

#### CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

### **AGENDA**

#### **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)**

**Date:** Thursday, April 25, 2019

7:00 p.m.

**Place:** San Mateo City Hall

Conference Room C 330 West 20th Avenue San Mateo, CA 94403

1. Call to Order Action

(Self)

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda Limited to 3 minutes

per speaker.

3. Meeting Minutes of the March 28, 2019 Meeting Action Pages 1-3

(Self)

4. Review and recommend approval of the Action Page 4-22

Transportation Development Act Article 3 (Hoang)

Program Call for Projects and schedule for Fiscal

Year 2019/20 Cycle

5. Member Communications Information No materials

(Self)

6. Adjourn Action

(Self)

#### The next BPAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 27, 2019.

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <a href="http://www.ccag.ca.gov">http://www.ccag.ca.gov</a>.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <a href="http://www.ccag.ca.gov">http://www.ccag.ca.gov</a>.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker. Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact John Hoang 650-363-4105.

#### City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting Minutes March 28, 2019

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair Fraser called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm.

Members Present: Marina Fraser, Marge Colapietro, Malcolm Robinson, Don Horsley, Ann Wengert, Ann Schneider, Karyl Matsumoto, Karen Cunningham, Matthew Self, Emily Beach.

Members Absent: Herb Perez, Daina Lujan, Jamie Axt.

Staff/Guests Attending: Sandy Wong, Van Ocampo, John Hoang – C/CAG; Ray Razavi – Half Moon Bay; Drew,

#### 2. Public Comments On Items Not On The Agenda

None.

#### 3. Meeting Minutes of October 25, 2018 (Action)

No comments or revisions were made on the meeting minutes of October 25, 2018. Chair Fraser called for a motion to approve the October 25, 2018, Meeting Minutes.

Motion: Member Colapietro moved/Member Horsley seconded approval of the October 25, 2018 minutes. The motion carried 8-1-0. Member Robinson opposed. Member Schneider abstained.

## **4.** Receive a presentation on the Half Moon Bay Safe Routes to Cunha School Project (Information)

Ray Razavi, Contract Engineer from City of Half Moon Bay, presented on the Half Moon Bay Safe Routes to Cunha School Project, funded by a C/CAG Pilot. The project demonstrates a cost-effective solution that integrates both safe routes and green infrastructure elements into the design.

It was requested that the presentation be posted on the Half Moon Bay as well as C/CAG websites.

## 5. Nominations and elections of a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Chair and Vice-Chair (Action)

Member Matsumoto nominated Member Matthew Self to be the next BPAC Chair. Member Colapietro seconded the nomination. Member Horsley nominated Member Malcolm Robinson to be the next Vice-Chair. Member Schneider seconded the nomination.

### 6. Review and recommend approval of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Call for Projects for Fiscal Year 2019/20 Cycle (Action)

Van Ocampo presented the draft call for project applications and scoring sheet. Discussions were as follows:

- Recommendation that each city be limited to one (1) application for planning and one (1) application for capital projects for a maximum of two (2) applications.
- Recommendation that staff prescreen the CEQA requirements and score the local cash match section.
- It was mentioned that after the last cycle, members provided comments to former C/CAG staff regarding ways to improve the application and scoring documents and directed staff to incorporate those comments.
- Request for staff to look into the treatment of motorized scooters and motorized bicycles operations on bike and pedestrian facilities.
- Request that staff clarify eligibility for JPBs.
- Request that staff clarify requirements of a city Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC).
- Recommendation for staff to coordinate with Chair Self and Vice-Chair Robinson to make updates to the documents to incorporate comments received for BPAC action at its next regular meeting.

#### 7. Member Communications (Information)

Member Matsumoto requested that the committee receive a list of BPAC members and list of C/CAG staff with contact information.

Member Matsumoto also reported that she has had communicated to the C/CAG Board suggesting changes to how BPAC members are appointed. The suggestion allows the BPAC to interview and recommend Public Member candidates to the C/CAG Board for appointment decisions. It was suggested that this item be agendized for a future meeting.

