

**2019 Prop K Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Program Update  
Draft Project Prioritization Tables (As of August 31, 2018)  
Table of Contents**

<b>No.</b>	<b>EP No. <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Expenditure Plan Line Item/ Category</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1	1	Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/MUNI Metro Network	1
2	7	Caltrain Capital Improvement Program	2
3	8	BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity	3
4	9	Ferry	4
5	10 - 16	Transit Enhancements	5
6	17M	Vehicles - Muni	11
7	17P	Vehicles - Caltrain	12
	20B	Facilities - BART	13
10	20M	Facilities - Muni	14
11	20P	Facilities - Caltrain	15
12	20U	Facilities - Undesignated	16
13	22B	Guideways - BART	17
14	22M	Guideways - Muni	18
15	22P	Guideways - Caltrain	19
16	22U	Guideways - Undesignated	20
17	26 - 30	New and Upgraded Streets	21
18	31	New Signals & Signs	23
19	32	Advanced Technology and Information Systems (SFgo)	24
20	33	Signals & Signs	25
21	34 - 35	Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Maintenance/ Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment	26
22	37	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Maintenance	28
23	38	Traffic Calming	29
24	39	Bicycle Circulation/ Safety	30
25	40	Pedestrian Circulation/ Safety	31
26	41	Curb Ramps	32
27	42	Tree Planting and Maintenance	33
28	43	TDM/ Parking Management	34
29	44	Transportation/ Land Use Coordination	36

<sup>1</sup> EP stands for Expenditure Plan.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table**  
**Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/MTA-MUNI Metro Network (EP 1)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Named in Prop K Expenditure Plan				
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	5	5				20
<b>Transit Rapid Network - Bus Rapid Transit</b>									
Geary Boulevard Improvement (BRT Phase 2) (PS&E)	3	2	3	5	5				18
Geary Boulevard Improvement (BRT Phase 2) (CON)	3	2	3	5	5				18
Project									0
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	On Rapid Network	In TEP	Improves On-Time Performance	Improves Travel Time	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	1	1	2	2	20
<b>Transit Rapid Network - Transit Effectiveness and Performance Initiatives</b>									
Transit Stop Enhancement Program	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	14
Project									0
Project									0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
 Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Named in Prop K Expenditure Plan:** Projects in the Prop K BRT/TPS/Muni-Metro Expenditure Plan include Geary, Potrero, and Van Ness. If not included in Prop K BRT/TPS/Muni-Metro Expenditure Plan, project must be identified through an adopted plan (e.g. Bi-County Study, SFTP, TEP or successor effort).

**On Rapid Network:** Project is on designated Muni Rapid Network.

**In Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP):** Improvements are included in the Transit Effectiveness Project.

**Improves On-Time Performance:** Project improves transit service schedule adherence or the level of success of service in remaining on the published schedule.

**Improves Travel Time:** Projects results in trip time reduction.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Caltrain Capital Improvement Program (EP 7)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency					
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3					10
<b>Subcategory Name</b>								
Signal System and Communications System Rehabilitation Program								
Ticket Vending Machine Rehab								
Local Capital Match Placeholder	<b>Projects in this category are prioritized by a capital improvement program, which is negotiated by the three county-member Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.</b>							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g., minimize costs and construction impacts); to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation); or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity (EP 8)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations		
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3		20
Powell Station Modernization	4	3	3	3	3	3		19
BART Accessibility Improvement Program	4	3	2	4	3	1		17
BART Station Wayfinding	4	2	1	2	3	1		13

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations:** Project supports reliable and efficient transportation services to meet growing demand.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Ferry (EP 9)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	Rehabilitates Passenger-Serving Facility		
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	4	2	2		22
Downtown Ferry Terminal - Passenger Circulation Improvements	4	2	0	4	0	2	0		12
Downtown Ferry Terminal Float Rehabilitation	4	2	0	2	4	2	2		16
Gangway and Piers Project - Reconstruction	2	0	1	2	4	2	2		13

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g., minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (Two points for each): Project addresses documented safety issue and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project provides multi-modal benefits (e.g. safety improvements for pedestrians or people on bikes) in addition to improvements in ferry safety. Projects receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians or bicyclists.

