

Highway Program Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criterion	Criterion Objectives	Potential Weighting
Congestion Relief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove an existing or future bottleneck • Significantly improve travel time or speed • Significantly increase person-throughput • Improve connectivity to regional intermodal facilities or emergency facilities decrease delay 	25
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce risk of fatalities • Reduce merge and weave conflicts • Not adversely affect bicycle or pedestrian movement • Improve safety of truck operations 	20
Environmental Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve mobility and accessibility for low-income travel markets • Promote alternative modes • Not adversely impact low-income or minority neighborhoods from construction and/or displacement 	15
Geographic Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a balance in terms of equitable distribution of highway investment throughout Santa Clara County • Consider local agency priority 	15
Implementability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote projects that are ready • Have local committed funding match for local interchange projects (e.g. not freeway to freeway interchanges) • Consider project s in adopted plan, e.g. General Plan 	15
Economic Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to jobs 	10
		<u>TOTAL = 100</u>

CRITERIA ADOPTED FOR LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS PROGRAM AREA

Planning Phase Scoring Criteria

Total Available Points: 100

Note: each member agency is guaranteed one project on the planning list. In case an agency submits multiple projects, the one scoring highest is the "guaranteed" project.

Street Connectivity: – Up to 25 Points

Provide more route options through increased connectivity of street system

- New connection of an existing roadway - Up to 25 points.
- or
- Removal of bottleneck by completing missing lanes including bicycle lanes and sidewalks - Up to 25 points.

Congestion Relief: – Up to 25 Points

Improve efficiency through improvements in system dependability and travel time

- Project increases person-trip capacity without adversely impacting other travel modes within surrounding area OR project significantly improves travel time by any mode - Up to 15 points.
- Project benefits a regional facility by providing local streets and/or county road connections that directly improve a non-freeway CMP facility or improve a CMP reliever route - Up to 10 points.

Safety: – Up to 30 Points

Improves safety of existing roadway, pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Projects that adversely affect bicycle or pedestrian movements and/or degrade the safety conditions for pedestrian and bicycles will not receive points in this category.

- Project includes elements that improve safety of an existing condition, which could reduce risk of injury accidents for all modes of travel – Up to 15 points.
- Project includes traffic-calming elements – Up to 15 points.

Transportation / Land Use Connection Interface: – Up to 20 Points

Encourage consideration of land uses and multimodal transportation planning

- Multi-modal projects near or providing improved access to serving concentrated commercial and/or higher density housing – Up to 5 points.

- Multi-modal projects at/near rail stations and bus transit centers (as defined in the VTA Short Range Transit Plan) – Up to 5 points.
- Primarily serves "communities of concern" and/or supports neighborhood/community plan – Up to 5 points.
- Project implements best practices for design of the relevant project type as defined in the 2003 CDT "best practices" manual - Up to 5 points.

Programming Phase Scoring Criteria

Total Available Points: 100

Project Readiness: – Up to 50 Points

Promote projects that have completed steps in project development

- Environmental Phase (ENV) complete – 20 points

Partial credit will be given as follows:

Status	Points
Notice of Preparation	5
Administrative Draft	10
Circulation of Draft	15
Final Approval	20

- Right-of-Way (ROW) complete – 15 points

Partial credit will be given as follows:

Status	Points
Limits Identified	2
Legal description obtained	4
Appraisal/Preliminary discussions with owner	8
Offers	12
ROW acquired	15

- Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PSE) complete – 15 point
Partial credit will be given as follows:

Status	Points
35% complete or PSR	4
65% complete	8
95% complete	13
100% complete	15

Match: Up to 25 Points

Promotes projects that have exceeded minimum funding match

- Match consists of contributions made toward project phases that would have been eligible for grant funding. Project sponsor expenditures for grant preparations and pre-grant feasibility studies do not count as match.