Member Schneider reported that the City of Millbrae held a Bike Rodeo event at the Taylor School on May 11th.

Member Schneider reported that the city has approved its Gateway project which includes a Bay trail.

Member Self reported that he is a new member of the Silicon Valley Mountain Biker Association.

Member Fraser reported that she was elected to serve on the SamTrans Board representing the Coastside.

#### 8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

### C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - 2019

Name	Agency	March 2019
Matthew Self - Chair	Public (Redwood City)	X
Malcolm Robinson – Vice Chair	Public (San Bruno)	X
Marge Colapietro	Public (Millbrae)	X
Ann Schneider	Millbrae	X
Marina Fraser	Half Moon Bay	X
Don Horsley	County of San Mateo	X
Emily Beach	Burlingame	X
Karyl Matsumoto	South San Francisco	X
Ann Wengert	Portola Valley	X
Herb Perez	Foster City	
Daina Lujan	Public (South San Francisco)	
Jamie Axt	Public (Redwood City)	
Karen Cunningham	Brisbane	X

### Others in attendance at the March 2019 BPAC Meeting:

Van Ocampo C/CAG Staff
John Hoang C/CAG Staff

Sandy Wong C/CAG Executive Director

Jeff Lacap C/CAG Staff
Ray Razavi Half Moon Bay
Drew Public Member

#### C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 25, 2019

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From: John Hoang

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Transportation Development Act Article 3

Program Call for Projects process and schedule for Fiscal Year 2019/20 Cycle

(For further information, contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG BPAC review and recommend approval of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Call for Projects process and schedule for Fiscal Year 2019/20 Cycle

#### FISCAL IMPACT

There is approximately \$1,950,000 available for the Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA Art. 3) Program Call for Projects for FY 2019/20 Cycle

#### SOURCE OF FUNDS

TDA Art. 3 funds are derived from the following sources:

- Local Transportation Funds (LFT), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
- State Transit Assistance Fund (STA), derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

#### BACKGROUND

TDA Article 3 funds are made available through State funds and are distributed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to C/CAG on a formula basis annually. C/CAG acts as the program administrator for San Mateo County and issues the call for project nominations for eligible bicycle and/or pedestrian projects within the county. Only the 20 cities, the County, and joint powers agencies in San Mateo are eligible applicants for this grant. There is approximately \$1,950,000 available in TDA Article 3 funds for the FY 2019/2020 Cycle and staff is recommending issuing a call for projects nominations this spring.

At the March 28, 2019 BPAC Meeting, staff presented the draft Call for Projects, Project Applications for Capital and Planning projects, and Scoring Sheet for review and comments. In addition to providing staff input and comments on modifying the draft application and scoring sheets, the main BPAC recommendation was to limit cities to one application for planning projects and one application for capital projects each for a maximum two (2) applications per city.

Out of the \$1,950,000, \$200,000 will be available to fund planning projects with \$1,750,000 available for capital projects. Maximum grant amount for planning project remains at \$100,000 with a

requirement of 50% match. The maximum grant amount for the capital projects remains at \$400,000.

The BPAC also recommended that staff coordinate with Chair Self and Vice-Chair Robinson to update the documents and bring back to the BPAC for final review and recommendations.

The proposed updated scheduled is as follows:

Activity	Date
Issue Call for Projects	May 15
Application Workshop	May 23, 2019
Application Due	TBD June/July, 2019
Project Sponsor Presentation to BPAC	September 26, 2019
Project Location Field Trip	TBD
Project Scoring BPAC Meeting	October 24, 2019
C/CAG Board Approval	November 14, 2019

<sup>\*</sup>Dates may be adjusted as needed

#### **ATTACHMENT**

- TDA Art. 3 FY 19/20 Call for Projects
- TDA Art. 3 Project Application Planning
- TDA Art. 3 Project Application Capital
- TDA Art. 3 Scoring Sheet (Original)
- TDA Art. 3 Scoring Sheet (Updated w/highlight)



#### CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

To: City/County Managers

**Public Works Directors** 

**Interested Parties** 

From: John Hoang, Program Director

Date: May 15, 2019

**Subject:** Call for Projects - Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Pedestrian

and Bicycle Program Call for Projects Fiscal Year 2019/20

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) is pleased to announce a Call for Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects under the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program. TDA Article 3 Funds are derived from Local Transportation Funds and the State Transit Assistance Fund.

For Fiscal Year 2019/20, there is a total of \$1,9500,000 available for this call for project nomination. Project submissions for TDA Article 3 funds will again be divided into Capital projects and Planning projects (Comprehensive bicycle and/or pedestrian plans).

Project Type	Available Grant	Maximum Grant
	Amount	Amount per Project
Capital	\$1,750,000	\$400,000
Planning (Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Plan)	\$200,000	\$100,000*
Total Grant Amount	\$1,950,000	

<sup>\*50%</sup> match required

#### Eligible projects include:

- Construction of a bicycle or pedestrian capital project (PS&E and Construction Phases
- Development of a comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian plan
- Maintenance of a multi-purpose path which is closed to motorized traffic
- Restriping Class II bicycle lanes

Each jurisdiction may submit a maximum of one (1) Capital project and one (1) Planning project for a maximum total of two (2) applications. The maximum grant amount for each capital project is \$400,000 and maximum grant amount for each planning project is \$100,000, with a 50% match required. Eligible project applicants are limited to the Cities and Towns within San Mateo County and the County of San Mateo.

#### **Project Requirements**

Per MTC Resolution No. 4108, all TDA Article 3 projects must meet the following requirements:

- Capital projects may include PS&E and construction phases only. Project level environmental, planning and right-of-way phases are ineligible for funding.
- Design must be 100% complete and meet Caltrans standards to be eligible for funding.
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) permits must be completed prior to receiving funding (as applicable).
- The project must be included in a locally approved bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, complete streets or relevant plan.
- Jurisdictions receiving TDA Article 3 funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects must have a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC).
- Jurisdiction must provide the 50% match required for planning projects.
- There is no minimum match required for capital projects, but the local match will be scored on a sliding scale. (C/CAG Requirement)
- TDA Article 3 funds for FY 2019/20 must be expended by no later than **June 30, 2022** after allocations are made by MTC.

The TDA Article 3 FY 2019/20 Call for Projects Guidelines, Application Forms and Score Sheet are available at <a href="http://ccag.ca.gov/call-for-projects/">http://ccag.ca.gov/call-for-projects/</a>. Please submit 1 original signed application, 15 hard copies, and 1 electronic version including supporting materials (disk, flash drive, e-mail or link to an online database system) for each application. Applications must be completed using the appropriate Microsoft Word project application forms posted at <a href="http://ccag.ca.gov/call-for-projects/">http://ccag.ca.gov/call-for-projects/</a>.

Applications are due by **4:30 p.m. on** \_\_\_\_\_ **2019.** Please send the hard copies & electronic copy to:

C/CAG Attn: John Hoang 555 County Center, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

E-mail: jhoang@smcgov.org

#### Field Review

Capital Project sponsors have the option to submit a field video (5 min. max). This field video is not required but is highly encouraged. The field video should show the project location, highlight the issues and show how the project will address the issue/s. This video will not take the place of the project presentation at a BPAC meeting (date to be determined) and should not be included in the project presentation.

#### **Applicant Workshop**

C/CAG Staff will be holding an Applicant Workshop to guide jurisdictions through the application process. The workshop will be held on:

May 23, 2019 10:00 – 12:00 noon SamTrans Building, 2nd Floor Auditorium 1250 San Carlos Avenue San Carlos, CA 94070

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (650) 363-4105 or jhoang@smcgov.org.



TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019/20

#### **PLANNING PROJECT APPLICATION**

l.	Project Name and Funding Request			
a.	Applicant Agency:			
b.	Funds Requested:	\$		
с.	Project Title:			
d.	Brief Project Summary:			
e.	Project Type:	☐ Comprehensive Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan ☐ Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan Only ☐ Comprehensive Bicycle Plan Only		
II.	Project Screening			
		San Mateo, a City within San Mateo County or a un Mateo County? Answer must be "Yes" to		
		l Yes □ No		
III.	Clear and Complete Proposal			
a.	Describe the project elements.			

	b.	Check one:	□ New Plan		
			☐ Update to existing pla	ın	Date of previous plan:
IV.		Community	Support		
	a.	meets the re	quirements established by ding committee. (Note: The lof TDA3 funds)	the Me	agency has a designated BAC that tropolitan Transportation Commission include representatives of bicyclists/pedestrians progress (expected date:)
	b.	Project is sup	ported by the BAC:		
			□ Ye	es 🗆	No
	с.	-	een approved by other or f walking and bicycling ne ☐ Ye	eds (se	
	Г	Names of oth	ner group(s): Type	of supp	ort: (e.g., letters, resolutions, minutes)
	•				
	-				
V.	l	Meets Progr	am Objectives		
		problem. Ho regarding excommunities.	w was the need determine kisting walking/bicycling d	d? Cite emand,	project addresses an identified relevant data or observations, or results of similar projects in other map. Describe the project's anticipated

C/CAG TDA Article 3 FY 19/20 Planning Project Application

Funding and Local Match

VI.

	a. Enter total project cost, totaling funds from all sources here: \$				
	TDA Funds requested: Local Funds provided: Local match percentage:	\$ \$ %			
	To calculate % Local Match Percentage  Local Matching Funds* =  Total Project Cost		ation:		
	*Local Cash Match only. Planning Project qualify for TDA Article 3 grant funding.	Cash Match only. Planning Projects are required to provide at least a 50% match to for TDA Article 3 grant funding.			
	b. Can this project be partially funde	qŝ	☐ Yes	□ No	
VII.	Single Point of Project Contact I	nformation			
	Name and Title:				
	Applicant Agency:				
	Telephone:				
	Email Address:				



TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019/20

#### **CAPITAL PROJECT APPLICATION**

I. Project Name and Funding Reque	≥st
-----------------------------------	-----

	a.	Applicant Agency:	
	b.	Funds Requested:	\$
	c.	Project Title:	Ψ
	d.	Brief Project Summary:	
	e.	Project Type:	
			☐ Capital: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility
			☐ Capital: Bicycle Facility Only ☐ Capital: Pedestrian Facility Only
			Lapital: redesition racinity Only
I.		Project Screening	
	a.		of San Mateo, a City in San Mateo County or a Joint Mateo County? Answer must be "Yes" to continue.
			☐ Yes ☐ No
	b.	Project meets Caltrans Standard	s: 🗆 Yes 🗆 No
		Brief description of project	
		elements meeting Caltrans Standards:	
		_	
	c.	Received California Environment	al Quality Act (CEQA) approval?
		Г	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable
		Date of CEQA Approval:	

Note: CEQA document must be submitted as an attachment to the application.

III.		Clear and Complete Proposal				
		Describe the project elements (i	ndicate lo	cation, le	ngth, sco	pe, size or extent)
IV.		State of Readiness				
	a.	Right-of-Way certification required?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	<b>A</b>
	b.	Right-of-Way certification completed (if applicable)?	☐ Yes	□ No		
	c.	Permits/Agreements approved?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	
		List all required permits and/or approved. Also list the required date of approval.	-		-	
		Name of Permit/Agreement				Date approved/obtained
		Describe the project's design stat	tus includir	ng percen	t comple	te.
	4	Describe the project's anticipated	l schedula	including	major m	illestones and construction

start/end dates.

