

# VTA OBAG 4 Criteria Proposal

Scoring Criterion	Max Points
<b>Needs and Benefits</b>	<b>30</b>
Safety	5
Gap Closure	5
Multimodal Benefits	5
Range and number of users	5
Improve access to key community amenities	5
Other project benefits	5
<b>Local Priorities</b>	<b>10</b>
Prior planning efforts	5
Demonstrated community support	5
<b>Equity Impacts</b>	<b>20</b>
EPCs & other vulnerable communities	15
MTC Growth Geographies	5
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>15</b>
Projects with limited other funding options	5
Local match	5
Project readiness	5
<b>CTA Total</b>	<b>75</b>



# Draft Criteria – Needs and Benefits (30 pts)

Scoring Criterion	Scoring Details
<p><b>Safety</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p><b>0-1:</b> Project will generally improve safety issues. Project has potential to reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists / pedestrians  <b>2-3:</b> Project will improve a situation with safety issues (e.g. conflicts or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed)  <b>4-5:</b> Address a demonstrated safety issue (e.g. multiple collisions/ fatalities/ injuries on a regular basis) with a proven/demonstrated countermeasure</p>
<p><b>Gap closure &amp; connectivity</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>Project proposes a shorter route, completes sidewalks, closes gaps in a transportation facility and/or multimodal network.</p>
<p><b>Multimodal benefits</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>Project will encourage more people to use pedestrian, bicycling, rolling, or transit.</p>
<p><b>Range and number of users</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>Project will serve a wide range and number of users (e.g. all ages and abilities, gender, mode share)</p>
<p><b>Improve access to key community amenities</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>Project is located near or serves key facilities (i.e. affordable housing, senior facilities, assisted living, schools, health care facilities, and community centers)</p>
<p><b>Other project benefits</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>Any other points assigned for overall project benefits and benefits not covered by other criteria (i.e. emission reduction, resilience, stormwater management, state of good repair, etc.)</p>



# Draft Criteria – Local Priorities (10 pts)

Scoring Criterion	Scoring Details
<b>Prior planning efforts</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i>	Project aligns with previous planning efforts (i.e. Community-Based Transportation Plans, Participatory Budgeting process, PDA plans, other local planning or project prioritization processes)
<b>Demonstrated community support</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i>	<u>5 points</u> : Project is endorsed by community-based organizations or other groups  <u>3 points</u> : Project has received public outreach responses specific to this project (i.e. public community, feedback from community workshops, survey responses, or direct communication with member agency’s point of contact)



# Draft Criteria – Equity Impacts (20 pts)

Scoring Criterion	Scoring Details
<p><b>Equity Priority Communities &amp; other vulnerable communities</b> <i>(up to 15 pts)</i></p>	<p><i>Projects can earn points in four different ways, which do not add up. The highest score of the four is used.</i></p> <p><b>A) <u>15 points</u></b> if project is within MTC EPC</p> <p><b>B) <u>12 points</u></b> if project is within USDOT Transportation Disadvantaged Communities or AB1550/SB535 Community</p> <p><b>C) <u>Up to 12 points</u></b> based on CalEnviroScreen4.0 score of project location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 12 points for &gt;90-100 score</li> <li>- 10 points for &gt;80-90</li> <li>- 8 points for &gt;70-80</li> <li>- 6 points for &gt;60-70</li> <li>- 4 points for &gt;50-60</li> <li>- 2 point for &gt;40-50</li> </ul> <p><b>D) <u>Up to 8 points</u></b> - self describe vulnerable communities* served by this project: _____</p> <p><small>Vulnerable communities include persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), persons with disabilities, persons of color, low-income persons, youth, and other underserved persons.</small></p>
<p><b>MTC Growth Geographies</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>5 points if within the Growth Geography 2 points if serves the Growth Geography</p>



# Draft Criteria – Other Criteria (15 pts)

Scoring Criterion	Scoring Details
<p><b>Projects with limited other funding options</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>Ineligible for other fund sources or eligible for very few sources                      Competes poorly for other discretionary fund sources ____ (explain)                      Other ____ (explain)</p>
<p><b>Local match</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p>1 point for each 2% local match exceeding 11.47% minimum local match requirement, with a maximum of 5 points at 21.47%</p>
<p><b>Project readiness</b> <i>(up to 5 pts)</i></p>	<p><u>Categorical Exclusion (CE) projects</u>                      +2.5 points 95% Design Complete                      +2.5 points ROW Complete</p> <p><u>Non-CE projects</u>                      +2 points NEPA Clearance Complete                      +1.5 points 95% Design Complete                      +1.5 points ROW Complete                      Note: documentation will be required for completed phases</p>



<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Milestone</b>
<b>November – December 2025</b>	Conducted individual meetings with Member Agencies and internal stakeholders
<b>January – March 2026</b>	Ongoing discussions at CIPWG meetings
<b>March 2026</b>	TAC and BPAC discussion item
<b>April 2026</b>	Committee action item
<b>May 2026</b>	Board approval and release of Call for Projects
<b>October 2026</b>	Board approval of Prioritized List of Projects
<b>October 31st, 2026</b>	MTC deadline for CTA submission of project nomination list



# Discussion

- Which criterion do you support including?
- How should points be allocated across the criteria?
- Which criterion(s) should have higher or lower points?
- How should each criterion be scored?
- Any other feedback regarding the proposal?

Please submit feedback **by March 18th.**