special circumstances.

SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Project Inventory
June 3, 2021

Table 4-1. Previously Submitted Project Details

| TA Project # | Project Name | Sponsor (Agency) | Next Feasible Phase | Total Project Cost | Cost of Next Feasible Phase | Measure A Category | Countywide Significance? |
|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| PLANNING & FEASIBILITY STUDIES | | | | | | | |
| TA-000625 | US 101 Candlestick Point Interchange Environmental Studies | Brisbane | Project Initiation Document | \$47,700,000 | \$500,000 | SR | |
| TA-000710 | Geneva Avenue Extension | Brisbane | Preliminary Planning Study | \$95,000,000 | \$500,000 | | |
| TA-000733 | SR 92 from US 101 to I-280 | San Mateo | Preliminary Planning Study | \$551,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | | Yes |
| TA-000792 | SR 92/South Delaware Interchange Improvement | San Mateo | Preliminary Planning Study | \$76,600,000 | \$1,000,000 | KCA | |
| TA-000796 | I-380 Congestion Improvements | San Bruno | Preliminary Planning Study | \$146,000,000 | \$500,000 | | |
| TA-100321 | Route 1/Manor Drive Overcrossing Project | Pacifica | Preliminary Planning Study | \$24,236,885 | \$1,720,000 | | |
| Subtotal | | | | \$940,536,885 | \$5,220,000 | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW | | | | | | | |
| TA-000801 | US 101/ Peninsula Avenue Interchange Project | San Mateo | Final Design (PS&E) | \$120,000,000 | \$6,557,000 | SR | |
| TA-000803 | US 101 / Produce Avenue Interchange Project | South San Francisco | Environmental | \$94,150,000 | \$8,000,000 | SR | |
| TA-100302 | US 101 Managed Lanes North Project (I-380 to SF/SM Co Line) | TA & C/CAG | Final Design (PS&E) | \$349,600,000 | \$16,800,000 | KCA | Yes |
| TA-100318 | US 101 / SR 92 Interchange Area Improvements Project | TA & C/CAG | Final Design (PS&E) | \$30,017,000 | \$2,817,000 | KCA | Yes |
| TA-100319 | US 101 / SR 92 Direct Connector Project | TA & C/CAG | Final Design (PS&E) | \$194,400,000 | \$12,200,000 | KCA | Yes |
| Subtotal | | | | \$788,167,000 | \$46,374,000 | | |

KCA – Key Congested Areas; SR – Supplemental Roadways

SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Project Inventory
June 3, 2021

Table 4-1. Previously Submitted Project Details (continued)

| TA Project # | Project Name | Sponsor (Agency) | Development Phase | Total Project Cost | Cost of Next Feasible Phase | Measure A Category | Countywide Significance? |
|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| ENGINEERING DESIGN | | | | | | | |
| TA-000768 | US 101/ Woodside Road (SR 84) Interchange Project | Redwood City | Right-of-Way | \$279,450,000 | \$60,000,000 | KCA | Yes |
| TA-000794 | SR 1 (Mid Coast) Congestion, Throughput & Safety Improvements | San Mateo County | Preliminary Engineering | \$16,219,815 | \$1,000,000 | | |
| Subtotal | | | | \$295,669,815 | \$61,000,000 | | |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY & CONSTRUCTION | | | | | | | |
| TA-000791 | US 101 Express Lanes Project (SCL/SM Co Line to I-380) | TA & C/CAG | Construction | \$581,136,036 | 5,000,000 | SR | Yes |
| TA-000793 | SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvement Project at Gray Whale Cove | San Mateo County | Final Design (PS&E) | \$3,179,505 | \$925,000 | SR | |
| TA-000795 | US 101/ Holly Street Interchange Project | San Carlos | Construction | \$18,970,000 | \$18,070,000 | SR | |
| TA-000800 | US 101/ University Avenue Interchange Improvements | East Palo Alto | Final Design (PS&E) | \$15,660,000 | \$15,660,000 | | |
| TA-000822 | SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvement Project: Wavecrest Road to Poplar St | Half Moon Bay | Project Closeout | \$5,090,000 | \$4,040,000 | | |
| TA-000823 | SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvement Project: Main Street to Kehoe Avenue | Half Moon Bay | Construction | \$11,162,290 | \$9,893,000 | | |
| Subtotal | | | | \$635,197,831 | \$53,588,000 | | |
| LANDSCAPING/CLOSEOUT | | | | | | | |
| TA-000621 | US 101 / Broadway Interchange Project | Burlingame | Landscaping | \$2,080,000 | \$2,080,000 | KCA | |
| TA-000622 | US 101 / Willow Road Interchange Landscaping | Menlo Park | Landscaping | \$6,360,000 | \$5,560,000 | KCA | |
| TA-000805 | SR 92 / SR 82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Project | San Mateo | Landscaping | \$2,000,000 | \$1,870,000 | KCA | |
| Subtotal | | | | \$10,440,000 | \$9,510,000 | | |
| TOTAL COST | | | | \$2,670,011,531 | \$175,692,000 | | |