**Rehabilitates Passenger-Serving Facility:** Project brings an existing passenger-serving facility to a state of good repair.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Extension of Trolleybus Lines/Motor Coach Conversion (EP 10)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	System Access Improvements		
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3		20
22 Fillmore - 16th Street Transit Priority	3	3	3	3	3	3		18
Project								0
Project								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**System Access Improvements:** Project improves customer access to transit (e.g. through network expansion, pedestrian access improvements, etc.) and/or reduce travel time.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Extension of Historic Streetcar Service to Fort Mason (EP 11)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging			
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	4			18
F Market + Wharves: Fort Mason Extension	3	3	2	3	1			12
								0
								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds. Per Prop K Expenditure Plan, non-Prop K funds will be provided by the National Park Service/Presidio Trust using Park funds.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Purchase and Rehab of Historic Light-Rail Vehicles (EP 12)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging			
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	4			18
Rehabilitate Historic & Milan Streetcars	4	1	2	3	4			14
								0
								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.



Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Balboa Park BART/MTA-MUNI Station Access (EP 13)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Prioritized by Balboa Park CAC		
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3		20
Balboa Park Plaza and Passenger Drop Off Improvements	3	3	3	4	3	3		19
Geneva/San Jose M-Line Terminal								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Prioritized by Balboa Park CAC:** 3 points for highest ranked project/tier of projects; 1 point for second highest ranked project/tier of projects.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table**  
**Relocation of Caltrain Paul Avenue Station to Oakdale Avenue (EP 14)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging			
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	4			18
Quint Street Jerrold Avenue Connector Road								0
								0
								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
 Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Other Transit Enhancements (EP 16)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Improves On-Time Performance	Improves Travel Time	Improves Customer Experience	Leveraging	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	2	2	1	2	21
Market St. / Balboa Park Elevator Master Plan	4	3	3	4	0	2	1	0	17
Geary Boulevard Improvement (BRT Phase 2)									0
Mobility as a Service Pilot									0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** One point for each: Project addresses demonstrated safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Improves On-Time Performance:** Project improves transit service schedule adherence or the level of success of service in remaining on the published schedule.

**Improves Travel Time:** Project results in trip time reduction.

**Improves Customer Experience:** Project includes elements that improve the customer experience (e.g. improved stop access, amenities such as shelters, real time travel information, etc.).

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Vehicles-Muni (EP-17M)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Need	Increases Capacity	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement (151 Replacement & 24 Expansion)	4	2	2	3	3	2	16
Rehabilitate Historic Streetcars (16 PCCs)							0
Rehabilitate Historic & Milan Streetcars							0
Replace 85 40-Foot Trolley Coaches							0
Replace 30 30-foot Hybrid Diesel Motor Coaches							0
Paratransit Van Replacement: Class B Vehicle (35)							0

#### Prioritization Criteria Definitions:

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Need:** Project replaces asset at at end of useful life.

**Increases Capacity:** Project increases passenger capacity or results in mid-life overhaul (e.g. replaces smaller vehicle with larger vehicle, reduces mean failure

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
New and Renovated Vehicles - PCJPB (EP 17P)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency					
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3					10
Revenue Vehicle Rehabilitation								
Local Capital Match Placeholder	Projects in this category are prioritized by a capital improvement program, which is negotiated by the three county-member Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g., minimize costs and construction impacts); to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation); or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Rehab/Upgrade Existing Facilities - BART (EP 20B)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations			
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3			20
Elevator Renovation Program	4	3	3	3	3	2			18

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations:** Project directly contributes to improved efficiency (e.g., level boarding, additional fare gates).

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Facilities - Muni, Undesignated (EPs 20M)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
Building Progress FIX (FCA Program) - Placeholder	Specific scopes will be scored when allocations from this placeholder are requested.						0
Muni Metro East Expansion	4	0	2	0	3	3	12
New Castro Station Elevator	4	2	0	0	3	2	11
Presidio Bus Lifts	4	0	0	4	1	3	12

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations:** Project directly contributes to improved efficiency (e.g. level boarding, additional fare gates).