Match to Total Project Cost	Points
50%+	25
40% - 49%	20
30%-39%	15
21% -29%	10
<20%	Ineligible

Planning Phase Score: Up to 25 Points

- Up to 30 points will be awarded based on the project's score in the planning phase as indicated below:

Planning Phase Score	Points
76-100	25
51-75	20
26-50	15
0-25	10

Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle Projects

Criteria	Rating	Description
A. Implementation	Very High- 6 points	Project has six of the following criteria: 1- Adopted Bike Plan and/or General/Specific Plan 2- Environmental Document Complete or Neg. Dec./Exemption Pending 3- Plans/Specs/Final Design Completed 4- BAC or Equivalent Endorsement 5- City Council/Board of Supervisors Approval 6- Local Match (when required)
	High- 5 points	Project has criteria #1, #2 and 2 of 3 through 6.
	Moderate High 4 points	Project has criteria #1, #2 and 1 of 3 through 6
	Moderate 3 points	Project has criteria #1, #4 and #5.
	Moderate Low 2 points	Project has criteria #1 and 1 of 2 through 6.
	Low 1 point	Project has criteria #1.
	Very low 0 points	Project has none of the six criteria.

Criteria	Rating	Description
B. Local Support/ Opposition	High- 4 points	Project has BAC endorsement and Board of Supervisors/City Council approval and high profile project with letters of support from several non-bike agencies/ organizations: e.g. schools, PTA, businesses, COC, homeowners, neighborhood groups, community organizations.
	Moderate High 3 points	Project has BAC endorsement or Board of Supervisors/City Council approval and letter(s) of support from one non-bike agency/ organization, or from individuals.
	Moderate 2 points	Project has BAC endorsement but no letters of support or opposition.
	Moderate Low 1 points	Project has BAC endorsement but no letters of support and organized opposition.
	Very low 0 points	There is organized opposition, and little or no demonstrated support.

Criteria	Rating	Description
C. Regional/ Countywide Mobility	Very High 6 points	Project is located on the Countywide Bicycle Network.
	High- 4 points	Project is a major commuter route or has other major regional significance, e.g. multi-modal, or is shown on the 1995 Trails Master Plan Update.
	Moderate High 3 points	Project is located on a CMP arterial and one of the following: directly links with a cross-county bike corridor or directly links with a bikeway shown on the 1995 Trails Master Plan Update.
	Moderate Low 2 points	Project is parallel to a CMP arterial, thus would serve bicyclists' demand for said corridor or directly links with a cross-county bike corridor
	Low 1 point	Project will result in a continuous route over seven miles long that connects with adjacent cities or counties, but is not on a cross-county bike corridor or CMP arterial.
	Very low 0 points	None of the above.

Criteria	Rating	Description
D. Gaps/ Missing Links	Very High- 6 points	Project closes gap in a route or otherwise eliminates circuitous travel; e.g. bike bridge or connecting path such as through a park.
	Moderate 4 points	Missing link or an extension of an on-street bikeway e.g. bike lanes on last section of arterial with otherwise continuous bike lanes.
	Very low 0 points	Does not close gap or provide a missing link.

Criteria	Rating	Description
E. Design (See Technical Guidelines)	High- 6 points	Project conforms to all pertinent VTA Technical Guidelines for both the specific facility as well as all roadways: Bike lane projects: Section D1.1; Bike routes: Section D1.2, D1.4, D1.5, D1.6 Bike Blvd: Section D.1.3 Signals: Section D5.2 Parking: Section P2.0 and P3.0 All projects D2.0, 3.0 and 4.0
	Moderate 3 points	Project conforms to all pertinent VTA Technical Guidelines, except one minor deviation, but still conforms to all HDM and AASHTO standards.

	Low 1 point	Project deviates from one or more VTA Technical Guidelines, but still conforms to all HDM and AASHTO standards.
	Very Low 0 point	Project deviates from HDM or AASHTO guidelines.

