

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
ALAMEDA COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
448 (2)	AC Transit BRT and Enhanced Bus: Shattuck/Alameda BRT; MacArthur Blvd BRT (Bayfair - Emeryville; MacArthur Ave to Oakland Airport; College/University Aves; Sacramento/Market Sts; Mission/Outer E 14th / Public: Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Eastshore South	\$330.0	H ††	H					H		H	Would require Big Tent revenue
92	Alameda County I-580 Ramp Metering and TOS Project / Caltrans	Tri-Valley	\$11.6	H ††			M			H		M	Overlap with #70 ?
94	Alameda County I-80 Ramp Metering/Fiber Optic Communications Project / Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$6.6	H ††			M			H		M	
95	Alameda County I-880 Fiber Optic Cable and CCTV and SR24 TOS Project / Caltrans	Eastshore South	\$19.8	H ††			M			M/H		M	
70	I-580 Corridor Ramp Metering: I- 238 - I-205 / Caltrans	Tri-Valley	\$20.2	H ††			M			L		M	Overlap with #92?
90	Alameda County West I-580 Ramp Metering and TOS: I-238 - Contra Costa County Line / Caltrans	Tri-Valley	\$11.2	H ††			M					M	
54 (1)	I-680 Southbound HOV Lane - Final Phase (auxiliary lanes and ramp metering) / Caltrans	Sunol Gateway	\$50.0	H ††								H	
93	Alameda County I-680 Sunol Grade TOS Project / Caltrans	Sunol Gateway	\$6.1	H ††								M	
64	I-680 SMART Carpool Lane Demonstration Project / Alameda County CMA	Sunol Gateway	\$7.0	H ††									
36 (3)	I-238/I-580 Truck Bypass Lane / Caltrans	Tri-Valley	\$120.4	H		H	M					M/H	
45 (1) (3)	I-880 Broadway/Jackson Interchange Improvements Phase 1 / Caltrans	Eastshore South	\$28.5	H		M/L	M						
60	Clawiter-Whitesell Interchange Hayward	Eastshore South	\$39.7	H		L							
76	I-880 Fifth Avenue Ramp Reconfiguration Project Oakland	Eastshore South	\$10.2	M ††		L	M					H (Seismic)	
39 (3)	I-580 Eastbound Truck Climbing Lane over AltamontPass / Caltrans	Interregional Gateways	\$65.0	M			M					M/H	
41 (3)	I-580 Westbound Truck Climbing Lane Lane (Ultimate Bypass Lane) / Caltrans	Interregional Gateways	\$105.3	M			M					M/H	
New Capacity													
53 (1)	I-680 HOV NB Lane: SR 237 - SR 84 (includes ramp metering and auxiliary lanes) / Caltrans	Sunol Gateway	\$150.0	H ††	H	H						H H (Seismic)	
452 (2)	East Bay Light Rail: on San Pablo Ave and University Ave / Public: SPARC (San Pablo Avenue Rail Coalition)	Eastshore North	\$852.5		H	M/H		M/H	H			M	Would require Big Tent revenue