Table 3. Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Facilities - PCJPB (EP 20P)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency					
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3					10
TVM Project	4	2	2					8
Local Capital Match Placeholder	Projects in this category are prioritized by a capital improvement program, which is negotiated by the three county-member Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g., minimize costs and construction impacts); to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation); or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.



**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Facilities - Muni, Undesignated (EPs 20U)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
Building Progress FIX (FCA Program) - Placeholder	Specific scopes will be scored when allocations from this placeholder are requested.						0
Potrero Facility Reconstruction	4	0	1	0	2	3	10

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Improves Efficiency of Transit Operations:** Project directly contributes to improved efficiency (e.g. level boarding, additional fare gates).

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
 Guideways BART (EP 22B)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Need	Leveraging			
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3			20
Traction Power Substation Replacement	4	3	3	2	3	3			18
									0
									0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
 Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Need:** Project replaces asset at at end of useful life.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Guideways - Muni (EP 22M)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Need	Leveraging	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
Overhead System Rehab/Replacement	4	2	3	4	3	2	18
Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program	4	2	3	4	3	3	19
Cable Car Infrastructure	4	2	2	4	3	2	17
L. Taraval: Transit & Streetscape Enhancements	4	2	3	4	3	3	19
Wayside/Central Train Control & Trolley Signal Systems Rehab	4	2	2	4	3	2	17

#### Prioritization Criteria Definitions:

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Need:** Project replaces asset at end of useful life.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

Table 3. Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
 Guideways - PCJPB (EP 22P)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency					
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3					10
Bridge/Structure Rehab								
Systemwide Track Rehabilitation Program								
Local Capital Match Placeholder	<b>Projects in this category are prioritized by a capital improvement program, which is negotiated by the three county-member Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.</b>							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g., minimize costs and construction impacts); to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation); or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Guideways - Undesignated (EP 22U)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Need	Leveraging	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
Caltrain Electrification (PCJPB)	4	3	3	0	0	3	13
Better Market Street (Central Subway OBAG2 exchange) (SFPW, SFMTA)	No prioritization scores needed for this project; this is part of a fund exchange approved by the Transportation Authority Board						0
							0

#### Prioritization Criteria Definitions:

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project improves safety for passengers, operators and/or employees. Projects that address a documented safety issue should score more highly.

**Need:** Project replaces asset at end of useful life.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
New and Upgraded Streets (EP 26-30)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
<b>EP 26- Great Highway Erosion Repair</b>							
Great Highway Terminus Narrowing	2	0	2	2	0	3	9
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Consistent with Bi-County Transportation Plan	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
<b>EP 27- Visitacion Valley Watershed</b>							
Bayshore Caltrain Station Upgrades	0	3	1	1	0	3	8
Bayshore Upgrades: Programmatic Placeholder	0	3	1	1	0	3	8
Southeast Muni Expansion, Harney-101 Transit Crossing (Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit)	0	3	1	2	0	3	9
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
<b>EP 30- Other Upgrades to Major Arterials</b>							
Sloat Skyline Intersection Improvements	3	2	2	4	1	3	15
<b>Prioritization Criteria Definitions:</b>							

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
 New and Upgraded Streets (EP 26-30)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue, reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project provides multi-modal benefits (e.g. safety improvements for people on bikes) in addition to improvements in motorist safety. Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and/or transit users.

**Consistent with Bi-County Transportation Plan:** Project is consistent with plan, including cost-sharing framework.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
New Signals and Signs (EP 31)

	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Benefits to Multiple Users	Supports Transit First	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
<b>New Traffic Signals</b>							
New Signal Contract 65	1	2	2	4	3	3	15
New Signal Contract 66	1	2	2	4	3	3	15

#### Prioritization Criteria Definitions:

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

#### Subcategories:

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses demonstrated safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and/or transit users.

**Supports Transit First:** Project improves transit service and reduces delay for transit vehicles at intersections controlled by traffic signals.



**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Advanced Technology and Information Systems (SFgo) (EP 32)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	Muni Rapid Network	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
Local Bus Transit Signal Priority	3	0	0	3	3	0	9
							0
							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** Project is located on a WalkFirst Safety Streets corridor (four points) or allows for a signal upgrade (e.g. pedestrian countdown signals) (two points).

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and/or transit users.