Criteria	Rating	Description
F. Safety/ Hazard Elimination/Risk Management	Very High- 6 points	Eliminate obstacles (e.g. spot improvement program to conform to TG Section D4.0) or improves problem areas (e.g. high accident location; conflict types described in TG Section D3.0).
	Moderate High- 4 points	Project reduces risk or exposure to vehicle conflicts: e.g. wide bike lanes or traffic signals to cross roadway with ADT > 20,000 or speeds >45mph.
	Moderate 3 points	Project on roadways with ADT between 10,000 – 20,000 or speeds between 35 to 45 mph.
	Moderate Low 2 points	Project on roadways with ADT between 4,000 - 10,000 or speeds between 25 to 35 mph.
	Low 1 point	Project on roadways with ADT less than 4,000, speeds of 25 mph or less.

Criteria	Rating	Description
G. Demand and Access	Very High 6 points	Project directly serves two or more high-use activity centers (e.g., schools, colleges with 300+ students or employment centers with 1000 + employees).
	High- 5 points	Project directly serves one high-use activity centers (e.g., schools, colleges with 300+ students or employment centers with 1000 + employees).
	Mod High- 4 points	Serves high-use attractors (e.g., 300+ students or employees) within 0.2 miles or directly serves medium-density attractors (500-1000 employees).
	Moderate 3 points	Serves neighborhood or strip commercial, and/or residential area.
	Moderate Low 2 points	Serves high-use attractors between 0.2 and 0.5 miles or serves medium use attractors within 0.2 miles.
	Low 1 point	Directly serves low density area or serves high-use attractors > 0.5 miles away.

Criteria	Rating	Description
H. Multi-Jurisdictional Coordination and Continuity	High- 4 points	Connects/involves three or more jurisdictions/agencies; and Project is included in at least two adopted plans; and sponsor has coordinated with other cities/agencies.
	Moderate High 3 points	Connects/involves two jurisdictions/agencies; and Sponsor has coordinated with other cities/agencies; and Project is included in at least one adopted plan.
	Moderate Low 2 points	Connects/involves two jurisdictions/agencies; and Sponsor has coordinated with any adopted plans.
	Low 0 point	Sponsor has not coordinated with other cities/agencies; and Project is not included in any adopted plans.

Criteria	Rating	Description
I. Attractiveness/Convenience	High- 4 points	Project increases attractiveness/convenience of cycling by: 1. Reducing the cyclists' travel time (see TG section D1.3, D5.2) (e.g., by implementing a new direct bikeway in a major corridor bike boulevard or traffic calming) <u>and</u> 2. Enhancing the travel experience by reducing cyclists' exposure to traffic noise, fumes and high speed traffic. See TG Section D6.0.
	Moderate High 3 points	Project increases convenience of cycling by: 1. Reducing the cyclists' travel time (see TG section D1.3, D5.2) <u>or</u> 2. Enhancing the travel experience by reducing cyclists' exposure to traffic noise, fumes and high speed traffic. See TG Section D6.0.
	Moderate Low 2 points	Project increases convenience of cycling by reducing exposure to traffic noise, fumes <u>or</u> high speed traffic. (See TG Section D6.0).
	Very low 0 points	None of the above

Criteria	Rating	Description
J. Social Equity	High- 4 points	Project will serve areas or activity centers with a large proportion of the population that does not have access to automobiles, e.g. poor, young and old.

	Moderate High 3 points	Project will serve junior high and/or high schools, (regardless of socio-economic neighborhood.)
	Moderate Low 2 points	Project will serve areas or activity centers with moderate proportion of the population that does not have access to automobiles e.g. poor, young and old.
	Very low 0 points	None of the above.

Expressway Program Criteria

Tier	Criteria
1A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At-grade improvements to mitigate existing LOS F intersections to E or better• Operational improvements to eliminate weaving, merging/diverging, and queuing problems, thus improving safety conditions• Signal operation improvements that improve traffic flow• Low-cost feasibility studies needed to answer critical questions about interchange reconfigurations that have a high level of local support
1B	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grade separation/interchange projects to mitigate existing LOS F intersections
1C	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improvements (both at-grade and grade separation/interchange projects) needed to mitigate the projected 2025 LOS F intersections• Longer term signal operational improvements
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All other expressway capacity improvement projects that can further facilitate traffic flow• Enhancements and upgrades to signal systems using new technologies that will become available over the next 30 years
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Major existing facility reconstruction and new facilities such as HOV direct connectors

Transit Project Prioritization Criteria

Potential Prioritization Criteria:

The following potential criteria could be used for defining the timing of individual transit projects. The use of criteria may vary from project to project and not all criteria are applicable for every project. Further description of each criterion is also provided.