V. Con	nmunity Support and Loca	ıl Match			
a.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC): Applicant agency has a designated BAC that meets the requirements established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and is a standing committee. (Note: a BAC that includes members representing pedestrians is required prior to award of TDA3 funds)				
		☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ In progress (expected date:)		
b.	Project has been approve	ed by the agency	BAC:		
		☐ Yes ☐ No			
	Project has been approve walking and bicycling ne		nized group(s) with demonstrated knowledge of ns):		
	Names of other group(s):	Type of support:	(e.g., letters resolutions)		
	Meets Program Objectiv	es			
a.	was the need determined	? Cite relevant d	the project addresses an identified problem. How ata or observations regarding existing nilar projects in other communities. Include a vicinity		
b.		a within the last f	of collision injury to people walking or cycling. Cite ive years (2011-2015, or more recent if available) ords System (SWITRS).		

C/CAG TDA Article 3 FY 19/20 Planning Project Application

VI.

c.	Access to high-use activity centers: List the destinations the project serves and estimate the number and frequency of people accessing these locations. For projects that serve both walking and bicycling, identify the features that serve walking transportation. Estimate the proportion of the project cost going toward pedestrian facilities. (See instructions) Describe if the project serves low income/transit dependent population and its proximity to Priority Development Areas (PDAs).
d.	This project includes facilities that serve walking trips: ☐ Yes ☐ No
	Describe parallel pedestrian amenities (if applicable):
e.	Degree to which this project improves conditions for bicycling and/or walking for <a href="mailto:transportation">transportation</a> purposes:
	☐ Primarily Transportation ☐ Transportation & Recreation ☐ Primarily Recreation
f.	Estimate the typical distances of walking and/or bicycling trips that will use this facility and, if available, demographic characteristics:
g.	What is the relationship of the project to the existing or regional bicycle or pedestrian routes? Is the project in coordination with neighboring jurisdictions? Explain.

h.	n. Project is consistent with local or regional plans (add lines, if necessary):					
	Type of Plan:			Name of Plan and Page (if applicable)		
	i. County of City facilities plan					
	ii. Circulation element of general plan					
	iii. San Mateo County Comprehensive B Plan	icycle & Pedestrian				
	iv. Other bicycle, pedestrian, or comple	te streets plan(s):				
	Funding and Local Match					
a.	Enter total project cost, totaling funds from \$	m all sources here:				
TD	A Funds requested:	\$				
Loc	cal Funds provided:	\$				
Loc	cal match percentage:	%				
То	calculate % Local Match Percentage, pleas	e use the following ed	quation:			
	<u>Local Matching Funds*</u> = Local <i>I</i> Total Project Cost	Match %				
	ash Match Only. Please note that local fund arces received from other grants.	s cannot include prior	funding			
b.	Can the project be partially funded or d	ivided into phases?	☐ Yes	□No		
c.	c. If applicable, are there any other funds (i.e., Grants) as part			□ No		
	of the project?					
	If yes, please list the funding source and	amount:				
	Optional Field Video					
	Is a video being submitted as part of th	is application?	☐ Yes	□ No		
	(Highly Recommended)					

C/CAG TDA Article 3 FY 19/20 Planning Project Application

VII.

VIII.

Revised 4/2019

XI.	Single Point of Contact Information			
	Name:			
	Title:			
	Applicant Agency:			
	Telephone:			
	E-mail Address:			



### CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

# TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS FISCAL YEAR 2019/20

#### **SCORING SHEET**

Applicant Agency:		Rater Name:		
I. Project Title:		Project type: (check one)		
		☐ Capital		
Application Number:		☐ Planning		
II. Project Screening:	II. Project Screening:			
	y, County of San Mateo, or joint	☐ Yes	□ No	
powers agency in San				
b. Meets applicable Calt		☐ Yes or NA	□ No	
c. CEQA approval, if ap	plicable	☐ Yes or NA	□ No	
d. BAC established as a s	standing committee	☐ Yes or NA	□ No	
e. BAC in progress		☐ Yes	□ No	
	Scale	Maximum	n Points	Points
				Assigned
III. Clear and Complete Prop		1		
a. Degree to which	0 = Incomplete description, missing			
proposal is clear and	documentation 1-5 = Clear project description	10	)	
complete	5-10 = Clear and complete scope and			
	documentation			
	Subtotal:	Max.	10	
L				
	r Capital Projects only: (Note: if Exempt or No	t Applicable, eligible	e for full points)	
a. Right-of-Way	0 = R.O.W. not certified, not started			
degree to which R.O.W.	1-2 = R.O.W. partially secured 3 = R.O.W. certification complete	3		
is secured	0 = No agreements or permits in place			
b. Permits obtained degree to which permits	1-2 = Some permits in place	3		
are in place	3 = All permits and agreements complete	3		
c. Design status	0 = Design not started			
degree to which design	1-3 = Design in progress	4		
is complete 4 = Design complete				
d. Schedule	0 = Major milestones and construction dates not included			
degree to which project can be completed	1-4 = Major milestones and construction	_		
before funds expire	dates included and completed when funds	5		
'	expire			
	5 = Major milestones and construction			
	dates included and completed before funds expire			
	Subtotal:	Max.	15	