**Muni Rapid Network:** Project is located on the Muni Rapid Network.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Signals and Signs (EP 33)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Replaces Asset at End of Useful Life	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
<b>Follow-the-Paving</b>							
Traffic Signal Conduits	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details.						0
<b>Traffic Signal Upgrades</b>							
Traffic Signal Upgrade Contract 35	4	2	3	4	3	3	19
Traffic Signal Upgrade Contract 36	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details.						0
3rd Street Traffic Signal Detection Upgrade Phase 3	4	0	0	3	3	3	13
Western Addition Signal Upgrade	3	3	2	4	3	3	18
Great Highway Signal Upgrade	3	1	0	4	3	3	14
Traffic Signal Visibility Upgrades	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details.						0
Traffic Signal Hardware							0
Traffic Sign Upgrades							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses demonstrated safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Replaces Asset at End of Useful Life:** Project replaces equipment that has reached the end of useful life per industry-accepted levels.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and/or transit users.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Maintenance (EP 34)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Pavement Condition Index (PCI) Score	Multi-Modal Routes	Equitable Distribution	Functional Classification	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	4	2	1	2	22
<b>Street Resurfacing</b>									
23rd St, Dolores St, York St, and Hampshire St Pavement Renovation	3	0	2	2	4	2	1	2	16
Golden Gate Ave and Laguna St Pavement Renovation	2	0	1	3	4	2	1	1	14
Sunset Blvd Pavement Renovation	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	1	13
McAllister St, 20th St, and 24th St Pavement Renovation	1	0	1	3	4	2	1	1	13
Claremont, Juanita, and Yerba Buena Pavement Renovation	1	0	1	3	4	2	1	1	13
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Need	Mandates	Cost Effectiveness		Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3	2	2		20
<b>Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment</b>									
Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment	4	0	3	2	3	2	2		16

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Street Resurfacing Category:**

**Safety:** Project receives three points if it is on the 2017 Vision Zero High Injury Network.

**Pavement Condition Index (PCI) Score:** The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) scores are used to identify and categorize the streets based on the maintenance requirements of the streets. The streets are categorized as requiring pavement preservation (PCI 60-80), resurfacing (PCI 50-60), or paving with base repair/reconstruction (PCI 0-50). Project receives 4 points if it has a PCI score of 60 or below. Public Works determines the amount of pavement preservation work based on the percentage recommended by the Pavement Management and Mapping System (PMMS).

**Multi-modal Routes:** Streets in the project can be used as transit routes, bicycle routes, vehicular routes and/or any combination of these routes. Project receives 2 points if street is a bicycle and transit route and 1 point if street is either a bicycle or transit route.

**Equitable Distribution Across the City:** Geographic equity is monitored to ensure that resurfacing projects are distributed to all neighborhoods and commercial districts in the City. Public Works uses StatMap, which shows planned paving projects on a rolling 5-year period, to identify gaps where paving projects are needed. The project will get 1 point if the project is located in a gap as identified by StatMap.

**Functional Classification:** Streets classified as arterials or collectors get higher priority over local streets with similar PCIs, because the former classifications are most heavily used. Project receives 2 points if the street is an arterial and 1 points if collector.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
 Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Maintenance (EP 34)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Pavement Condition Index (PCI) Score	Multi-Modal Routes	Equitable Distribution	Functional Classification	
<b>Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment Category:</b>									

**Safety:** Project receives one point if it reduces harmful air pollution, one point if it improves or mitigates a documented unsafe condition for residents and one point if it improves or mitigates a documented unsafe condition for employees.

**Need:** Equipment has reached the end of useful life per industry-accepted levels (i.e. replacing sweepers every 5 to 7 years, packer trucks every 10 years and front end loaders and Street Flusher trucks every 8 years).

**Mandates:** Equipment is needed per department projects and programs (e.g. Sheriff's Work Alternative Program, which required DPW to replace its 10-passenger vans in order to carry participants to and from their cleaning worksites) or equipment is needed to comply with external regulations (e.g. alternative fuel vehicles are required by federal, state or local regulations but they cost up to 70 percent more than a non-clean air version of the vehicle).