Evaluation Criterion	Potential Weighting
Congestion Relief/Ridership	25
Customer/Operational Benefits	15
Land Use	15
Environmental Equity	10
Socio-Economic Equity	10
Geographic Equity	10
Program Efficiency/Project Readiness	10
Funding	5
TOTAL = 100	

Congestion Relief/Ridership (25 points)

- Congestion Relief – Peak trips removed from roadway system; also assesses travel-time savings and whether the project serves high commute and/or highly congested corridors.
- Ridership – Additional transit riders expected to be added to current ridership, typically expressed in number of new riders as well as total transit riders in the corridor. The existing transit market (number of current transit riders in the corridor) is also a consideration.

Customer/Operational Benefits (15 points)

- Customer service – Project enhances service for transit riders by addressing important needs in terms of the quantity and quality of transit service provided, including reliability, convenience, safety or comfort.
- System Connectivity – Project provides an important extension or connection to the transit system that increases accessibility to transit service.

Land Use (15 points)

- Transit-Supportive Land Use – Project provides opportunities to achieve VTP 2020 land use objectives. Assesses whether appropriate land use policies are currently in place along the corridor or whether there is a commitment to implement such land use policies to provide the necessary density, type and mix of land uses to support a high level of transit investment and promote “smart growth”. Addresses compatibility with existing land uses and availability of right-of-way to implement project. Also addresses future land uses and projected growth. A city’s overall history of supporting transit-oriented land uses is also a consideration.

Environmental Equity (10 points)

- Project does not result in disproportionate environmental impacts on particular areas or particular low-income or minority populations, including seniors and the disabled community, including factors such as traffic, air quality, aesthetics, etc. Cumulative impacts that result in a disproportionate burden on specific geographic areas should also be considered, for example, specific areas in which other private or public works development projects have already resulted or will in the future result in substantial environmental impacts.

Socio-Economic Equity (10 points)

- Project provides balance in terms of socio-economic factors and does not result in disproportionate social impacts on particular areas or particular low-income or minority populations, including seniors and the disabled community. Factors considered could include health, employment opportunities, community cohesion, and access to services.
- Provides transit access and mobility for the transit dependent. This could be measured by determining the number of low-income and/or zero-auto households served.

Geographic Equity (10 points)

- Project provides balance geographically in terms of investment in transit infrastructure.

Program Efficiency/Project Readiness (10 points)

- Program Efficiency – Inclusion of 2000 Measure A funded elements in other transit projects will lead to a cost-effective implementation of the 2000 Measure A project. As an example, early commitment of funds to fully expand operating facilities at one time may be more efficient than several expansion phases.
- State of Readiness – Project is well defined, has undergone planning studies (for example, a Major Investment Study [MIS] or similar effort that included technical analysis, public outreach, etc.) and is ready to proceed with environmental review, design & construction.

Funding (5 points)

- Commitment of Funding – Funds to carry out the project are reasonably assured. External funding is expected for projects requiring multiple funding sources. Funding commitments are in place for projects that involve a partnership with other agencies. The degree of local funding (for example, local contribution by a city or the County) committed to the project would also be an important factor.

VTP 2035 – TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS OPERATIONS & MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fund Countywide ITS operations, management and maintenance program |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Projects that improve traffic flow through improved signal operations for local roadways/expressways, freeways (ramp meters), transit (priority treatment at traffic signals) and bicycle traffic (bicycle detection and signal timing) are the first priority. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ITS Projects that emphasize integration and connecting of systems. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work with Cities and County to identify projects that meet above criteria. |