KCA – Key Congested Areas; SR – Supplemental Roadways

Notes: (1) Total project cost includes expenditures incurred prior to FY2021 in the amount of \$612,133,921. (2) For the purposes of Measure A, any newly submitted projects that are non-KCA designated may be assigned an SR designation. For the purposes of this analysis, only previously assigned Pipeline-SR-designated projects in Measure A were included in the SR cost estimate.

SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Project Inventory
June 3, 2021

Table 4-2. Newly Submitted Project Details

| TA Project # | Project Name | Sponsor (Agency) | Development Phase | Total Project Cost | Cost of Next Feasible Phase | Measure A Category | Countywide Significance? |
|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| PLANNING AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES | | | | | | | |
| UA-000101 | I-280/John Daly Boulevard Overcrossing North Side Widening for Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodation | Daly City | Preliminary Planning Study | \$16,650,000 | \$1,000,000 | | |
| UA-000102 | I-380 Connection (via new Haskins Way Bridge) | South San Francisco | Preliminary Planning Study | \$128,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | | |
| UA-000104 | Kelly Avenue & SR 1 Safety Improvement Project | Half Moon Bay | Not initiated | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | | |
| UA-000105 | SR 82 (El Camino Real), Safety and Operational Improvements | Redwood City | Project Initiation Document | \$30,000,000 | \$500,000 | | |
| UA-000106 | SR 84 (Woodside Road), Safety and Operational Improvements | Redwood City | Not initiated | \$40,000,000 | \$250,000 | | |
| UA-000107 | US 101/Sierra Point Pkwy Interchange replacement and Lagoon Way Extension | Brisbane | Preliminary Planning Study | \$24,000,000 | \$500,000 | | |
| UA-000108 | Roadway Facility Improvements between US 101 and Dumbarton Bridge | C/CAG | Not initiated | \$7,000,000 | \$500,000 | | Yes |
| Subtotal | | | | \$247,150,000 | \$5,250,000 | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW | | | | | | | |
| UA-000103 | ITS Improvements in Daly City, Brisbane, and Colma | C/CAG | Final Design (PS&E) | \$10,885,000 | \$350,000 | | |
| Subtotal | | | | \$10,885,000 | \$350,000 | | |
| TOTAL COST | | | | \$258,035,000 | \$5,600,000 | | |

Note: One additional project was submitted by San Mateo County for the Connect the Coastline Operational and Safety Project after the evaluation process was finalized, but it is included in this CIP and will be eligible for highway program funding.

SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Policy Framework
June 3, 2021

Table 2-1. SRHP Technical Metrics

| Metric | Highway Program Evaluation Criteria | Points | Technical Measure(s) | Data Source |
|----------------------|--|-----------|---|---|
| Need | | 22 | | |
| N-1 | Severity of current and projected congestion | 5 | Peak hour delay index Pct Free flow Speed Peak hour V/C | State Highway System Congestion and Safety Performance Assessment; C/CAG Model Run for "No Build" Condition; INRIX Analytics from MTC data purchase |
| N-2 | Need to improve access and connections to jobs, housing, transit hubs and other high activity centers, supporting existing economic activity and spurring new economic development in the vicinity | 5 | Number of activity centers served | 1/2 mile buffer around facility, GIS mapping of activity centers and project limits |
| N-3 | Project recognized in adopted statewide, regional, county or local planning and fund programming documents | 5 | Project's inclusion in plan(s) | Plan documents |
| N-4 | Identified safety issue (e.g., documented collision history due to site conditions that is higher than average for the facility type) | 4 | Crash rate per million VMT | Crash data (SWITRS or Congestion and Safety Performance Assessment), AADT (PeMS/Census/INRIX), Length of segment, No. of Lanes |
| N-5 | Regional/Countywide significance, including where applicable, location and relevance on the State Highway Congestion & Safety Performance Assessment for San Mateo County | 3 | Project extent and location information Select link analysis of project traffic | Refer to Appendix B of SRHP |
| Effectiveness | | 37 | | |
| E-1 | Potential increase in person through-put | 6 | Average Vehicle Occupancy Support for transit mode shift | TBD |
| E-2 | Ability to relieve congestion/performance improvement (e.g., reduces/ eliminates bottleneck) | 5 | Project addresses interchange bottleneck Improvement in peak hour delay index Improvement in pct. free flow speed | Project description and location; analysis from environmental phase |
| E-3 | Value: Benefit relative to the amount of funding requested (high impact, low cost - "bang for the buck") | 5 | Total Project Cost to benefit ratio Cost per GHG/VMT/time reduction | Project inventory and evaluation tool |
| E-4 | Degree to which project reduces GHG emissions and improves air quality | 5 | Percent reduction in GHG and other emissions | SB1 Emissions Calculator; No Build and Build VMT |
| E-5 | Potential VMT reduction ¹ | 5 | Percent reduction in VMT | Project description and plan documents |

Notes: Evaluation criteria and scoring from San Mateo County Transportation Authority Final Strategic Plan 2020-2024,

¹Caltrans guidance specifies that transportation projects should be analyzed using net VMT impact (see [Transportation Analysis under CEQA](#) and [Transportation Analysis Framework](#), first editions, September 2020).

SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Policy Framework
June 3, 2021

Table 2-1. SRHP Technical Metrics (continued)

| Metric | Highway Program Evaluation Criteria | Points | Technical Measure(s) | Data Source |
|-----------------------|---|---------------|---|---|
| E-6 | Ability to address safety issue (e.g., project improves site conditions to reduce potential for collisions) | 4 | Safety countermeasure effectiveness | Project description; USDOT Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse |
| E-7 | Potential travel time savings | 4 | Total corridor travel time savings Travel time index | Comparison of future scenarios generated with an operational or travel demand model (C/CAG model) for project corridor from planning or environmental study |
| E-8 | Demonstrates coordination with adjacent projects/integration of inter-related projects | 3 | Degree of project coordination | Project description or inventory |
| Sustainability | | 16 | | |
| S-1 | Project accommodates multiple transportation modes (e.g., pedestrian & bicycle access as well as transit infrastructure) where contextually appropriate and to the extent feasible (Complete Streets), including infrastructure for transit (e.g., express lanes, bus only lanes) | 5 | Number of different modes accommodated | Project scope and description |
| S-2 | Project is primarily an operational improvement (e.g., safety or ITS) rather than infrastructure expansion (e.g., adding general purpose lanes) | 4 | Split between operational improvement elements and infrastructure expansion | Project Inventory and Project Scope |
| S-3 | Impact project has on low income, transit dependent and or other vulnerable populations | 3 | Whether beneficial impact occurs to COC or location with CES > 75% or communities with low income and high transit dependency | GIS data layer of C/CAG Equity Focus Areas |
| S-4 | Innovative low environmental impact/green infrastructure, including resiliency elements to address climate change | 3 | Incorporation of resilience and impact reduction/green infrastructure elements | Project document |
| S-5 | Project accounts for long term repair/maintenance needs (e.g., uses materials with long life cycles, low maintenance costs & has a funding plan for maintenance) | 1 | Whether the project accounts for long term repair/maintenance needs | Project document |

Notes: Evaluation criteria and scoring from San Mateo County Transportation Authority Final Strategic Plan 2020-2024, Appendix E; technical measures.

SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Policy Framework
June 3, 2021

Table 2-1. SRHP Technical Metrics (continued)

| Metric | Highway Program Evaluation Criteria | Points | Technical Measure(s) | Data Source |
|-------------------------|---|------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Readiness | | 15 | | |
| R-1 | Clear and complete proposal | 3 | Whether proposal is complete and not missing any information | Project inventory |
| R-2 | Project status and schedule | 3 | Stage in process from PID to PSE | Project inventory |
| R-3 | Ease and speed of implementation | 3 | Right of Way status Permitting process status | Project inventory or document |
| R-4 | Demonstrates stakeholder support/community engagement | 3 | Documented support from stakeholders Public engagement activities Involvement of non-sponsor stakeholder | Documents from project sponsors |
| R-5 | Has a credible cost estimate and funding plan | 3 | Phase-wise funding information Full funding availability Documentation to show matching funds | Project inventory |
| Funding Leverage | | 10 | | |
| FL-1 | Percent of matching fund contribution | 8 | Match percentage | Project inventory |
| FL-2 | Private sector contribution, including public/ private partnerships | 2 | Private sector contribution as percent of total project cost | |
| | Total | 100 | | |

Notes: Evaluation criteria and scoring from SMCTA Final Strategic Plan 2020-2024, Appendix E; technical measures.

N-1 Severity of current and projected congestion

| Peak Hour Delay Index | Points to Assign |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| <1 | 0 |
| 1-1.25 | 1 |
| 1.25-1.5 | 2 |
| 1.5-1.75 | 3 |
| 1.75-2 | 4 |
| >2 | 5 |

| Percent Free Flow Speed | Points to Assign |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| >90% | 0 |
| 70-90% | 1 |
| 50-70% | 2 |
| 30-50% | 3 |
| 20-30% | 4 |
| <20% | 5 |

| Peak Hour V/C Ratio* | Points to Assign |
|----------------------|------------------|
| <1 | 0 |
| 1-1.25 | 1 |
| 1.25-1.5 | 2 |
| 1.5-1.75 | 3 |
| 1.75-2 | 4 |
| >2 | 5 |

Calculation tool will take the maximum score from available technical metrics.

**More applicable for analysis of projected congestion.*

| Potential data sources for current/observed congestion: | |
|---|--|
| State Highway System Congestion and Safety Performance Assessment | -Buffer index and percent free flow speed for 2015; -State highways only -Need to request data set in GIS format |
| State Highway System Congestion and Safety Performance Assessment | 2015; -State highways only |
| INRIX Analytics from MTC data purchase | -Available via C\CAG and MTC -Covers most arterials and highways |

| Data Source for Projected Congestion | |
|---|--|
| CCAG Model Run for "No Build" Condition | Likely available only for projects in pre environmental phase or later |

N-2 Need to improve access and connections to jobs, housing, transit hubs and other high activity centers, supporting existing economic activity and spurring new economic development in the vicinity

| Number of Activity Centers Served | Points to Assign |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| 0 | 0 |
| 1 to 5 | 1 |
| 5 to 10 | 2 |

Definition of activity centers:

Transit hubs - More than one transit mode served or fixed rail transit station

Shopping centers

Schools or Colleges

Hospitals or Medical Campuses

Large Office Campuses

Civic Campuses - City Halls, County Buildings, Community Centers, etc.

Proposed project limits should extend to within a half mile of the activity center.

N-3 Project recognized in adopted statewide, regional, county or local planning and fund programming documents

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Not included in RTP, Countywide Transportation Plan, or local plan | 0 |
| Included in local jurisdiction transportation planning document only | 1 |
| Included in RTP and/or countywide transportation planning document | 2 |

Alternative

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Not currently included in any planning documents | 0 |
| Included in at least one planning document | 1 |
| Included in more than one planning document | 2 |

N-4 Identified safety issue (e.g. documented collision history due to site conditions that is higher than average for the facility type)

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Crash rate per million VMT for project intersection or roadway segment <2 | 0 |
| Crash rate per million VMT for project intersection or roadway segment between 2 and 5 | 1 |
| Crash rate per million VMT for project intersection or roadway segment between 5 and 10 | 2 |
| Crash rate per million VMT for project intersection or roadway segment between 10 and 15 | 3 |
| Crash rate per million VMT for project intersection or roadway segment > 15 | 4 |

Distribution of points based on crash rates per *mile* categories in the *State Highway System Congestion and Safety Performance Assessment*

Source for worksheet for crash rate calculation:
[1 CRPC STGB200K Project Scoring Guide.pdf](#)

Data sources for Crash Rate Calculation

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Crash records | Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) |
| Alternative data source | Crash rate data from Congestion and Safety Performance Assessment in GIS format (based on 2013-2015 crash records) |

N-5 Regional/Countywide significance, including where applicable, location and relevance on the State Highway Congestion & Safety Performance Assessment for San Mateo County

For screening

| Percent of Traffic | Points to Assign | Data Source |
|--|------------------|---|
| Project does not improve or provide access to a major activity center; and Project is not on a State highway facility; and Project facility is not located on border of county and serving significant inter-County traffic. | 0 | GIS mapping |
| Project improves or provides access to a major activity center; OR Project is on a State highway facility; OR Project facility is located on border of county and serves significant inter-county traffic | 1 | GIS mapping and engineering judgement regarding traffic composition |

For Comparison of Projects of Countywide Significance within the same Project Phase

| Percent of Traffic | Points to Assign | Data Source |
|--|------------------|--|
| Existing or projected traffic < 50% inter-jurisdictional | 0 | C\CAG travel demand model select link assignment for PM peak |
| Existing or projected traffic is at least 50% inter-jurisdictional or inter-county | 1 | C\CAG travel demand model select link assignment for PM peak |

Definitions:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Project traffic | Includes all vehicle trips using a project facility or corridor during the peak hours |
| Inter-county | Trips with origin or destination outside San Mateo County |
| Inter-jurisdictional | Trips with origin or destination outside the jurisdiction in which it is located. |
| Major activity center | Includes BART or Caltrain stations, airport, and major shopping/entertainment centers |

Potential increase in person through-put

Metric - Average Vehicle Occupancy (AVO)

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Project does not increase AVO | 0 |
| Project increases AVO by up to 15% | 1 |
| Project increases AVO by up to 30% | 2 |
| Project increases AVO by up to 45% | 3 |
| Project increases AVO by up to 60% | 4 |
| Project increases AVO by up to 75% | 5 |
| Project increases AVO by more than 75% | 6 |

OR

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|---|------------------|
| Project does not support transit mode shift | 0 |
| Project supports transit mode shift - moderate effect (e.g. transit signal priority) | 2 |
| Project supports transit mode shift - medium effect (??) | 4 |
| Project supports transit mode shift - strong effect (e.g. bus on shoulder running, bus only lane) | 6 |

Ability to relieve congestion/performance improvement (e.g. reduces/ eliminates bottleneck)

E-2

| 1. Project Addresses Interchange Bottleneck | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Criteria | Points to Assign |
| Project does not address interchange bottleneck | 0 |
| Project addresses interchange bottleneck | 4 |

| 2. Percent Improvement (Reduction) in PM Peak Hour Delay Index | |
|---|-------------------------|
| | Points to Assign |
| 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 1 |
| 40 | 2 |
| 60 | 3 |
| 80 | 4 |
| 100% | 5 |

| 3. Percent Improvement (increase) in Free Flow Speed | |
|---|-------------------------|
| | Points to Assign |
| 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 1 |
| 40 | 2 |
| 60 | 3 |
| 80 | 4 |
| 100 | 5 |

| Data Sources |
|---|
| 1. Project description and location |
| 2-3. Analysis for environmental phase - comparison of future No Build to Build scenarios for general purpose lanes. |

E-3 Value : Benefit relative to the amount of funding requested (high impact, low cost - "bang for the buck")

| Cost per Merit Score Point | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Over 80th percentile | 1 |
| Up to 80th percentile | 2 |
| Up to 60th percentile | 3 |
| Up to 40th percentile | 4 |
| Up to 20th percentile | 5 |

Definitions

Merit Score is total of Need+Effectiveness+Sustainability Scores

Cost is total requested Measure A or W funding

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| No reduction in GHG emissions | 0 |
| Upto 5% reduction in GHG emissions | 1 |
| 5-10% reduction in GHG emissions | 2 |
| 10-15% reduction in GHG emissions | 3 |
| 15-20% reduction in GHG emissions | 4 |
| >20% reduction in GHG emissions | 5 |

Potential Data Sources/Calculation Method:

SB 1 Emissions Calculator (requires change in average daily VMT and vehicle fleet makeup and average speeds generated in planning analyses outside this tool.)

E-5 Potential VMT reduction ~~per capita~~

| Project | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Induces VMT (new GP lane miles)* | 0 |
| May be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts* | 3 |
| Plausibly reduces VMT through mode shift or reduction of travel distance (e.g. a new bridge) | 5 |

[*Refer to OPR Technical Guidance](#)

Projects that may be presumed to have less than significant impacts include addition of active transportation facilities, transit-only lanes, and operational improvement among others.

OR

| Project | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Induces VMT | 0 |
| Upto 5% reduction in VMT per capita | 1 |
| 5-10% reduction in VMT | 2 |
| 10-15% reduction in VMT | 3 |
| 15-20% reduction in VMT | 4 |
| >20% reduction in VMT | 5 |

Note: The second measure criteria is for projects that have reached Environmental Analysis phase.

E-6 Ability to address safety issue (e.g.project improves site conditions to reduce potential for collisions)

| CMF Value | Points to Assign |
|---|-------------------------|
| Project does not incorporate safety countermeasure included in CMF clearinghouse or CMF>1 | 0 |
| 0.9 | 1 |
| 0.8 | 2 |
| 0.7 | 3 |
| 0.6 | 4 |
| 0.5 | 5 |

Data Sources

Project description

[USDOT Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse](#)

E-7 Potential travel time savings

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|-------------------------|
| Project increases or does not reduce total travel time | 0 |
| Upto 5% reduction in total travel time | 1 |
| 5-15% reduction in total travel time | 2 |
| 15-25% reduction in total travel time | 3 |
| >25% reduction in total travel time | 4 |

Data Source:

Comparison of future scenarios generated with an operational or travel demand model (C/CAG model) for project corridor from planning or environmental study.

