

# 2021 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 2021 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/Projects/Call\\_for\\_Projects.html](https://www.smcta.com/Projects/Call_for_Projects.html)

## SCHEDULE

Call for Projects Issued after TA Board Meeting	August 6, 2021
Call for Projects Workshop: Virtual via Zoom (will be recorded)	August 11, 2021
Notify TA of Intent to Submit	August 13, 2021
Early Submittal Reviews due	September 10, 2021
Project Applications due	September 24, 2021
Evaluation Period	October 2021
Informational item to TA Board on Draft Program of Projects	November 4, 2021
TA Board approves proposed Program of Projects	December 2, 2021

**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 August 13, 2021. 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 during the week of September 13-17, 2021 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 **September 24, 2021 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:

Jennifer Williams, at [williamsj@samtrans.com](mailto:williamsj@samtrans.com) or (650) 508-6343

## 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.**

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:

[www.smcta.com/Assets/SMCTA/Documents/2009-2033+Transportation+Expenditure+Plan.pdf](http://www.smcta.com/Assets/SMCTA/Documents/2009-2033+Transportation+Expenditure+Plan.pdf)

Measure W Congestion Relief Plan:

<https://www.samtrans.com/Assets/public+affairs/pdf/Ordinance.pdf>

Transportation Authority 2020-2024 Strategic Plan

[https://www.smcta.com/about/Strategic\\_Plan\\_2020-2024.html](https://www.smcta.com/about/Strategic_Plan_2020-2024.html)

2021-2030 Short Range Highway Plan and Capital Improvement Program

<https://www.smcta.com/Programs/Highway.html>

### ***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 2021 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**

<b>Funding Track</b>	<b>Available funds</b>	<b>Eligible Projects</b>
Measure A: (KCA & SR)	\$80 million <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• KCA: \$50.4m</li><li>• SR: \$29.6m</li></ul>	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.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$100 million</b>	

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.

- ***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 as a KCA project will be accepted for consideration. Any highway project not listed as a KCA, is automatically designated as SR for Measure A or may use Measure W 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 2021 Highway Program Call for projects. Final Board action is tentatively scheduled to take place at the TA's December 2021 meeting, which means the schedule for the requested phase of work should show work commencing no later than December 2022.

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

- **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 August 13, 2021 (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)**.

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/pdpm/chap\\_pdf/chapt20.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/pdpm/chap_pdf/chapt20.pdf)

- 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 Joe Hurley, Director, Transportation Authority Program at [hurleyj@samtrans.com](mailto:hurleyj@samtrans.com) or (650) 508-7942.*

## 5. APPLICATIONS

- **Governing Board Resolutions**

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 September 24, 2021 application deadline, the application will be accepted on an interim basis with an endorsement letter from the sponsor's staff lead (e.g. City or County Manager, Executive Director). *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 November 19, 2021 prior to the final TA Board adoption of the program.*

- **Cover Letter & Non-Supplantation of Funds Statement**

In addition to the required signatures, 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 and attest to non-supplantation of funds if awarded highway program funding.

- **Letters of Support**

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 project's 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**

Funding agreement and memorandum of understanding (MOU) templates are included as part of the Call for Projects packet. Potential project sponsors should review the templates prior to submitting applications. 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. *Any concerns or changes suggested by sponsors should be brought to the attention of the TA general application staff contact, as noted at the beginning of these guidelines, by the **September 10, 2021** early submission deadline if they are to be considered by the TA.*



## 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?
<b>PLANNING &amp; FEASIBILITY STUDIES</b>							
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		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$940,536,885</b>	<b>\$5,220,000</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</b>							
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
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$788,167,000</b>	<b>\$46,374,000</b>		

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?
<b>ENGINEERING DESIGN</b>							
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		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$295,669,815</b>	<b>\$61,000,000</b>		
<b>RIGHT-OF-WAY &amp; CONSTRUCTION</b>							
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		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$635,197,831</b>	<b>\$53,588,000</b>		
<b>LANDSCAPING/CLOSEOUT</b>							
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	
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$10,440,000</b>	<b>\$9,510,000</b>		
<b>TOTAL COST</b>				<b>\$2,670,011,531</b>	<b>\$175,692,000</b>		

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?
<b>PLANNING AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES</b>							
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
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$247,150,000</b>	<b>\$5,250,000</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</b>							
UA-000103	ITS Improvements in Daly City, Brisbane, and Colma	C/CAG	Final Design (PS&E)	\$10,885,000	\$350,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$10,885,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>		
<b>TOTAL COST</b>				<b>\$258,035,000</b>	<b>\$5,600,000</b>		

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
<b>Need</b>		<b>22</b>		
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
<b>Effectiveness</b>		<b>37</b>		
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 <sup>1</sup>	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,

<sup>1</sup>Caltrans 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)**

<b>Metric</b>	<b>Highway Program Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Technical Measure(s)</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
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
<b>Sustainability</b>		<b>16</b>		
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
<b>Readiness</b>		<b>15</b>		
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
<b>Funding Leverage</b>		<b>10</b>		
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	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>		

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.*

**Project recognized in adopted statewide, regional, county or local planning and fund programming documents**

**N-3**

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

<b>1. Project Addresses Interchange Bottleneck</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
Project does not address interchange bottleneck	0
Project addresses interchange bottleneck	4

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

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

<b>Data Sources</b>
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")**

<b>Cost per Merit Score Point</b>	
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 <del>per capita</del>	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)**

<b>CMF Value</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Project provides improved access or other benefit to area with EFA Score of:</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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)

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Project Phase</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points to Assign</b>
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