**Cost Effectiveness:** New item will minimize maintenance costs compared to item being replaced.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Pedestrian Bicycle Facility Maintenance (EP 37)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency						
Public Sidewalk and Curb Repair	Locations are determined by DPW inspection and public input. See text for details.								
Bicycle Facility Maintenance	Locations are prioritized by inspection and public input. See text for details.								

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Traffic Calming (EP 38)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	High Injury Corridor	Leveraging	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	20
<b>Local/Neighborhood Program</b>								
Application-Based Local Streets Traffic Calming Program	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
Proactive Local Traffic Calming Program	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
Speed Radar Sign Installation Program	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
<b>Schools Program</b>								
Operational Traffic Safety Improvements Around Schools	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
<b>Corridor Improvements</b>								
6th Street Pedestrian Safety Project	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	14
Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
Excelsior Neighborhood Traffic Calming	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
Sloat Skyline Intersection Improvements	0	3	1	3	2	2	1	12
Safer Taylor Street	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	18
<b>Follow-the-Paving</b>								
Project								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
 Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project reduces vehicle speeds; addresses documented safety issue; and reduces potential conflicts between modes.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and/or transit users.

**High Injury Corridor:** Project is located on the 2017 Vision Zero High Injury Network.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Bicycle Circulation and Safety (EP 39)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	Focus on Community of Concern	Leveraging	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	20
<b>Bicycle Safety, Education and Outreach</b>								
Bike To Work Day	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	6
TDM: Bicycle Outreach and Education	4	2	0	2	0	2	0	10
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	High Injury Corridor	Leveraging	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	20
<b>System Evaluation and Innovation</b>								
Project								0
<b>Bicycle Network Expansion and Upgrades</b>								
Beale Street Bikeway	3	2	1	2	3	0	1	12
Cesar Chavez/Bayshore/Potrero Intersection Improvements (Hairball) Ph	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	19
Grove Street/Civic Center Improvements	2	3	0	2	3	2	1	13
Ocean Avenue Safety Improvements	1	3	0	2	3	2	2	13
Page Street Neighborway (Webster to Stanyan)	1	2	0	2	3	1	1	10
The Embarcadero Southbound Bike Lane Spot Improvements	3	2	0	2	3	2	2	14
Valencia Bikeway Improvements	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	15
Program: Citywide Neighborway Design and Implementation	This is a placeholder. Project sponsor to score when a specific scope is identified.							
<b>Bike Parking and Transit Access</b>								
Short-term Bike Parking	4	2	1	1	1	0	1	10
Caltrain Wayside Bike Parking Improvements	4	2	1	2	1	0	1	11

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; and increases security.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of pedestrians, motorists and/or transit users.

**Focus on Community of Concern:** Project includes specific focus to target traditionally underrepresented groups in bicycling and communities of concern (e.g. multi-lingual materials/classes).

**High Injury Corridor:** Project is located on the 2017 Vision Zero High Injury Network.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Pedestrian Circulation/Safety (EP 40)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Provides Benefits to Multiple Users	High Injury Corridor	Leveraging	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	20
<b>Corridor Projects</b>								
6th Street Pedestrian Safety Project	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	17
Cesar Chavez/Bayshore/Potrero Intersection Improvements (Hairball) Phase 2	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	19
Grove Street/Civic Center Improvements	2	3	0	2	3	2	1	13
Folsom-Howard Streetscape	3	3	0	3	3	2	2	16
Lake Merced Pedestrian Safety	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	9
Leavenworth Livable Street	1	3	0	3	2	2	2	13
Mission Street Excelsior Safety Project	3	2	0	3	3	2	2	15
Monterey Street Safety Improvements	1	0	0	2	3	2	2	10
Ocean Avenue Safety Improvements	1	3	0	2	3	2	2	13
The Embarcadero at Pier 27 / Cruise Ship Terminal - Complete Street Improvements	3	2	0	2	3	2	2	14
Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan Near Term Implementation	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details							
Project								0
<b>Follow-the-Paving</b>								
<b>Citywide Pedestrian Safety and Circulation Improvements</b>								
Project								0
<b>Prioritization Criteria Definitions:</b>								

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Safety:** (One point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; and increases security.