E-8 Demonstrates coordination with adjacent projects/ integration of inter-related projects

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|---|-------------------------|
| Project is not coordinated with other or adjacent projects | 0 |
| Project provides landscaping or other amenities to previously completed project | 1 |
| Project is coordinated with or fills gap with respect to a locally significant project | 2 |
| Project is coordinated with or fills gap with respect to a regionally significant project | 3 |

S-1 Project accommodates multiple transportation modes (e.g. pedestrian & bicycle access as well as transit infrastructure) where contextually appropriate and to the extent feasible (Complete Streets), including infrastructure for transit (e.g. express lanes, bus only lanes)

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|---|------------------|
| Project serves SOV travel only | 0 |
| Project serves SOV + HOV or express lane travel | 1 |
| Project serves, auto + active transportation users with Complete Streets features | 3 |
| Project incorporates both Complete Streets features plus transit improvements | 5 |

Complete Streets features could include:

- Lane reduction (road diet)
- Addition of active transportation facilities (bike lanes, cycle tracks, paths, sidewalks)
- Addition of pedestrian refuge medians
- Protected intersections

Transit serving features could include:

- Transit signal priority
- Bus only lanes
- Bus queue jumps
- BRT infrastructure
- New or improved transit stops or stations

Data source: Project scope and description

S-2

Project is primarily an operational improvement (e.g. safety or ITS) rather than infrastructure expansion (e.g. adding general purpose lanes)

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|---|-------------------------|
| Project adds new general purpose vehicle travel lanes >1* mile in length* | 0 |
| Project adds general purpose lane capacity but also includes operational or safety improvements | 2 |
| Project consists solely of operational or safety improvements | 4 |

** Consistent with OPR guidance on projects that can be presumed less than significant with respect to VMT impacts.*

Data source: Project inventory and scope

S-3 Impact project has on low income, transit dependent and or other vulnerable populations

| Project provides improved access or other benefit to area with EFA Score of: | Points to Assign |
|---|-------------------------|
| 0-3 | 0 |
| 4-6 | 1 |
| 7-8 | 2 |
| 9-10 | 3 |

Data Sources:

GIS data layer of C\CAG Equity Focus Areas

Notes:

The C\CAG Equity Focus Areas were identified with an analysis of U.S. Census data as areas with many low-income households, people of color, households without access to a vehicle, and households burdened by housing and transportation costs compared to other areas in San Mateo County.

Scoring should be supported by some analysis or clear indication that benefits accrue to the equity areas in question. A project that simply passes through an area may not offer any benefits to offset any noise, pollution, or other impacts.

Benefits may include things like reduced travel times, improved modal options, better access to transit, improved active transportation facilities, or improved safety.

S-4 Innovative low environmental impact/greeninfrastructure, including resiliency elements to address climate change

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|-------------------------|
| Project does not include elements for climate change resilience or low environmental impact/green infrastructure | 0 |
| Project addresses climate change resilience OR Includes at least one low environmental impact/green infrastructure element | 1 |
| Project addresses climate change resilience AND Includes at least one low environmental impact/green infrastructure element | 2 |
| Project addresses climate change resilience AND Includes more than one low environmental impact/green infrastructure element | 3 |

Eligible Elements

Project responds to climate change or improves climate resiliency (e.g. realigning road away from expected sea level rise)

- Promote use of clean fuel and ZEVs*
- Reduction in GHG and air pollutants*
- Climate resistant paving materials*
- Upgrade road drainage systems*
- Traffic management systems and emergency communication*
- Green stormwater treatment*
- Addition or replacement of trees in ROW*

S-5 Project accounts for long term repair/maintenance needs (e.g. uses materials with long life cycles, low maintenance costs & has a funding plan for maintenance)

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|---|-------------------------|
| Project does not account for long term repair/maintenance needs | 0 |
| Project accounts for long term repair/maintenance needs (e.g. uses materials with long life cycles, low maintenance costs & has a funding plan for maintenance) | 1 |

R-1 Clear and complete proposal

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|---|-------------------------|
| Application is missing required information or incomplete | 0 |
| Application is complete and not missing any information or required attachments | 3 |

Data Source:
Project inventory

Required elements for proposal to be considered complete:
TBD pending discussion with SMCTA

R-2 Project status and schedule - aims to give priority to shovel ready projects

| Project Phase | Points to Assign |
|--|-------------------------|
| Not initiated Approval needed | 0 |
| Preliminary Planning Study Project Initiation Document Preliminary Environmental | 1 |
| Environmental Preliminary Engineering Final Design (PS&E) up to 65% PEER Conceptual Landscape Design | 2 |
| Final Design (PS&E) up to 95% ROW Engineering Design Svcs. During Construction Construction Landscape Design Plant Establishment Period | 3 |

Data source: project inventory

R-3 Ease and speed of implementation

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Project will likely require R/W in fee ownership, permanent easements and/or temporary construction easements from private owners and/or will require utility relocations from utility companies outside that implementing agency's governmental control. | 0 |
| 1. Project is 100% within the Implementing Agency's right-of-way or is within their control at the time of this application submittal (this includes temporary construction easements) AND 2. Applicant has not begun permitting or environmental clearance processes. | 1 |
| 1. Project is 100% within the Implementing Agency's right-of-way or is within their control at the time of this application submittal (this includes temporary construction easements) AND 2. Applicant <u>has</u> completed environmental clearance process and begun permitting. | 2 |
| 1. Project is 100% within the Implementing Agency's right-of-way or is within their control at the time of this application submittal (this includes temporary construction easements) AND 2. Applicant has completed environmental clearance and required permitting for construction. | 3 |

Data source: Project inventory/ project document

R-4

Demonstrates stakeholder support/community engagement

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| Application lacks documented support from the community or the applicant has not engaged the community on this project. | 0 |
| 1. Applicant has described documented support from the community but it is unclear if the supporters will directly benefit from the project AND 2. Applicant has described community engagement activities, but not demonstrated how input was used to shape the project scope of work AND 3. Applicant has identified concerns raised by the community, but not included any discussion of ways to mitigate concerns. | 1 |
| 1. Applicant has described documented support from members of the community that will benefit directly from the project AND 2. Applicant has described how input received from public engagement activities helped shape the project scope of work AND 3. Applicant identifies concerns raised and plans for resolving those concerns if possible AND 4. Applicant lists non-sponsor stakeholders that have taken a formal position on the project. | 3 |

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Funding information is either not provided for each phase or is unrealistic given the size and complexity of the project OR 2. Project is not fully funded and there is no credible plan for obtaining funding within one year of the funding award OR 3. Applicant cannot phase the project if funding cannot be obtained. | 0 |
| 1. Funding information is provided for each phase and realistic given the size and complexity of the project AND 2. Project is not fully funded for every scope phase with either Measure A & W program request or other secured matching funds, however applicant describes credible plan to close funding gap within one year of the funding award date OR 3. Applicant describes phased approach to completing the project with associated costs. | 1 |
| 1. Funding information is provided for each phase and realistic given the size and complexity of the project AND 2. Project is fully funded for every scope phase with either Measure A & W program request or other secured matching funds AND 3. Applicant submits documentation to show matching funds are secured AND 4. Applicant anticipates no funding shortfalls. | 3 |

FL-1 Percent of matching fund contribution

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|-------------------------|
| Match percentage <= 10%. | 0 |
| Local match percentage is greater than 10% and less than 20% | 1 |
| Local match percentage is between 20% and 29% | 2 |
| Local match percentage is between 30% and 49% | 4 |
| Local match percentage is between 50% and 70% | 6 |
| Local match percentage is greater than 70% | 8 |

Note: Cost match percentage applies to current project phase.

FL-2

Private sector contribution, including public/ private partnerships

| Criteria | Points to Assign |
|--|-------------------------|
| No private sector funding is part of this project application. | 0 |
| Project includes any amount of private sector contribution, but less than 15% of the total project cost. | 1 |
| Private sector contribution to local match is equal to or greater than 15% of total project cost. | 2 |