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
M/H Medium High
M Medium
M/L Medium Low
L Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
ALAMEDA COUNTY (CONTINUED)													
New Capacity													
449 (2)	East Bay Streetcar Corridors: "high quality transit service" linking employment centers in Oakland, Emeryville, Berkeley not close to BART / Public: www.publictransit.us	Eastshore North	\$925.0		H	M		M/H	H		M		Would require Big Tent revenue
451 (2)	Telegraph Avenue LRT: UC Berkeley to Jack London Square / Public: individual	Eastshore North	\$890.0		H	M		M/H	H		M		Would require Big Tent revenue
78 (1)	State Route 260/Posey Tube-I-880 Connector Project / Oakland	Eastshore South	\$35.6	H	H	M/L			L	M/H			
40 (1)	Widen I-580 for HOV lanes from west of Tassajara Rd. in Pleaston to east of Vasco Rd. in Livermore / Caltrans	Tri-Valley	\$211.1	H	H		M				M		
63	Route 238 Corridor Improvement Project: Widening Foothill/Mission between I-580 and Harder Rd. / Hayward	Eastshore South	\$152.5	H	H	M							
43	Widen/Upgrade SR-84 to 4-lane expressway / Caltrans	Sunol Gateway	\$200.0		H								
482 (2)	Enhanced AC Transit Transbay service / Public: individual	Transbay	\$125.0	M/H	M/H						H		Would require Big Tent revenue
35	Extend HOV lanes on I-580: SR 24/I-580 interchange to I-80/I-580 interchange / Caltrans	Transbay	\$152.5	M	M						H		
Access and Connectivity													
42	HOV Lanes on I-680 in both directions: SR 84 to Alcosta / Caltrans	Sunol Gateway	\$180.0	H	H	H					M	H	(Seismic)
109 (1)	Union City Intermodal Station, Phase 2 Passenger Rail Project / Union City	Fremont-South Bay	\$101.7			H	M	M	M	Yes	H	M	(Noise)
529 (1)	Dumbarton Rail Corridor / San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Transbay	\$277.6 †		M	H		M/H	M		M		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
509 (3)	I - 680/I - 880 Cross Connector Project / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Fremont-South Bay	\$400.0 †	M/H ††	M/H	H				Yes			Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
37	WB I-238 HOV lane to SB I-880: HOV bypass connector / Caltrans	Tri-Valley	\$71.2	M		H	M						
1	I-880 HOV lanes: NB lane from Hacienda Blvd. overcrossing to 98th & SB lane from 98th to Marina / Caltrans	Eastshore South	\$101.7	H	H	H	M				H		
68	I-580/Route 84 (Isabel Avenue) Interchange Phase 2 Livermore	Tri-Valley	\$28.5	H	H	M/H	M						
62	Irvington BART Station / Fremont	Fremont-South Bay	\$77.3			M/H		M/H			M		
44	Widen/Upgrade SR-84 - HOV bypass on SR-84/I-680 connector only / Caltrans	Sunol Gateway	\$50.0	H		M							
29	I-580 Interchange Improvements in Castro Valley Alameda County	Tri-Valley	\$31.1	H		L	M						
61 (1)	Emeryville Intermodal Transit Center/Parking Garage/Transit Village Emeryville	Eastshore North	\$30.5			L					M		

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
M/H Medium High
M Medium
M/L Medium Low
L Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions, 2004\$) [†]	Efficient Operations ^{††} Reliability	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality	Other	Notes
ALAMEDA COUNTY (CONTINUED)													
Port/Airport Access													
86 (1) (3)	Joint Intermodal Terminal (JIT) Expansion / Port of Oakland	Eastshore South	\$76.3		Yes		H						The adopted measures for capacity and operations do not apply well for this project. A Yes/No approach was used.
510 (3)	Railroad Corridor Improvements in Alameda and Contra Costa County / Port of Oakland	Eastshore North	\$100.0 [†]	M ^{††}	M		M						Forecasts suggest I-80 from Richmond to I-880 and I-880 to Port of Oakland are not highly congested. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
Community Vitality/Smart Growth													
104	Fruitvale Transit Village and Streetscape Enhancement Project /Unity Council sponsored by City of Oakland	Eastshore South	\$46.1			H		M/H	M	Yes	H		
56	Ashby BART Station - Ed Roberts Campus (east)/ Transit Village (west)/Station Capacity Improvements / Berkeley	Eastshore North	\$46.0			H		M/H	H		H		Access could be considered another main objective.
107	Coliseum BART Station Intermodal Transit Oriented Development (including replacement parking) / Oakland	Eastshore South	\$43.0			H		M/H	H		H		
77 (1)	MacArthur BART Station Intermodal Transit Village / Oakland	Eastshore North	\$30.5			H		M/H	M		H		
79	West Oakland BART Station Transit Village / Oakland	Eastshore South	\$30.0			H		M/H	M		H		
98 (1)	San Leandro BART Station Transit Village / San Leandro	Eastshore South	\$29.0			H		M/H	M		H		
Equity													
508	Regional Lifeline Transit Priorities (AC Transit) / AC Transit	Regional	\$614.1 [†]			H			H		M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Project would be candidate for Lifeline mobility program funding. Cost reflects capital (\$4.1 million) plus 25-years of net operating (\$24.4 million annually). Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
108	Lifeline Transportation for the Tri-Valley (Route 10) / Livermore Amador Valley Transit (LAVTA)	Tri-Valley	\$41.3 [†]			H			H		M		Project would be candidate for Lifeline mobility program funding. Cost reflects capital (\$3.8 million) plus 25-years of net operating (1.5 million annually).
Seismic Safety/Emergency Response													
9	Fruitvale Avenue Bridge Lifeline Retrofit Project (roadway and rail bridge) / Alameda County	Eastshore South	\$30.5								H (Seismic)		
51	Webster & Posey Tubes Lifeline Seismic Retrofit / Alameda	Eastshore South	\$508.5								M (Seismic)		Would require Big Tent revenue.

NOTES
 (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
 (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
 (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.
[†] See notes for more information on cost.
^{††} Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

^{†††} Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).
^{††††} Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
 M/H Medium High
 M Medium
 M/L Medium Low
 L Low

Yes Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions, 2004\$) [†]	Efficient Operations ^{††} Reliability	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality	Other	Notes
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
143	BART Contra Costa County Track Crossovers / BART	Transbay	\$50.8	H ^{††}							L	M	
375	Contra Costa County SR 24 and I-680 TOS and Fiber Optic Cable Project / Caltrans	Diablo	\$15.8	H ^{††}								M	
358	I-80/SR-4 Interchange Improvements / Contra Costa County Transportation Authority	Delta	\$142.4	M/H		L	M						Projected interchange volumes are relatively low; however, forecasts show congestion on the ramps.
376	Contra Costa County SR 4 Ramp Meter, TOS and Fiber Optic Cable Project / Caltrans	Delta	\$19.3	M/L ^{††}						M/H	M		
378	Contra Costa County I-80 and I-580 TOS and Fiber Optic Cable Project / Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$13.7	M/L ^{††}			M			H	M		
New Capacity													
369	SR4 South Parallel Arterial - Antioch: Widen and extend Buchanan and widen Tregallas / Antioch	Delta	\$32.0	H	H	M							
391 (1)	SR-4 (e) Widening/HOV lanes, Somersville to SR-160 / Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Delta	\$259.0	M/H	M/H	M				M		Yes (Noise)	
400	State Route 239 (Brentwood - Tracy Expressway) / Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Delta	\$145.0		M/H								
516	Capitol Corridor Regional Rail Service (West Contra Costa and Solano counties) / AMTRAK	Eastshore North	\$122.0 [†]	H	M	M	H	M/H	M		M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
115	Antioch/Pittsburg to Martinez to San Francisco Ferry Service / Water Transit Authority	Transbay	\$59.1		M	M			M		M	M (Seismic)	Would require Big Tent revenue.
141 (1)	eBART (State Route 4 East Rail Transit Project) / BART	Delta	\$390.6		M	M/L		M/H			H		Would require Big Tent revenue.
356	I-80 Eastbound HOV lane from Willow Avenue to Crockett / Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$50.8	M	M		M				H		Forecasts show that I-80 on this segment is not highly congested; however, this may not reflect congestion associated with back up at the toll plaza.
119	Hercules to San Francisco Ferry Service / Water Transit Authority	Transbay	\$35.1		M	M/H					M	M (Seismic)	Would require Big Tent revenue.
396 (1)	State Route 4 Bypass - Phase II: Lone Tree Way to Balfour Rd upgrad to freeway includes interchanges / State Route 4 Bypass Authority	Delta	\$130.0		M	H							
399	State Route 4 Widening - Marsh Creek Road to San Joaquin County line / Contra Costa County	Delta	\$65.1		M	M/H							
Access and Connectivity													
351	I-680 NB HOV Gap Closure Between N. Main and SR242 / Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Diablo	\$43.5	H	H	H					H		
332	BART parking Structure and Access Improvements at Eastshore Blvd and San Pablo Avenue (Transit Village concept) / El Cerrito	Eastshore North	\$25.4			H		M			M		

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

[†] See notes for more information on cost.

^{††} Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

^{†††} Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

^{††††} Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
M/H Medium High
M Medium
M/L Medium Low
L Low

Yes
 Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions, 2004\$) [†]	Efficient Operations ^{††} Reliability	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality	Other	Notes
Access and Connectivity													
352	I-680/Norris Canyon Rd HOV Direct Ramps in San Ramon / Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Diablo	\$45.7				H				M		
349 (1)	I-680/SR 4 Interchange Improvements (Phase 1 & 2) / Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Diablo	\$116.0	M/H	M/H	M				M/L			
350	I-680/SR 4 Interchange Improvements (Phases 3-5) / Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Diablo	\$111.9	M	M	M							
Port/Airport Access													
88 (3)	Railroad Corridor Improvements in Alameda and Contra Costa County / Port of Oakland	Eastshore North	\$100.0 [†]	M ^{††}	M		M						Forecasts suggest I-80 from Richmond to I-880 and I-880 to Port of Oakland are not highly congested. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
Equity													
4	Regional Lifeline Transit Priorities (AC Transit) / AC Transit	Regional	\$614.1 [†]			H			H		M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Project would be candidate for Lifeline mobility program funding. Cost reflects capital (\$4.1 million) plus 25-years of net operating (\$24.4 million annually).

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS



 High Medium High Medium Medium Low Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
MARIN COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
483 (2)	Santa Rosa - S.F. BRT / Public: individual	Golden Gate	\$5.0	H ††	M/H						M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; Marin County share would be smaller.
160	Marin County South Route 101 and I-580 Ramp Meter, TOS, Fiber Optic Cable Project / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$10.1	H ††						M/L	M		
458 (2)	Sir Francis Drake Blvd./Red Hill/2nd & 3rd St. Arterial HOV Demonstration Project with enhanced bus service / Public: TRANSDEF	Golden Gate	\$0.8	H ††	M/L						M		Would require Big Tent revenue for operations.
159	Marin County North Route 101 Ramp Meter, TOS, Fiber Optic Cable Project / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$8.1	H ††							M		
437	MRN-101 NB Auxiliary lane at Nave Dr. / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$20.3	H									Would require Big Tent revenue.
444 (1)	HOV connector from WB I-580 to NB US 101 / Caltrans	Transbay	\$101.7	M		M/L				H	H		Medium rating for operations May not reflect localized operational issues such as queues due to merging.
436	MRN-101 SB Auxiliary lane at Lincoln to Mission / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$20.0	L							M/L		Forecast for this location does not show high level of congestion; however this may not reflect operational issues or localized backups that could be mitigated with an auxiliary lane.
New Capacity													
517 (1)	Widen US 101 (add HOV lane in each direction): Rte 37 to Old Redwood Hwy / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$368.8 †	H	H	H					H		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
513	SMART Commuter Rail (includes Bicycle Path) / Sonoma/Marin Area Rail Transit District (SMART)	Golden Gate	\$210.6 †		M/H	M/H					M	H (Noise)	Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
Access and Connectivity													
150 (1)	Hwy 101 Corridor from SFD Interchange to Tamalpais Interchange / Marin Congestion Management Agency	Golden Gate	\$61.0	M		H				Yes			
163 (1)	Construct New WB I-580 to SB US 101 Freeway Connector / Caltrans	Transbay	\$101.7		M/H	H							Would require Big Tent revenue.
459 (2)	Southern Marin Streetcar / Public: individual	Golden Gate	\$600.0		L	M/L		M			M		Would require Big Tent revenue.

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS





Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality††† Other††††	Notes
NAPA COUNTY												
New Capacity												
214	Widen SR 29 from SR 12 to Solano County line to six lanes / Napa County Transportation Authority	Napa Valley Subarea	\$30.0		M/H							
Access and Connectivity												
222 (1)	SR 12/29/Airport Interchange / Napa County Transportation Authority	North Bay East-West	\$49.1	H		M/H				M		Forecast number of vehicles at this interchange projected to be low on regional scale, but may still be significant for Napa County. Intersection area forecasted to be congested.
212	Connect Flosden Road to SR 12 / Napa County Transportation Authority	Napa Valley Subarea	\$30.0		M	M						
Safety												
209 (1)	SR12/29/121 (Carneros) Construct Interchange Napa County Transportation Authority	North Bay East-West	\$28.0	M/H		M/L				H		Forecast number of vehicles at this interchange projected to be low on regional scale, but may still be significant for Napa County. Intersection area forecasted to be congested.

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
 M/H Medium High
 M Medium
 M/L Medium Low
 L Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
427	Potrero Bus Rapid Transit / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$60.0	H ††	H				H		M	H (Noise)	Would require Big Tent revenue.
413	Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$141.1	H ††	H						M		
4	19th Avenue Bus Rapid Transit / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$25.9	H ††	H						M		Would require Big Tent revenue.
428	Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$76.7	H ††	H						M		
462 (2)	MUNI Rapid/Enhanced Bus on 30-Stockton line / Public: Architecture 21	San Francisco Countywide	\$113.0	H ††	H						M		Would require Big Tent revenue.
537 (1)	Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification / Caltrain	Peninsula	\$657.0 †	H ††							M	H (Noise)	Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
New Capacity													
414	Geary LRT / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$1,734.2		H	M/H		M/H			M		Would require Big Tent revenue.
535	Caltrain Rail Capacity Improvements (Baby Bullet Phase II) / Caltrain	Peninsula	\$335.6 †	H	M						M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
Access and Connectivity													
253	Downtown Ferry Terminal / Port of San Francisco	Transbay	\$86.4		M/H	H		M/H	M		M	M (Seismic)	Would require Big Tent revenue.
515	Bayshore Intermodal Facility (cross platform transfers with 3rd Street LRT at Caltrain Bayshore station and improve bus connection) / Brisbane	Peninsula	\$36.8 †			H			H	Yes	H		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
419	Trolley Coach Extension/Conversions / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$624.1	H		M/H			H		M	H (Noise)	Would require Big Tent revenue.
247	Bayview Transportation Improvements Project (alternate access route between Hunters Point Shipyard and US 101) / San Francisco City/County	San Francisco Countywide	\$152.5			M		M	H	Yes			Would require Big Tent revenue.
415	Historic Streetcar Service / San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$32.5	H	Yes	M					M		

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

- * Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.
- † See notes for more information on cost.
- †† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

- ††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).
- †††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

High
 Medium High
 Medium
 Medium Low
 Low

Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
SAN MATEO COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
536 (1)	Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification / Caltrain	Peninsula	\$657.0 †	H ††							M	H (Noise)	Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
424	BART Advanced Automatic Train Control Phase V - Daly City to Millbrae/SFO / BART	Peninsula	\$53.9	H ††	H								
284 (3)	Route 92 Slow Vehicle Lanes- Route 280 to Route 35 (South) / San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Peninsula	\$64.0	H						M/L			
262	San Mateo County North 101/92 Ramp Metering/ TOS/Fiber Communications Project / Caltrans	Peninsula	\$19.2	M/H ††			M				M		
264	San Mateo County North I-280/380 Ramp Metering/ TOS/Fiber Communications Project / Caltrans	Peninsula	\$18.7	M/H ††							M		
230	I-280 Auxiliary Lanes: I-380 - Hickey Blvd. Daly City	Peninsula	\$101.7	M/H									
265	San Mateo County South I-280 and SR 92 Ramp Metering/TOS/Fiber Communications Project / Caltrans	Peninsula	\$12.2	M ††							M		
281	I-280 Auxilliary Lanes at Woodside Rd. (SR84) Caltrans	Peninsula	\$40.7	M									
New Capacity													
528 (1)	Dumbarton Rail Corridor / San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Transbay	\$277.6 †		M	H		M/H	M		M		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
534	Caltrain Rail Capacity Improvements (Baby Bullet Phase II) / Caltrain	Peninsula	\$335.6 †	H	M						M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
120	Redwood City to San Francisco to Alameda Ferry Service / Water Transit Authority	Transbay	\$34.8		M	M/L					M	M (Seismic)	Would require Big Tent revenue.
283	State Route 92, from Route 101 to 280: widen to 6 lanes / San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Peninsula	\$100.0		M								
Access and Connectivity													
226	Bayshore Intermodal Facility (cross platform transfers with 3rd Street LRT at Caltrain Bayshore station and improve bus connection) / Brisbane	Peninsula	\$36.8 †			H			H	Yes	M		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
234	Dumbarton Bridge Highway 101 Access / City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County	Transbay	\$100.0	M		H			H	Yes			Placeholder. Model forecasts moderate congestion in approaches. This may not reflect local operational concerns or local bottlenecks.

NOTES
 (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
 (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
 (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.
 † See notes for more information on cost.
 †† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).
 †††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
M/H Medium High
M Medium
M/L Medium Low
L Low

Yes
 Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
SANTA CLARA COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
435 (1)	Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification Caltrain	Peninsula	\$657.0 †	H ††							M	H (Noise)	Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
127	SCI-85 NB/SB Auxiliary lane from Saratoga/Sunnyvale to Stevens Creek / Caltrans	Silicon Valley	\$25.4	H ††									
124	SCI-680 NB/SB Auxiliary lane from McKee to Berryessa / Caltrans	Silicon Valley	\$45.8	M/H ††									
161	SR-85 Improvements - Northern Segment (improve interchanges, widen, and add ramp metering): El Camino - SR 237 / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$38.5	M ††	M	L					M/H		
128	SCI-85 NB/SB Auxiliary lane from Saratoga Ave. to Saratoga/Sunnyvale / Caltrans	Silicon Valley	\$32.5	M ††									
130	SCI-85 NB/SB Auxiliary lane from N. of Winchester to Saratoga Ave. / Caltrans	Silicon Valley	\$30.5	M ††									
158	SR-85 Improvements - Southern Segment: Homestead Road - El Camino Real (auxiliary lanes and overcrossing widening) / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$57.0	M	M								
180	Central Expressway Improvements: improve ramp operations between Mary Ave and Lawrence Expwy / Santa Clara County	Silicon Valley	\$13.0	M							L	Yes	
New Capacity													
410 (1)	Dumbarton Rail Corridor / San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Transbay	\$277.6 †		M	H		M/H	M		M		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
172	Widen I-880 to 8 lanes by adding 2 HOV lanes: SR 237 - Old Bayshore / Caltrans	Silicon Valley	\$271.4	M	M	H	M				M		
434	Caltrain Rail Capacity Improvements (Baby Bullet Phase II) / Caltrain	Peninsula	\$335.6 †	H	M						M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
140 (3)	US-101 Widening from Cochrane Road to Monterey Highway / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$259.6		M	M/H	M						This segment of road not projected to be heavily congested. May result from smart growth land-use assumptions, which would reduce growth in in-commuting from neighboring counties.
186	San Tomas Expressway Improvements Between SR82 and Williams Road: widen to 8 lanes / Santa Clara County	Silicon Valley	\$28.0		M						Yes		
138 (3)	US-101 Widening from Monterey Highway to Route 25 / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$32.0		L		M				M/L		This segment of road not projected to be heavily congested. May result from smart growth land-use assumptions, which would reduce growth in in-commuting from neighboring counties.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
M/H Medium High
M Medium
M/L Medium Low
L Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/Reliability ††	New Capacity	Access/Connectivity	Port/Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality †††	Other ††††	Notes
SANTA CLARA COUNTY (CONTINUED)													
Access and Connectivity													
15 (3)	I - 680/I - 880 Cross Connector Project / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Fremont-South Bay	\$400.0 †	M/H ††	M/H	H					Yes		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
470 (2)	Personal Rapid Transit: 3 mile Feeder to Milpitas LRT Station Public: Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association	Fremont-South Bay	\$300.0			M/H							Would require Big Tent revenue
471 (2)	Personal Rapid Transit: 10 mile route connection to Montague BART station [proposed] and extensive circulation within Milpitas / Public: Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association	Fremont-South Bay	\$1,000.0			M/H							Would require Big Tent revenue
147	US 101 Interchange at Zanker Road/Skyport Drive/ North Fourth Street / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$46.8	M/H	M/H	M	M						
165	Southbound US 101 to Eastbound SR 237 Improvements (auxiliary land and interchange improvements) / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$38.1	M ††	M	M	M						
148	US 101 Interchange at Mabury Road/Taylor Street / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$33.1	H	H	M/L	M						
162	SR 237 Westbound to SR 85 Southbound Improvements / Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	Silicon Valley	\$26.0	M	M	M/L							

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS



 High Medium High Medium Medium Low Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
SOLANO COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
328	Solano County I-680 Ramp Metering and TOS Project / Caltrans	Diablo	\$8.1	H ††							M		
316	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Air Base Parkway to North Texas / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$24.9	H	H		M						
318	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Cherry Glen to Alamo / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$8.0	H	H		M						
319	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from Merchant to Cherry Glen / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$16.8	H	H		M						
443	Solano County I-780 Ramp Metering, TOS and Fiber Optic Communication Project / Caltrans	Diablo	\$16.5 †	M/H ††							M		No cost estimate provided by Caltrans.
295	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Magellan to Beck / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$12.8	M/H	M/H		M						
320	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from North Texas to Waterman / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$28.9	M/H	M/H		M						
325	Solano County I-80 TOS Project / Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$14.2	M ††			M				M		
326	Solano County I-80 Ramp Meter Project and TOS fiber optic communications system / Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$16.8	M ††			M				M		
329	Solano County SR-37 TOS and Fiber Optic Communication Project / Caltrans	North Bay East-West	\$7.8	M ††							M		
310	I-80 EB Auxiliary lane from Benicia Road to Georgia Street / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$13.4	M	M		M			H			
309	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from Georgia to Benicia / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$14.2	M	M		M			M/L			
307	I-80 EB Auxiliary lane from Tennessee to Redwood / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$19.1	M	M		M						
308	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from Redwood to Tennessee / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$11.0	M	M		M						
315	I-80 EB and WB Auxiliary Lanes - SR 12 E to Suisun Valley Road / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$11.1	M	M		M						
323	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from the SR 12 EB off-ramp to the Magellan EB off-ramp / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$10.2	M	M		M						
322	EB I-80 Auxiliary Lane from Redwood to SR 37 / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$18.4	L	L		M			H			
New Capacity													
288 (1)	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From Air Base Parkway to I-505 / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$70.2	H	H		M				M		
289 (1)	Jepson Parkway: I-80 - SR 12 / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$145.4		H	M	L			Yes			

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
M/H Medium High
M Medium
M/L Medium Low
L Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
SOLANO COUNTY (CONTINUED)													
New Capacity													
92 (1)	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From SR 12 West to Air Base Parkway / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$42.7	M/H	M/H		M				M		
304 (1) (3)	Complete I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Improvements (Phase 3) / Solano County Transportation Authority	Diablo	\$508.5		M/H	M				M			Would require Big Tent revenue.
381	Capitol Corridor Regional Rail Service (West Contra Costa and Solano counties) / AMTRAK	Eastshore North	\$122.0 †	H	M	M	H	M/H	M		M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
445	Martinez-Benicia-San Francisco Ferry Service / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$35.0		M	M/H		M/H			M	M	Would require Big Tent revenue. (Seismic)
303	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From Carquinez Bridge to SR 37 / Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$31.4	M	M		M				M		
286	SR 37 Widening with environmental mitigation / Solano County Transportation Authority	North Bay East-West	\$154.5		M								Would require Big Tent revenue.

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
 M/H Medium High
 M Medium
 M/L Medium Low
 L Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
SONOMA COUNTY													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
538 (2)	Santa Rosa - S.F. BRT / Public: individual	Golden Gate	\$5.0 †	H ††	M/H						M		Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; Sonoma County share would be smaller.
190	Hwy 116/Hwy 121 Intersection Improvements: signalize and channelize / Sonoma County	North Bay East-West	\$6.0	H		L							
200	Sonoma County 101 Ramp Metering and fiber optic cable / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$27.7	M/H ††						L	M		
199	Sonoma County 101 Corridor TOS Project / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$17.3	M/H ††							M		
New Capacity													
438 (1)	Widen US 101 (add HOV lane in each direction): Rte 37 to Old Redwood Hwy. / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$368.8 †	H	H	H					H		Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
174 (1)	Widen US 101 for HOV lanes: Old Redwood Hwy - Rohnert Park Expressway / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$90.0	H	H	H							
189 (1)	Widen for US 101 HOV lanes: Steele Lane - Windsor River Rd. / Caltrans	Golden Gate	\$90.3	H	H								
113	SMART Commuter Rail (includes Bicycle Path) / Sonoma/Marin Area Rail Transit District (SMART)	Golden Gate	\$210.6 †		M/H	M/H					M	H (Noise)	Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

- * Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.
- † See notes for more information on cost.
- †† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

- ††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).
- †††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

H High
 M/H Medium High
 M Medium
 M/L Medium Low
 L Low

Yes Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
REGIONAL													
Access and Connectivity													
481 (2)	Bay Bridge: West Span Bicycle and Maintenance route / Public: Bay Area Bicycle Coalition	Transbay	\$160.3			H		M/H			H		Would require Big Tent revenue.
480 (2)	San Rafael - Richmond Bridge Bicycle Access / Public: Marin County Bicycle Coalition and Bay Area Bicycle Coalition	Transbay	\$93.0			H		M			H		Would require Big Tent revenue.
Equity													
441	Regional Lifeline Mobility Program (LIFT) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$216.0†			H			H				Programmatic. Cost shown here may be capital or operating.
Maintenance													
111	Golden Gate Bridge Rehabilitation Projects / GGBHTD	Golden Gate	\$99.4									H (Maintenance)	
Seismic Safety/Emergency Response													
131	BART Seismic Retrofit Program / BART	Regional	\$1,199.7†									H (Seismic)	Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

				
High	Medium High	Medium	Medium Low	Low



Meets objective but data not sufficient to rate

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability††	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality†††	Other††††	Notes
REGIONAL Projects Subjected to Yes/No Evaluation													
Efficient Operations and Reliability													
542	Regional Technical Assistance Program (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) 25-year operating requirements	Regional	\$25.0 †	Yes ††		Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes (Maintenance)	Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost reflects (\$1 million annually).
541	Incident Management (FSP) (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$46.7 †	Yes ††						Yes	Yes	Yes (Customer Service)	Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue for capital and operating. Cost reflects \$2.2 million in capital plus 21-year operating (\$2.1 million per year).
540	Freeway Operations (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$255.0	Yes ††						Yes	Yes		Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue
543	Rideshare - Regional Commute Alternatives Incentive Program (Guaranteed Ride Home) (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$5.0 †	Yes ††							Yes	Yes (Customer Service)	Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost reflects 25-year operating requirement (\$0.2 million annually).
545	Signal Timing (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$30.0	Yes ††						Yes	Yes		Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue
546	TransLink® (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$46.2	Yes		Yes					Yes	Yes (Customer Service)	Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue
489 (2)	Dial-A-Ride Vanpools / Public: individual	Regional	\$6.3 †	Yes							Yes		Programmatic. Cost reflects capital (\$50,000) plus 25-years of operating (\$250,000 annually).
New Capacity													
423	BART System Capacity Program / BART	Transbay	\$1,045.5 †	Yes ††	Yes					Yes		Yes (Seismic)	Programmatic. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
Access and Connectivity													
133	BART Station Access Projects / BART	Peninsula	\$757.9 †		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Programmatic. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
433	Caltrain Rail Access Improvements (Systemwide) / Caltrain	Peninsula	\$297.0		Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes	Yes (Maintenance)	Programmatic
442	Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$200.0		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes		Programmatic
135	BART Station Capacity Projects / BART	Transbay	\$976.3 †	Yes		Yes				Yes	Yes		Programmatic. Cost is total; county share would be smaller.
477 (2)	Safe Routes to Transit: Regional Program / Public: Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC)	Regional	93.4			Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes		Programmatic
476 (2)	Bike Parking at Key Transit Centers / Public: Bay Area Bicycle Coalition (formerly REBAC)	Regional	\$5.0			Yes		Yes			Yes		Programmatic
478 (2)	Carshare expansion near transit and in neighborhoods with high CalWORKS populations / Public: City CarShare	Regional	\$150.0			Yes				Yes			Programmatic

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS

Yes

Meets objective

ID	Project Title / Submitted by	Corridor	Capital Cost † (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operations/ Reliability ^{††}	New Capacity	Access/ Connectivity	Port/ Airport Access	Community Vitality	Equity	Safety	Air Quality ^{†††}	Other ^{††††}	Notes
REGIONAL Projects Subjected to Yes/No Evaluation (CONTINUED)													
Air Quality													
487 (2)	Free Transit Days (on Spare the Air Days) / Public: individual	Regional	\$9.8								Yes		Project is not a TCM but has been considered as an episodic control measure.
Customer Service													
544	511/Transit (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$9.8 [†]			Yes						Yes (Customer Service)	Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue. Cost reflects capital (\$8.2 million) plus 23-year operating costs (0.2 million annually).
547	511/Traffic (Big Tent Project) / Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Regional	\$21.5	Yes ^{††}								Yes (Customer Service)	Programmatic. Would require Big Tent revenue.

NOTES

- (1) Project is in the 2001 RTP and is expected to have a greater than 30% increase in regional funding need.
- (2) Project was submitted by a member of the public.
- (3) Project may have benefits for goods movement. More information forthcoming from the Regional Goods Movement Study.

* Projects in the detailed evaluation with cost over \$25 million as well as all projects in the detailed evaluation with Operational Efficiency and Reliability as a main objective.

† See notes for more information on cost.

†† Indicates project address both reliability and operational efficiency.

††† Air quality based on one of two adopted measures (whether project is a state or federal TCM).

†††† Includes seismic safety, maintenance, noise reduction and customer service objectives.

PROJECT RATINGS



Meets objective