V. Community Support a	nd Local Match	For all projects types:		
a. Project supported by BAC or other group(s)	0 = No support 1 - 5 = Support fro 6 - 10 = Support f	om other groups From BAC <u>and</u> group(s)	10	
b. Local Cash Match	0 = 0% match 2 = 10% match 4 = 20% match	6 = 30% match 8 = 40% match 10 = 50% match	10	
	•	Subtotal:	Max. 20	

	Scale	Max Points Capital	Max Points Planning	Points Assigned
.VI. Meets Program Objective	es			
For All Projects:  a. Project Need: Degree to which problems, need, and issues are described, urgent and documented	0 = No need demonstrated 1-5 = Moderate description of need or problem 6-10 = Documented need, data cited 11-20 = Effective strategy	20	)	
For Planning Projects Only:  b. Score reflects how many and how well the following items are addressed:  Vision/Mission Statement Budget and tasks Schedule Attainable goals/metrics Outreach methods Data collection/evaluation Specific improvements Programs/Initiatives Format and Readability Multi-Modal/Complete Streets Concepts	Add up to 5 points for each item addressed in list at left using the following scale:  1-2 point = briefly addressed 3-4 points = adequately addressed 5 points = addressed well, in detail		55	
b. For Capital Projects Only (b – h): Safety: degree of reduction in injury risk	0 = no documentation of risk reduction 1 - 3 = Moderate collision risk reduction 4 - 7 = Documented crash risk reduction 8 - 10 = Severe injury crash history, effective strategy	10		
c. High use activity centers, population served, and proximity to PDAs	0 = no activity centers/PDAs in proximity or low income/transit dependent population served 2 - 3 = moderate number of activity centers/PDAs accessed or trips/low income/transit dependent population served 4 -5 = high number of activity centers and trips served, within PDA	5		
d. Pedestrian facility	0 = does not provide pedestrian facility 5 = provides a pedestrian facility	5		
e. Transportation purpose	0 = facility serves recreational uses exclusively 1 - 2 = serves mainly recreational uses 3 - 4 = serves both transportation and recreation purposes 5 = serves mainly transportation trips	5		

f. Connection to network	0 = does not connect to network 1-4 = connects to local network 5 = connects to regional network	5		
g. Consistent with plans	0 = not included in local or regional plans 1-4 = included in some local plans 5-8 = priority in some local plans 9-10 = included in CBPP regional plan	10		
	Subtotal:	Max. 60	Max. 75	
Total Score: (Maximum total points: 105)				

<sup>\*</sup>Capital Projects are highlighted in Orange; Planning Projects are highlighted in Green; and White cells indicate both Project types.



# TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS FISCAL YEAR 2019/20

#### **SCORING SHEET**

Revised: April 9, 2019 Note: Gray shaded tables to be scored by staff

I. Project Name and Funding Request

a. Applicant Agency:		Rater Name:			
I. Project Title:		Project type: (check one)  ☐ Capital ☐ Planning			
II. Project Screening:					
<ul><li>a. Eligible jurisdiction: Cit powers agency in San</li></ul>	y, County of San Mateo, or joint Mateo County	Yes	No		
b. Meets applicable Caltra	ans standards	Yes	No		
c. CEQA approval, if appli	cable (Date of Approval:)	Yes or NA	No		
d. BAC established <mark>as a st</mark>	anding committee	Yes	No	In Pr	ogress
	Scale	Maximu	ım Points		Points Assigned
III. Clear and Complete Prop	osal				
a. Degree to which	0 = Incomplete description, missing				
proposal is clear and	documentation	10			
complete	1-5 = Clear project description 5-10 = Clear and complete scope and				
	documentation				
	Subtotal:	Ma	x. 10		
	or Capital Projects only: <mark>(Note: if Exempt or Not A</mark>	<mark>Applicable, eligibl</mark>	e for full poin	ts)	
<ul> <li>a. Right-of-Way degreetowhich R.O.W. is secured</li> </ul>	0 = R.O.W. not certified, not started 3 = R.O.W. certification complete or not required		3		
b. Permits obtained degree to which permits are in place	0 = No agreements or permits in place 1-2 = Some permits in place 3 = All permits and agreements complete		3		
c. Design Status degreetowhichdesign is complete	0 = Design not started 1-3 = Design in progress (35%-65%-95%) Complete 4 = Design 100% complete (ready to advertise)		4		
d. Schedule  degreetowhich project can be completed before fundsexpire	0 = No Major milestones and construction dates included 5 = Major milestones and construction dates included and completed before funds expire		5		
	Subtotal:	Ma	x. 15		
	Subtotui.	- William			

V. CommunitySupportand		For all project types:		
a. Project supported by BAC or other group(s)	1 - 3 = Support fro	ed support om BAC only from BAC <u>and</u> other	10	
b. Local Cash Match	0 = 0% match 2 = 10% match 4 = 20% match	6=30% match 8=40% match 10 = 50% match	10	
		Subtotal:	Max. 20	

	Scale	Max Points Capital	Max Points Planning	Points Assigned
.VI. Meets Program Objectives		Capitai	Figitiiiig	Assigned
For All Projects:  a. Project Need: Degree to which problems, need, and issues are described, urgent and documented	0 = No need demonstrated 1-5=Moderatedescriptionofneedor problem 6-10 = Documented need, data cited 11-20 = Effective strategy	20	)	
For Planning Projects Only:  b. Score reflects how many and how well the following items are addressed:  Vision/Mission Statement Budget and tasks Schedule Attainable goals/metrics Outreach methods Data collection/evaluation Specific improvements Programs/Initiatives Format and Readability Multi-Modal/Complete Streets Concepts Target low income/transit dependent population	Add up to 5 points for each item addressed in list at left using the following scale:  1-2 point = briefly addressed 3-4 points = adequately addressed 5 points = addressed well, indetail		<mark>55</mark>	
For CapitalProjects Only (b - g): b. Safety: degree of reduction in injury risk	<ul> <li>0 = minimal safety improvement</li> <li>5 = moderate reduction of risk of severe crashes/injuries</li> <li>10 = significant reduction of risk of severe crashes/injuries</li> </ul>	10		
c. High use activity centers, population served, and proximity to PDAs	0 = no activity centers/PDAs in proximity or low income/transit dependent population served 2 - 3 = moderate number of activity centers/PDAs accessed or trips/low income/transit dependent population served 4 - 5 = high number of activity centers and trips served, withinPDA	5		
d. Pedestrian facility	0 = does not provide pedestrian facility 5 = provides a pedestrian facility	5		
e. Transportation purpose	0 – serves recreational uses 1 - 5 = serves transportation trips	5		

f. Connection to network	0= does not expand network 1-7 = expands local network 8-10 = expands regional network	5		
g. Consistent with plans	0=notincludedinlocalorregionalplans 1-5 = included in local or regional plans 6-10 = priority in local and regional plan	10		
	Subtotal:	Max. 60	Max. 75	
		(Maximum tota	Total Score: al points: 105)	

<sup>\*</sup>Capital Projects are highlighted in Orange; Planning Projects are highlighted in Green; and White cells indicate both Project types.