**High Injury Corridor:** Project is located on the 2017 Vision Zero High Injury Network.

**Provides Benefits to Multiple Users:** Project receives one point each for addressing the needs of bicyclists, motorists and/or transit users.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.



Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Curb Ramps (EP 41)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency						
Curb Ramps	Locations are determined by inspections and requests from the public.								

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Tree Planting and Maintenance (EP 42)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA					Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency						
Tree Planting and Establishment	Locations are determined by inspections and requests from the public. See text for more details.								

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
 Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table**  
**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)**

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Vehicular Trip Reduction	Cost Effectiveness	Leveraging	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	24
<b>Citywide TDM</b>								
TDM: Bicycle One Stop Resource	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	24
TDM: Evaluation	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9
TDM for Tourists	4	3	3	3	2	2	3	20
Commuter Benefits Ordinance Update								0
Mobility as a Service Pilot	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	23
Curb Management Strategy								0
Comprehensive TDM (Residential)	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details.							0
Comprehensive TDM (Business)								0
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Vehicular Trip Reduction	Cost Effectiveness	Leveraging	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	24
<b>Demand and Pricing Management</b>								
Pricing and Incentives	2	1	0	3	4	4	3	17
TSP Evaluation Tool	4	1	1	3	2	4	3	18
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging			Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3			16
<b>Modal Plans</b>								
AV Shuttles Pilot	3	3	3	3	3			15
ConnectSF Modal Study Follow On	3	3	2	3	2			13
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Leveraging	Benefits COC		Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3		20
<b>Communities of Concern Access</b>								
								0
								0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA				Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Vehicular Trip Reduction	Cost Effectiveness	Leveraging	

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
 Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
 Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
 One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Leveraging:** Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

**All categories except Communities of Concern Access:**

**Safety:** (1 point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes.

**Vehicular Trip Reduction:** Project leads to reduction in number of single-occupancy vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.

0-2 points for number of SOV trips and/or miles reduced;

1 point for peak trip reduction;

1 point for long-term viability (benefits of program continue after program completion);

**Cost Effectiveness:** Cost effectiveness can be demonstrated by status as RTP high-performer, cost per single-occupancy vehicle trip reduced, or cost-effectively increasing person throughput.

**Communities of Concern Access:**

**Safety:** (1 point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

**Benefits to Communities of Concern (CoC):** Project supports improved access and/or mobility for San Francisco’s low-income populations or CoCs, as defined by MTC.

Full points for projects that provide broad geographic benefits and/or significantly improve access in a CoC, partial points for projects that provide benefits with limited geographic distribution and/or moderate access improvements in a CoC.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
Transportation/Land Use Coordination (EP 44)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Limited Local Match Options	Benefits Community of Concern	
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	4	3	3	20
<b>One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) / Housing Incentive Program (HIP) Match</b>							
OBAG Local Match (Cycle 3)	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Forms for more						0
Housing Incentive Pool Match							0
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Limited Local Match Options	Benefits Community of Concern	Total
<i>Total Possible Score</i>	4	3	3	3	3	3	19
<b>Neighborhood Transportation Planning/Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning</b>							
NTIP Pre-Development Program/Program Support							0
NTIP Planning	Locations will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Forms for more details.						0
Planning Grant Match (e.g. Caltrans Planning Grants)							
Priority Development Area Planning Match							0

**Prioritization Criteria Definitions:**

**Project Readiness:** Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay

**Community Support:** Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.  
Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.  
Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.  
One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

**Time Sensitive Urgency:** Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

**Limited Local Match Options:** Project has no or limited other options (including other Prop K categories and non-Prop K funds) to provide match to an external grant.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table  
 Transportation/Land Use Coordination (EP 44)

	PROP K PROGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA			CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA			Total
	Project Readiness	Community Support	Time Sensitive Urgency	Safety	Limited Local Match Options	Benefits Community of Concern	

**Benefits a Community of Concern (CoC):** Project is located within a CoC as defined by MTC (one point); will directly benefit the identified needs of a CoC (two points) **or** will generally benefit the needs of a CoC (one point).

**One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) / Housing Incentive Program (HIP) Match**

**Safety:** One point for each: Project addresses demonstrated safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases

**Neighborhood Transportation Planning/Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning**

**Safety:** One point for each: Project addresses demonstrated safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes.