



## 2025 MEASURE A & W HIGHWAY PROGRAM GUIDELINES

### INTRODUCTION

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) is pleased to announce the Measure A and W Highway Program 2025 Call for Projects. The focus of the program is to reduce traffic congestion and improve throughput and safety on the most critical commute corridors in San Mateo County. This cycle will promote a large availability of funds that can go toward newly approved Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways eligible corridors list. These Supplemental Roadways corridors will allow local jurisdictions to apply for multimodal congestion and safety improvements on local arterials and main streets.

Up to \$200 million may be made available between both measures for projects that best meet the program evaluation criteria.

### APPLICATION MATERIALS

The Call for Projects packet consists of the program guidelines, an application form, non-supplantation of funds certificate, and a sample resolution. These documents and other related reference materials, including template funding agreements, can be found at:

<https://www.smcta.com/whats-happening/call-projects>

### WORKSHOP

The 2025 Highway Program Call for Projects Workshop is scheduled for July 16, 2025 at 1:00 PM. For more information and to register, please visit the link below. This is intended primarily for eligible sponsors (local cities, County, and Caltrans staff) but all interested parties are welcome to attend.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/Gi4oQX4pSpeNa9bwh4CrTQ>

*After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.*

### SCHEDULE

Call for Projects Issued after TA Board Meeting	July 11, 2025
Call for Projects Workshop	July 16, 2025
Notify TA of Intent to Submit	August 1, 2025
Mandatory Pre-Submittal Meetings with TA Staff	August 4-8, 2025
<b>Project Applications due</b>	<b>September 12, 2025</b>
Evaluation Period	September/October 2025
Informational item to TA Board on Draft Program of Projects <i>Note: Any Sponsor requesting PS&amp;E, ROW, or CON must present to the TA Board in alignment with the Major Projects Advancement Policy</i>	November 6, 2025
TA Board approves proposed Program of Projects	December 4, 2025

## APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

**Step 1 - Notice of Intent to Submit:** Sponsors must fill out the notice of intent to submit survey using the link below with the project name and sponsor agency information by August 1, 2025. This will be used to set up a Dropbox account for submission of all materials. Additionally, sponsors should indicate any assistance needed from the Transportation Authority either related to the application or regarding the implementation of the proposed project. Please note that changes to the details provided are allowable in the submitted application from the Sponsor Agency. If a sponsor does not indicate an intent to submit by the requested timeline, sponsors may be allowed to submit an application but will need to request a Dropbox for submittal as soon as possible before the application due date and schedule a required pre-submittal meeting.

[Click here for the Notice of Intent Survey Link](#)

**Step 2 – Mandatory Pre-submittal Meetings:** The TA will be requiring all applicants to participate in a mandatory pre-submittal meeting during the week of August 4-8, 2025 to review proposed requests to ensure they align with all the updated guidelines and discuss any technical assistance requested. TA staff will be available to discuss

**Step 3 - Submitting Applications:** Sponsors must submit one electronic copy of the completed application with all required attachments by uploading all materials to a specific Dropbox link that will be provided. Completed applications must be received no later than **September 12, 2025 by 4:00 PM. Late or incomplete applications will not be accepted.** It is the sponsor's responsibility to check with TA staff to confirm the receipt of applications prior to the submission deadline.

## CONTACT

For general application questions, including receipt of applications, information on prior Measure A and Measure W funding allocations and clarifications on the description of listed candidate projects, contact:

Patrick Gilster, at [gilsterp@samtrans.com](mailto:gilsterp@samtrans.com) or (650) 622-7853

## ORGANIZATION

1. Reference Information
  2. Available Funding
  3. Eligibility
  4. Roles
  5. Applications
  6. Evaluation Criteria
  7. Other Policies/Guidelines for the 2025 Call for Projects
    - Exhibit A - TA Strategic Plan 2025-2029 Competitive Program Guidelines and Highway Program Guidelines
    - Exhibit B – 2021-2030 Short Range Highway Plan and Capital Improvement Program List of Eligible Projects
    - Exhibit C – 2025 Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways List of Eligible Projects
    - Exhibit D – 2025 Highway Program Scoring Rubric
- 

### 1. REFERENCE INFORMATION

In 1988, San Mateo County voters passed the original Measure A sales tax, which included funding for specific highway projects listed in the 1988 Transportation Expenditure Plan. In 2004, the voters of San Mateo County reauthorized the Measure A Program and approved an extension of the existing half-cent transportation sales tax for 25 years from 2009 through 2033. The 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) provides that 27.5 percent of the sales tax revenue be dedicated to the highway program, with 17.3 percent committed to projects on state highways known as Key Congested Areas (KCA) and 10.2 percent for Supplemental Roadways (SR) for projects on highways and other roadways. In 2018, the voters of San Mateo County approved Measure W, a new 30-year half-cent sales tax for transportation programs and projects that took effect July 1, 2019 and expires June 30, 2049. The Measure W Congestion Relief Plan (CRP) identifies that twenty two and one half percent of Measure W be dedicated to highway congestion improvements.

In 2021, the TA Board adopted the Short Range Highway Plan (SRHP) and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to support future investment decisions for the Measure A Highways & Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion categories. The SRHP incorporates the Measure A goals along with the new Measure W core principles and is the policy foundation for making highway program investment decisions. The TA Strategic Plan 2025-2029 adopted in December 2025 then consolidated and updated the policies and evaluation criteria for the Highway Program (Exhibit A) based on input from the TA Citizens Advisory Committee, TA Board of Directors, C/CAG Congestion Management Technical Advisory Committee, and other stakeholders. Additionally, one key action identified in the TA Strategic Plan 2025-2029 was to update the list of candidate projects eligible for the Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways subcategory which was adopted in June 2025 (Exhibit B).

**To be eligible for the Call for Projects a project must be included in the CIP, listed in the Measure A or W Expenditure Plans, be identified in the updated Measure A Supplemental Roadways candidate project list, have been previously funded by the TA Highway Program with additional approval from the TA. Please contact Patrick Gilster, Director of Planning & Fund Management if you are interested in a project not listed in any of those documents.**

Applicants are encouraged to review the following links to learn more about the TA and the Measure A & W Highway Program:

Measure A Transportation Expenditure Plan:

<https://www.smcta.com/about-us/funding-overview/measure>

Measure W Congestion Relief Plan:

<https://www.smcta.com/about-us/funding-overview/measure-w>

TA Strategic Plan 2025-2029

<https://www.smcta.com/StrategicPlan2029>

Measure A & W Highway Program Web Page – Includes the 2021-2030 Short Range Highway Plan and Capital Improvement Program along with previously funded projects

<https://www.smcta.com/projects-programs/highway>

### ***Definitions***

The following terms are used throughout the application materials:

- i. Overall project: The entire project ultimately to be constructed.
- ii. Project scope: The specific project phases or elements for which Measure A and W funds are being requested in this application/cycle. The project scope may be a subset of the overall project.
- iii. Sponsor Agency: The applicant for Measure A and W funds for the project scope, the public and political champion, solidify funding plan, coordinate with the TA to identify appropriate implementing agency, submit monitoring reports, sign funding agreements .
- iv. Implementing Agency: The agency implementing the project scope (see Table 3 for sample roles).

## 2. AVAILABLE FUNDING

The Measure A and Measure W 2025 Highway Program Call for Projects is based on the guidance adopted in the 2021-2030 SRHP/CIP and certain elements may be updated in the TA Strategic Plan 2025-2029.

This Call for Projects has two funding tracks as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Available Funding Tracks**

Funding Track	Available funds	Eligible Projects
Measure A: (KCA & SR)	\$120 million <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KCA: \$45m</li> <li>SR: \$75m</li> </ul>	KCA and SR projects identified in the 2004 TEP. Additional SR projects not included in the 2004 TEP must be approved in the updated Candidate Supplemental Roadways Project List (Exhibit C).
Measure W	\$80 million	Eligible candidate projects will be focused on highway and interchange facilities, including Highway 101, Highway 280, and other highways and their interchanges. Eligible candidate projects can include bicycle and pedestrian components or facilities that are incorporated into and enhance safety for a larger highway or interchange project.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$200 million</b>	

- **Geographic Distribution Targets**

As part of the TA Strategic Plan 2025-2029, the TA Board approved the following geographic distribution targets to allow the TA to more fairly evaluate applications against projects in similar settings in San Mateo County. Funding will be assigned to projects in the applicable geographic category first, should there additional funding available then the remaining categories can receive the additional funding which will be assigned based on the final application score. The geographic distribution targets as follows:

1. Small/Coastal (15%)
2. Mid/Large (50%)
3. Countywide Significance (35%)

Small/Coastal and Mid/Large jurisdictions are defined in Exhibit A. Projects in the Small/Coastal and Mid/Large along with Supplemental Roadways projects are eligible

- **Projects of Countywide Significance**

Projects are eligible for consideration in the Countywide Significance category if they meet at least two of the following screening criteria:

1. Project serves a significant amount of person throughput, inclusive of all modes
2. Project serves a significant amount of inter-county traffic
3. Project significantly improves connections between two or more geographic areas of the county
4. Project is a priority component of a countywide or regional multijurisdictional effort

## 5. ROLES

- **Sponsor and Implementing Agency Roles**

While funding applications must be submitted by eligible sponsors for Measure A and Measure W funding, there is flexibility in terms of the agency that will be implementing the project scope. A sponsor may implement the project scope itself; or partner with an implementing agency.

Sponsors that intend to partner with another agency for implementation must coordinate with that agency in submitting applications for this cycle.

The roles and responsibilities of a sponsor-implementing agency partnership will need to be defined and documented as part of the Measure A and Measure W Highway Program application. These roles will also be enumerated in the applicable funding agreement or supplemental agreement. The sponsor and the implementing agency may be different for different phases of a given project. Table 3 provides a model of how the responsibilities could be divided between a sponsor and implementing agency.

**Table 2. Example of a Sponsor Agency – Implementing Agency Partnership**

Sponsor	Implementing Agency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political champion</li> <li>• Provide local input for project (policy/oversight)</li> <li>• Public spokesperson</li> <li>• Advocate for funding</li> <li>• Submit Governing Board resolutions and applications for Measure A funds</li> <li>• Signatory to Measure A funding agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of project scope</li> <li>• Coordination with Caltrans</li> <li>• Coordination with regulatory/review agencies</li> <li>• Invoicing and progress reporting to TA</li> <li>• Technical project oversight/ management</li> </ul>

- **TA Role**

The TA will work closely with C/CAG, Caltrans, local jurisdictions and regulatory agencies on the implementation of Measure A and Measure W highway projects. The TA has and may make available the resources and expertise for highway project or other eligible roadway planning and delivery upon request. The TA may become an implementing agency if requested by a sponsor as part of the TA's Technical Assistance program.

Mandatory consultation with the TA:

*Sponsors must consult with the TA before submitting applications if they are requesting that the TA be the implementing agency for the project (either as the lead implementer or to support implementation.)* The TA's willingness to be an implementing agency for a project does not imply that the project will receive Measure A or Measure W funding. This should also be indicated in the initial "Notice of Intent to Submit" survey.

Applicants are encouraged to consult the TA for the following during the application process for:

- a. An assessment on the:
  - i. level of resources and expertise that will be needed to deliver the project scope to better ensure they are in place at the start of the project, and
  - ii. credibility of projected costs and schedules to better manage project delivery:

The projected project cost should reflect the most recent planning level cost estimate or design level cost estimate. For planning level cost estimate (Preliminary Planning Study, Project Initiation Document, Environmental Document/Project Report and Plans, Specification and Estimate (PS&E)), the project costs should be adjusted from the date of the estimate to the projected year of expenditure. For construction cost estimate prepared during the PS&E phase, the projected project cost is to be escalated to the mid-point of construction. The project sponsor establishes the escalation rate based on the construction cost indices and market conditions.

Preparation of cost estimates should be consistent with the standard approach and guidelines provided in Chapter 20 – Project Development Cost Estimates of the **Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual (PDMP)**.

<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/manual-project-development-procedures-manual-pdpm>

- b. Requests for multi-agency coordination: The TA can help with stakeholder coordination for project scopes which involve multiple agencies.

***Final approval for receiving technical assistance and implementation support will come from Peter Skinner, Executive Officer, Transportation Authority after consultant with Patrick Gilster, Director of Planning & Fund Management and Jessica Manzi, Director of Project Delivery.***

## 6. APPLICATIONS

- ***Governing Board Resolutions (Attachment A)***

An adopted governing board resolution from the project sponsor in support of the project application is required. The resolution will affirm the sponsor's support for the project scope, the sponsor's role for the project scope, confirm the commitment of matching funds and the ability to commence project scope within 12 months of receiving TA Board funding award. If the sponsor will not be able to obtain a governing board resolution prior to the September 12, 2025 application deadline, the application will be accepted on an interim basis with a copy of the draft resolution and an indication of which governing board meeting the resolution is planned for adoption. *If the application is to be considered for the programming and allocation of Measure A or Measure W funds, an adopted governing resolution must be submitted to the TA no later than October 17, 2025 prior to the draft recommendations materials being submitted ahead of the November TA Board meeting.*

- ***Cover Letter & Non-Supplantation of Funds Statement (Attachment B)***

In addition to the required signatures in the application, a cover letter should be provided by the sponsor agency's City Manager or Executive Director attesting to accuracy of the project cost estimate, schedule, and funding provided in the application along with a brief description of project benefits to the applicable community. The cover letter must also state attest to non-supplantation of funds if awarded highway program funding.

- ***Letters of Support (Attachment F)***

Sponsors are encouraged to provide up to five letters of support from stakeholders that are not a part of the eligible sponsoring agency. These letters of support will maximize points achieved for community support in the evaluation criteria. process. Descriptions of stakeholder support and community involvement will still be required as part of the application.

- ***Applications for multiple phases***  
Except for a concurrent request to fund the plans specifications and estimates (PS&E) and Right of Way (ROW) phases of work, sponsors may only apply for one new phase of work in the application project scope. However, if there is a compelling case requesting more than one phase(s) that is also projected to be underway within one year of the TA action to program and allocate funds for the project than that may be considered but is not guaranteed for funding with the potential awards.
- ***Applications for ROW and Construction***  
Sponsors requesting Measure A and Measure W Highway Program funds for the ROW and Construction phases of work will need to provide a credible funding plan for the delivery of the project through construction as part of the application. The costs associated with ROW can be significant. The TA will assess the reasonableness of the funding plan to better manage the risk it undertakes making significant capital outlays with respect to the sponsor's ability to fully deliver the project through construction. As noted previously, the TA generally funds up to 50 percent of a projects total cost. Therefore, sponsors must provide a credible funding plan that demonstrates how the remaining funding gap will be closed with additional local, regional, state, or federal sources.
- ***Funding Agreements/Memorandums of Understanding***  
The TA's Primary Grant Agreement and Supplemental Agreement templates will be used for any 2025 Highway Program awards. The Supplemental Agreement will detail roles and responsibilities if the TA is the implementing agency on behalf of an outside agency project sponsor.
- ***Exhibit A Scope of Works (Attachment E)***  
The TA will also require each applicant to fill out the TA's standard Exhibit A Scope of Work template that accompanies every Supplemental Agreement. This will help expedite the funding agreement execution process. All projects should assume an earliest start date of December 8, 2025 after the final program adoption. Sponsors may request a Letter of No Prejudice if work will commence on or after December 8, 2025 and prior to the execution of the Supplemental Agreement.

## **7. ELIGIBLE COSTS**

Measure A and Measure W Highway Program funds shall be used for direct eligible costs to complete the scope of work. Expenses incurred for the development of project applications and the review of funding agreements are not eligible for reimbursement. The TA, or its authorized agents, reserves the right to audit the sponsor's performance to ensure compliance with the terms of the sponsor's funding agreement or memorandum of agreement.

The lists of phases below include eligible costs that can be funded by the TA but all generally allow consultant technical work, community engagement, staff time, Caltrans fees, and permit fees:

- Planning (PLAN) – technical studies, community engagement, and other necessary activities necessary to complete the Scope of Work.
- Project Initiation Documents (PID) - activities necessary to complete PIDs covered under the Scope of Work.



- Environmental Studies – environmental studies costs, including determination of the appropriate environmental document, preparation of all preliminary engineering for each alternative, including geomantic layouts, determination of right-of-way needs, environmental technical studies (such as air, noise, energy, cultural resources and hazardous waste), and all other studies or activities necessary to prepare and finalize the appropriate documents for Project and environmental approval.
- Design – design activities such as preparation of design studies; materials and foundation reports; drainage, hydrology and hydraulic reports; surveying and mapping; preparation of the plans, specifications and estimate; preparation of bid documents and Project files; preparation of permit applications and maintenance agreements; coordination of agency reviews and any other activities necessary to prepare final plans specifications and estimate (PS&E) for bid advertisement and award; and management oversight of these tasks except as limited in Section 2.2 (b) of the Agreement.
- Right-of-Way Acquisition – all activities related to right-of-way including determination of right-of-way needs; title searches; preparation of appraisal maps, legal descriptions and plat maps; parcel appraisals and appraisal reviews; hazardous materials testing and analysis; preparation of right-of-way acquisition documents; activities involved with acquiring rights-of-way including negotiation with property owners and cost associated with condemnation proceedings (including legal costs, expert witness costs, etc., but not including costs related to claims for inverse condemnation), right-of-way capital costs and cost-to-cure impacts related to the acquisition. To the extent allowed by law, Sponsor shall undertake all best efforts so that cleanup of existing hazardous materials shall remain the liability of the property owner.
  - Services provided for right-of-way activities involved with property not necessary for the Measure A or Measure W Highway Program-funded Project as defined in the Scope of Work, and the associated costs for all such property, shall be at the sole expense of the Sponsor.
  - Any property not used for construction of the Project, or used for any purpose other than construction of the Project as defined in the Scope of Work, should be identified and the funding agencies should be informed. Any excess right-of-way shall be identified as early as possible in the Project design process and sold. The proceeds from the sale of such property shall be returned to the funding agencies, prorated based on the percentage of funds each agency contributed to the purchase of the property.
- Construction – construction expenditures for the Project (construction capital, management and inspection, surveys, public outreach, and related activities) that are part of the Scope of Work agreed to by the TA. Sponsor must submit all change orders over \$50,000 to the TA for review and written approval before the TA will reimburse the Sponsor with Measure A Funds or Measure W Funds.
  - In addition, Measures A and W Funds are eligible for reimbursement of Sponsor's Project management oversight expenses associated with the construction of the Project. This would include activities such as construction management inspection, expenses associated with reviewing proposed change orders, and activities involved with submitting final costs to the appropriate agencies to secure other leveraged funds.

- Miscellaneous – fees from other agencies, including permit fees or reimbursement for review or oversight costs needed for the Project are eligible costs. However, the cost of permits or fees from the Project Sponsor will not be eligible. Utility relocation costs are eligible for reimbursement according to previous agreements establishing rights for those utilities. The costs for specialized equipment for testing, analysis or production of documents for Project-related work are also eligible.

The Sponsor may include additional work beyond the Scope of Work for the Project at its own expense if the need arises. However, the TA will require these costs to be segregated from the other item work expenses and paid for with non-Measure A or Measure W Highway Program funds.

## **OTHER POLICIES/GUIDELINES FOR THIS CALL FOR PROJECTS**

- ***Sponsors in Good Standing***  
As part of the application review process, TA staff will review and provide an overview individual sponsor or implementing agency past records on meeting the terms and conditions of current or past Funding Agreements or MOUs to the scoring evaluation committee. If a sponsor or implementing agency has a poor record, the readiness category score may be reduced or the scoring evaluation committee may elect to recommend additional terms and conditions or reject the application.
- ***Specific Funding Tracks***  
Since some projects may qualify for either Measure A or Measure W funds, TA staff will assign specific projects to specific funding tracks. Both funding tracks will have the same funding agreement, invoicing and reporting requirements.
- ***Under-subscription and Right to Change Funding Amounts***  
If the Call for Projects is undersubscribed this funding cycle, the TA may still elect not to fund all eligible project applications. Only the projects that best meet the project evaluation criteria may be funded. The TA also reserves the right to increase or decrease the amount of available funding depending on the project applications submitted.
- ***Cost increases***  
The Project Sponsor shall immediately notify that TA at the time it is discovered that the allocated funding is not sufficient to complete the funded scope of work. It is the responsibility of the sponsor to take the lead in identifying and securing any additional funds to complete the scope of work. The TA has no obligation to allocate additional Measure A or Measure W Highway Program funds to address a cost increase. Sponsors can work with the TA, C/CAG and other funding entities to secure additional funds or explore and implement scope modification to align the project with the available funding.  
  
Projects that previously received highway program funding from the TA for an applicable phase and costs have increased would be eligible to request up to 50% of the cost increase from a subsequent Call for Projects. Please consult TA staff prior to applying.
- ***Non-supplantation of funds***  
Sponsors are required to certify that Measure A and Measure W funds awarded in this cycle will not replace existing funds. This should be provided as a statement in the cover letter.

- ***Reimbursement***

Project costs must be incurred and paid for by the sponsor or implementing agency prior to requests for Measure A and Measure W funding reimbursement. Project costs incurred prior to the execution of the funding agreement may not be eligible for reimbursement. Documentation must accompany all requests for reimbursement such as, but not limited to, copies of vendor invoices, timesheets, backup documentation, checks, and payment advice.

- ***Attribution Requirements***

Sponsors must include attribution that indicates work was funded with “Measure A Funds” or “Measure W Funds” or “Measures A/W Funds from the TA.” This provision applies to any project, or publication, that is funded in part or in whole by “Measure A Funds” or “Measure W Funds” or “Measures A/W Funds.” Acceptable forms of attribution include TA branding on Project-related documents, construction signs, public information materials, and any other applicable documents. Sponsor must comply with the TA’s External Attribution Guide, which may be updated from time to time and will be available on the TA’s website. This section is applicable to any project funded in part by the TA and is also a requirement in Primary Grant Agreements.

- ***Scope changes***

Project sponsors seeking a change in project scope after the TA Board approval of the Measure A and Measure W allocation must obtain approval from the TA staff or risk losing the associated measure funds. Minor scope changes may be administratively approved if the TA determines the ultimate benefits indicated in the application do not significantly change. Major scope changes may result in a rescinding of an award if the TA determines the ultimate benefits of a project are not realized.

- ***Construction and Landscape/Close-out Requests***

Project sponsors should note that all landscaping and close-out costs should be included with the request for construction funds. Future requests for only landscaping and other close-out costs will not be considered separately, except under limited special circumstances. Costs for landscaping capital are eligible for TA reimbursement but any on-going monitoring or required Caltrans establishment periods should be called out for any construction requests. The TA may allow an eligible are expressly the responsibility of the sponsor. The TA will close-out projects after the completion of the landscape construction.

# 8

## **Programming, Allocation, and Monitoring Guidelines**

## 8.1 PROJECT SELECTION CATEGORIES

The TA Strategic Plans have historically categorized Measures A and W funding programs and subcategories into three categories: Agreement-Based Programs, Plan-Based Programs, and Competitive Programs. This plan removes the Plan-Based Programs category since multiple plans were adopted in the prior Strategic Plan period, but the TA may elect to update those individual plans as conditions change in the future. Additional plans may be developed for individual funding programs periodically to guide updates and reflect best practices over time in the future and updates to the Strategic Plan also qualify as plan-based changes. The results of which are now either agreement-based, competitive-based, or a combination of the two for the Strategic Plan 2025-2029.

The programs included in the Agreement-Based category are governed by agreements that are either specified in the Measure A Expenditure Plan or the Measure W Congestion Relief Plan. The programs included in the Competitive Program category are governed by a CFP cycle or on a first-served, ready-to-go basis. These program designations are shown in Table 11.

Agreement-Based		
Measure A	Measure W	
Local Streets & Transportation	Local Safety, Pothole & Congestion Relief (Local Investment Share)	
BART	N/A	
Caltrain		
Dumbarton Rail Corridor		
Ferry		
Competitive		
Measure A	Measure W	Project Selection Approach
Highways	Countywide Highway Congestion Improvements	Call for Projects process guided by the Short-Range Highway Plan (SRHP) and Highway Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Alternative Congestion Relief (ACR)	Transportation Demand Management (TDM) <sup>1</sup>	Call for Projects process guided by the ACR/TDM Plan
Pedestrian & Bicycle	Bicycle & Pedestrian	Call for Projects process
Local Shuttle <sup>2</sup>	N/A	Call for Projects process guided by the Peninsula Shuttle Study
N/A	Regional Transit Connections	Call for Projects process guided by the Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) and Transit CIP
Grade Separations	Local Safety Pothole & Congestion Relief Improvements (Grade Separations)	Fund pipeline projects on a rolling basis

Table 11: Project Selection Approach

Notes:

1 The Measure W TDM program is a subcategory of the Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion Improvements program.

2 The Measure A Local Shuttle program is a subcategory of the Measure A Transit program

## 8.2 STANDARD GUIDELINE ELEMENTS

The following sections describe standard guidelines and policies that are generally applicable to all TA funding programs. However, individual programs in the Competitive Program category may specify additional guidelines and requirements as part of each subsequent CFP that also must be adhered to.

### 8.2.1 Eligible Sponsors

The designated participants in the Measures A and W programs are the project initiator, the Sponsors, the project manager/operator, and the TA. Table 12 defines the eligibility requirements, roles, and responsibilities of each of these participants.

Participant	Eligibility	Roles and Responsibilities
<b>Project Initiator</b>	<b>Any person or entity</b>	<b>Develops scope for the initial project</b>
Sponsor	Measure A: identified in Expenditure Plan for each program category Measure W: as determined through the Strategic Plan development process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit funding request or CFP applications to the TA</li> <li>• Develop funding plan</li> <li>• Coordinate with the TA to identify appropriate implementing agency</li> <li>• Submit monitoring reports</li> <li>• Sign primary grant agreement and project supplement(s)</li> </ul>
Implementing Agency	The agency who is responsible for leading funding award on behalf of an eligible Sponsor. The TA may act as an implementing agency, if requested.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan/engineer/construct projects</li> <li>• Operate services</li> <li>• Sign primary grant agreement and project supplement(s) when applicable</li> </ul>
Transportation Authority	Identified in the Measure A Expenditure Plan and the Measure W Congestion Relief Plan as the manager/ administrator of the Measures A and W programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate and prioritize projects</li> <li>• Coordinate with Sponsor to determine implementation lead</li> <li>• Program and allocate funds</li> <li>• Oversight of projects / programs</li> <li>• Sign primary grant agreement and project supplement(s)</li> </ul>

Table 12: Measures A and W Participants and Responsibilities

## 8.2.2 TA Board of Directors Approval

The TA Board of Directors makes fund programming decisions based on recommendations developed during CFP processes. These decisions reserve funds for specific projects or a program of projects. Either concurrent with the programming or in a separate action, the Board of Directors will allocate funding and track allocated funds as part of the TA's annual budget approval process. This series of actions ensures timely availability of funds.

## 8.2.3 Primary Grant Agreement and Project Supplement(s)

Historically, the TA has executed separate funding agreements and memoranda of understanding, or amendments thereto, for each phase of each project. To streamline and expedite future contracting processes, the TA has developed a new primary grant agreement through which the TA and Sponsors will document the structure of their relationships and related obligations. Concise individual project supplements will detail each funded project and any specifically-associated requirements during the 10-year term of the primary grant agreement.

To be eligible for TA Measures A and W funding over the next 10 years, the TA will require Sponsors' governing boards to adopt resolutions authorizing the Sponsors' chief executive/mayor/chair, or designee, to sign a primary grant agreement with the TA.

## 8.2.4 Matching Funds

The TA requires that Sponsors provide matching funds for all individual funding requests. The matching funds can either be supplied from the options below:

- Local general funds
- Local investment funds from Measure A Local Streets/Transportation and Measure W Local Safety, Pothole, and Congestion Relief Improvements that are discretionary transportation funds provided for each local jurisdiction
- External local, county, regional, state, and federal grants or other funding sources

Navigating through the network of external funding and securing matching funds may be complicated for Sponsors. To aid local jurisdictions in obtaining funds as needed to meet the minimum matching funds requirement, the TA has provided a representative summary of existing federal, state, and local funding programs that can be leveraged with Measures A and W funding contained in **Appendix G**, although these programs are subject to change. As resources permit, the TA will work with Sponsors to maximize the amount of matching funds secured for each project, which is discussed further in **Section 11**.

## 8.2.5 Timely Use of Funds

As part of TA funding agreements, Sponsors have been required to comply with timely-use-of-funds requirements pertaining to project initiation timelines and invoicing for the Highways, ACR/TDM, Bicycle & Pedestrian, and RTC competitive funding programs. The Strategic Plan 2025-2029 extends these requirements to all TA funding programs with additional guidelines for defining what constitutes project initiation. Projects that fail to meet the outlined requirements will be at risk of being deprogrammed and the awarded funds may be reprogrammed to other projects. Project deprogramming will be implemented using the following tiered monitoring system.

## PROJECT INITIATION REQUIREMENTS

- For project awards identified as “fully funded” as the result of a TA allocation, the project must be initiated within 12 months of the funding award. At a minimum, this includes the execution of a funding agreement or project supplement, along with the submittal of the first request for reimbursement of a Sponsor’s own staff’s work, release of a Request for Proposal for pre-construction work (PLAN or PID, PA/ED or PE/EV, and PS&E phases), or release of a construction bid opportunity.
- If a Sponsor does not initiate work within 12 months of the funding award as indicated in required Quarterly Status Reports, the TA will require a meeting with the Sponsor’s chief executive and project staff to review reasons for the delay. The TA Executive Director or Executive Officer may approve one six-month extension, at their discretion, if a reasonable strategy and commitment by the Sponsor are agreed to. Projects granted this extension must be able to initiate the project within 18 months of the funding award. The TA may de-program a project if these requirements are not met and may provide additional exceptions on a case-by-case basis for extenuating circumstances.
- For projects awards that have requested to use Measure A and/or Measure W funding as leverage for other external grant opportunities, the TA will monitor a timeline for the applicable project phase to be fully funded: Projects costing under \$5 million must be fully funded within two years, and projects costing over \$5 million must be fully funded within five years. Once a project becomes fully funded, the project initiation requirements detailed above will apply.

## INVOICING REQUIREMENTS

- Sponsors will be required to invoice at minimum once a quarter from project initiation.
- The TA will update the Quarterly Status Reports format to include a stoplight to monitor and report on invoicing compliance
- If a project does not bill two quarters in a row, a project will be deemed inactive, and the TA will require a meeting with the Sponsor’s chief executive and project staff to review project progress. If a project does not bill for one year, then the TA Executive Director or Executive Officer may consider recommending the Board of Directors de-program the project.

## ATTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS

- Sponsors must include attribution that indicates work was funded with “Measure A Funds” or “Measure W Funds” or “Measures A/W Funds from the TA.” This provision applies to any project, or publication, that is funded in part or in whole by “Measure A Funds” or “Measure W Funds” or “Measures A/W Funds.” Acceptable forms of attribution include TA branding on Project-related documents, construction signs, public information materials, and any other applicable documents. Sponsor must comply with the TA’s External Attribution Guide, which may be updated from time to time and will be available on the TA’s website.

## 8.2.6 Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

### GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

All TA-funded projects are subject to monitoring and reporting requirements. Historically, monitoring and reporting requirements varied for each individual funding program. The Strategic Plan 2025-2029 merges the disparate requirements into a single requirement of formal reporting to the Quarterly Status Reports (QSRs). The TA may require additional monitoring requirements for Sponsors on a case-by-case basis. These requirements will also be included in the forthcoming



Principal Agreements that each eligible Sponsor must adopt to receive funding from the TA.

- Capital projects
  - Sponsors will be required to submit formal reports to be included in the TA Quarterly Status Reports (QSRs) during the planning, design development, and construction of capital projects. The content of the QSRs will be focused on project scope, schedule, budget, cash flow, and identification of potential project risks. A final report documenting the final project scope, schedule, and budget along with photo evidence will be required.
- Operational projects
  - Sponsors will be required to submit QSRs with content focused on project performance for operating projects. Sample performance measures include ridership, service effectiveness (cost per passenger), service quality, and customer satisfaction. If performance measures indicate less than acceptable performance, the TA will work with the Sponsor to set up a mitigation program and achieve improvements as a condition of continued funding from the TA.

### MAJOR PROJECTS ADVANCEMENT POLICY

For projects with projected total costs over \$25 million, Sponsors must present a presentation to the TA Board upon completion of the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance (PE/EV or PA/ED) phase of work prior to requesting funding for Final Design, Right-of-way, and Construction phases of work. The Sponsors must present information on project needs, benefits, impacts, and costs/funding plan to the TA Board of Directors and Community Advisory Committee. This can be done as part of the Draft Recommendations for a Calls for Projects cycle or as a standalone presentation.

The intent of the Major Projects Advancement Policy is to better inform the TA Board of Directors and Community Advisory Committee about potential trade-offs and impacts of projects earlier on in the development process once these considerations are known upon the completion of environmental review. This policy also applies to projects exempt from environmental review but with projected costs over \$25 million. Required analysis and impact assessment should be discussed with TA Executive and Director-level staff during preliminary engineering scoping.

As a Key Action for the Strategic Plan 2025-2029, the TA will also be developing Program Management Guidelines with updates to the oversight process for projects over \$25 million.

### CREDIBLE FUNDING PLAN

A Credible Funding Plan requirement applies to all projects subject to the Major Advancement Policy. The Credible Funding Plans should clearly lay out the TA's maximum contribution and how a Sponsor will use other local funds or external grant sources to fully fund the project. The Sponsors should acknowledge their responsibility for securing the remaining funding or request assistance from the TA. TA staff will create a standard template and review Credible Funding Plans to assess the assumptions for potential external grant awards.

The following level of effort is required based on the phase of work being request for funding in a CFP cycle:

- **Planning (PLAN):** For planning requests only that phase of work needs to be identified for funding.
- **Project Initiation Document (PID), Pre-Environmental/Environmental (PE/EV), or Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA/ED):** Following the development of a

planning study, a planning level cost estimate will be required for the total project cost and a full funding plan with estimated costs for all future phases of work is required to be signed by the Public Works Director (or similar position). Additionally, a description of how the project aligns with the California State Transportation Agency's (CalSTA) Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure goals by describing how a project is working to meet the metrics identified in the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Systemwide Investment Strategy (CSIS). This will be critical to understanding how the project may be able to leverage external state funding.

- **Final Design (PS&E), Right-of-Way (ROW), or Construction (CON):** Following the completion of preliminary engineering and environmental review phase, a revised preliminary engineering cost estimate will need to be prepared. The full funding plan with updated costs for all future phases of work is required to be signed by the Public Works Director (or similar position) for projects under \$25 million and by the City Manager (or other similar executive position) for projects over \$25 million in total cost.

## 8.3 TA ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### 8.3.1 Funding Agency

The primary role of the TA is to act as the funding agency to administer the Measures A and W transportation sales tax revenues. As part of this role, the TA actively assists Sponsors with leveraging funds and securing external grant awards, especially for major projects over \$25 million.

### 8.3.2 Sponsor

In 2016 and 2019, the TA Board of Directors authorized the agency to become an eligible Sponsor for the Measure A Key Congested Areas and Supplemental Roadways categories through minor Transportation Expenditure Plan amendments because the TA was not listed as an eligible Sponsor in the Measure A TEP (Reso 2016-12 and 2019-25). Subsequently in the 2021 Short-Range Highway Plan, the TA limited itself to sponsoring highway projects of countywide significance.

The Measure W Congestion Relief Plan does not specify eligible Sponsors for individual funding programs and permits eligible Sponsors to be further clarified in guidelines for each required Strategic Plan. However, consistent with the TA Board's direction in the Short-Range Highway Plan (adopted June 2021), the TA should continue to be eligible for projects of countywide significance in the Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion Improvements category.

### 8.3.3 Technical Assistance

The TA will take on an expanded technical assistance role to aid current and potential Sponsors in project delivery in various TA funding programs through several technical offerings, as described in the Technical Assistance Program in [Section 11](#).

## 8.4 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

### 8.4.1 Special Circumstance Requests

There will be special circumstances when Sponsors need to request Measures A and W funding outside the established funding processes discussed in [Section 5](#). The TA Board of Directors may make funding available outside established CFP cycles upon request based on the following criteria:

- Urgency
  - A project that calls for immediate construction to address a public safety need
  - A project that can realize significant cost savings if it can be constructed in an earlier timeframe
  - Loss of funding sources if the project is not constructed within a certain timeframe
  - Expected escalation of project development and construction costs outpaces the rate of growth of Measures A and W revenues
- Impact to the Measures A and W programs
  - Potential of the funding advance delaying other projects
  - Financial fees associated with advancing funds (the potential saving in implementation costs should be considered)

The TA will determine the method of delivering the advance at the time the request is granted by the TA Board of Directors. The TA should also develop CIPs to determine if advancing funds by either borrowing from other programs or using financing would be an economically and fiscally prudent means of delivering high-priority projects at a lower cost (adjusted for inflation) compared to waiting and implementing projects strictly using a pay-as-you-go approach.

#### **8.4.2 Financing and Bonding Backed by Sales Tax Revenue**

Both Measures A and W allow the TA to bond against their future tax revenues for the purpose of advancing the commencement of or expediting the delivery of transportation programs and projects. The bonding capacity is limited by future anticipated Measure A or Measure W revenues. The TA will weigh the benefits of bonding to facilitate timely implementation of programs and projects and avoidance of escalating construction costs against the costs of issuing debt. In recent years, interest rates have been relatively low, and the bonding agencies have been particularly receptive to issuing bonds supported by sales tax revenues. However, it will remain important for the TA to weigh the costs of a bond issue and the interest payments that will be required against the costs of deferring or delaying projects until the natural flow of funds is sufficient to move forward.

10

**Competitive  
Program  
Administration**

Competitive programs are those in which new projects proposed within each program category will compete for funding. The competitive programs are:

- Highway
- Transportation Demand Management
- Pedestrian and Bicycle
- Peninsula Shuttle Program
- Regional Transit Connections
- Grade Separations

## 10.1 CFP PROCESS

As described above, Measures A and W provide funding for a multitude of mobility programs in San Mateo County. While some programs call for direct, formulaic allocations (such as the Local Streets and Transportation category), other programs require programming and allocation actions by the Board, sometimes through a competitive selection process known as a “Call for Projects”. The frequency of CFPs differs by program.

The five general categories of criteria that are considered for project evaluation and selection during CFPs are: Need, Effectiveness, Equity & Engagement, Readiness, and Funding Leverage. The Strategic Plan 2025-2029 lays out specific evaluation criteria and supersedes previous Board-adopted short-range planning documents (Short-Range Highway Plan, Alternative Congestion Relief/Transportation Demand Management Plan, and Regional Transit Connections Plan). The criteria are reexamined with each TA Strategic Plan and may be modified, subject to Board approval, to retain flexibility and account for new policy directives, initiatives, and legislation that further promotes expenditure plan goals.

TA staff develop CFP funding recommendations based on input from CFP Project Review Committees. Funding recommendations from staff are then presented to the TA Board, which approves and programs the project awards, either as presented or with amendments.

### 10.1.1 Roles of Different Stakeholders & Decision Makers

#### PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEES

Project Review Committees, referred to above and sometimes called “Evaluation Committees,” are comprised of technical staff and stakeholders with interests and/or experience in relevant CFP topics. These committees score and recommend funding for projects based on selection criteria set by the TA Strategic Plan or listed in a related Board-adopted short-range planning document. For example, in the Ped/Bike CFP, the Project Review Committee often consists of county and regional technical staff (e.g., staff from Caltrans, MTC, the District, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (owner and operator of Caltrain) and volunteers from the county and/or C/ CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees.

#### COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The CAC provides input to staff for CFPs but does not direct staff’s work. CAC members generally provide input on whether proposed projects are eligible and in alignment with each Measure and its respective Goals/Core Principles, but do not conduct detailed evaluation scoring as part of Project Review Committees. CAC members can also recommend additional considerations, such as limiting awarded projects to a certain score threshold to retain funding for future CFP cycles. Staff

recommendations to the Board may take the CAC's input into account. In addition, the CAC can share its input directly with the Board.

## TA BOARD

The TA Board's role is to consider input from staff, Project Review Committees and the CAC, as well as funding capacity, to program and allocate funds to eligible projects, and may make modifications to proposed programs of projects. The Board may periodically assemble an ad hoc committee of its own members to work with staff before a final proposed program of projects is presented for Board approval.

### 10.1.2 Evaluation Criteria and Equity

A priority for the TA and its stakeholders for the Strategic Plan 2025-2029 is to elevate Equity as a primary evaluation category for all competitive funding programs. Following the adoption of the previous Strategic Plan 2020-2024, three competitive programs have implemented modified evaluation criteria to include Equity as an evaluation category in project selection and prioritization. The remaining programs that will now include the new Equity evaluation category include the Highway, Pedestrian & Bicycle, and Grade Separation programs.

For each Competitive Program the Equity evaluation category will include five individual evaluation criteria. The criteria are based on the ACR/TDM Equity evaluation category and have been expanded to include additional principles of equity as shown below.

- 1. Location-Based Equity:** does the project's geographic extent fall within a local, countywide, regional, state, or federal level equity priority community?
- 2. User-Based Equity:** does the project positively impact transportation affordability, mobility, or access for disadvantaged communities and serve more than one type of mode of travel? Tools such as the Housing and Transportation Affordability Index from the Center of Neighborhood Technology can help identify metrics such as transportation costs as percent of income and availability of autos per household.
- 3. Environmental Justice:** does the project fall within an Environmental Justice (EJ) community (i.e., California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment CalEnviroScreen 4.0) and positively impact those communities with respect to pollution and other public health factors?
- 4. Community Engagement/Involvement:** does the project have demonstrated support from relevant community stakeholders and CBOs in and around the affected communities? To what extent has the project involved/included community stakeholders/members in the project planning process, not solely as part of an areawide/citywide planning process?
- 5. Mitigation of Harmful Impacts:** does the project introduce any potential negative impacts for historically disadvantaged communities? If so, does the project identify ways to address/mitigate these impacts?

The evaluation criteria and associated scoring rubric metrics for each Competitive Program for the Equity evaluation category may vary slightly to best align with the goals and challenges of each program but will each follow the general principles as described above. While the Equity evaluation criteria will replace the previous Strategic Plan 2020-2024 sustainability evaluation category, the sustainability evaluation criteria will be relocated to other evaluation categories.

### 10.1.3 Geographic Distribution Framework

The Highways, Pedestrian & Bicycle, and Transportation Demand Management Programs each employ a geographic distribution framework to dedicate targets for available funds to different geographic areas and project subcategories, ensuring more parity in distributing funding awards. The two geographic area categories are small/coastal jurisdictions and mid/large jurisdictions. Unincorporated San Mateo County, Caltrans, the District, and Caltrain will be considered on a case-by-case basis as different project locations may have different contexts. For instance, projects or programs proposed in unincorporated communities of less than 20,000 people are eligible under the Small and Coastal category, while a countywide effort would be considered under the Mid and Large category.

The following jurisdictions are eligible to apply under each category.

<b>Small and Coastal Jurisdictions</b>	<b>Mid and Large Jurisdictions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atherton</li> <li>• Brisbane</li> <li>• Colma</li> <li>• Half Moon Bay</li> <li>• Hillsborough</li> <li>• Pacifica</li> <li>• Portola Valley</li> <li>• Woodside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belmont</li> <li>• Burlingame</li> <li>• Daly City</li> <li>• East Palo Alto</li> <li>• Foster City</li> <li>• Menlo Park</li> <li>• Millbrae</li> <li>• Redwood City</li> <li>• San Bruno</li> <li>• San Carlos</li> <li>• San Mateo</li> <li>• South San Francisco</li> </ul>

## 10.2 HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Highway Program consists of the Measure A Highways and Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion Improvements program categories to allow the TA to administer one consolidated funding program. The Highway Program and related policies are guided by the SRHP and corresponding Highway CIP which was adopted in 2021. The Strategic Plan 2025-2029 provides guidance that supersedes the SRHP. Projects must be included in the 2021-2030 CIP (or subsequent updates), the Measure A TEP, or the Measure W Congestion Relief Plan to be eligible for funding in the Highway Program. Additional projects may be considered with prior approval by TA staff on a case-by-case basis. The Highway Program comprises 27.5% of the total annual funds collected through Measure A and 22.5% of the total annual funds collected through Measure W.



### 10.2.1 Measure A Highways

The Measure A Transportation Expenditure Plan states:

*The Highway Program is divided into two components; funding for highway projects in key congested areas as designated by city, county and TA engineers and confirmed by public input; and funding for supplemental projects for all types of roadways (local-collector-arterial-state route) anywhere in the County.*

- **Key Congested Areas (KCA):** Each of these projects is deemed to be of equal importance and they are not expressed in any priority order – **17.3% of Measure A funds**
  - Highway 280 North Improvements
  - Coastside Highway Improvements
  - Highway 92 Improvements
  - Highway 101 Mid-County Improvements
  - Highway 101 South Improvements
- **County-wide Supplemental Roadway Projects (SR):** This project provides funding for supplemental roadway projects critical for congestion reduction in addition to those identified in the key congested areas. Supplemental roadway projects may include any type of roadway (local-collector-arterial-state route) anywhere in the County. A partial list of Candidate Projects is included below. Additional Candidate Projects may be submitted to the TA for consideration to account for changing needs during the 25 year term. Funds will not be adequate to construct all Candidate Projects. The TA will determine Candidate Project selection criteria and prioritization in the Strategic Plan as provided in the Implementation Guidelines. – **10.2% of Measure A funds**
  - Route 35 (I-280-Sneath Lane) widening
  - US 101/Produce Avenue Interchange
  - Route 92 (I-280-Route 35) truck climbing lane
  - Willow Road adaptive signal control system



- US 101 (Sierra Point Parkway – SF/SM County Line) auxiliary lanes
- Geneva Avenue extension
- I-280/John Daly Boulevard Overcrossing (north side) widening
- Junipero Serra Boulevard Improvements in Daly City, Colma and South San Francisco
- US 101/Candlestick Point Interchange
- US 101 (Sierra Point Parkway – San Bruno Avenue) auxiliary lanes
- I-280/I-380 local access improvement
- Highway 101/Sierra Point Pkwy Interchange replacement and Lagoon Way extension
- Triton Drive widening (Foster City)
- Sand Hill Road signal coordination
- *Woodside Road Widening (US 101-El Camino Real)*

### 10.2.2 Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion Improvements

The Measure W Congestion Relief Plan states:

*A total of twenty-two and one-half percent (22.5%) of Tax Proceeds will be invested in highway projects throughout the County designed to: provide congestion relief; reduce travel times; increase person throughput; improve highway and interchange operations, safety and access; and deploy advanced technologies and communications on the highways. Eligible candidate projects will be focused on highway and interchange facilities, including Highway 101, Highway 280, and other highways and their interchanges. Eligible candidate projects can include bicycle and pedestrian components or facilities that are incorporated into and enhance safety for a larger highway or interchange project.*

*Investment will be made on a discretionary basis according to criteria and award schedules established by the Authority.*

- **Highway Congestion Infrastructure Projects:** The focus of this program is on highways and highway interchanges, although projects that alleviate congestion on connecting arterial streets that impact the highway system are also eligible. – **21.5% of Measure W funds**
- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM):** TDM efforts with a nexus to vehicle miles travelled (VMT)/congestion relief that encourage non-Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV) trips and off-peak trip demand. This program subcategory is discussed further in the Transportation Demand Management Program section – **1% of Measure W funds**

### 10.2.3 Program Specific Guidelines

The program specific guidelines and requirements for this funding program are detailed in Table 19.

Program Guideline Category	Guideline Requirement												
Funding Cycles	2 Years												
Eligible Sponsors/ Eligible Sponsors	Caltrans, cities and county, C/CAG, TA for countywide significant projects, Express Lane JPA, and Commute.org (for countywide TDM)												
Matching Funds (Standard and Equity Based)	A minimum 10% funding match is required with each phase of work for all projects. A cash match is required for all phases of work except for right of way acquisition												
Minimum Funding Request	N/A												
Maximum Funding Request	N/A												
Maximum Project Contribution (All Phases)	Up to 50% of total project cost (Countywide Significance) Up to 75% of total project cost (local projects only)												
Number of Applications	N/A												
Timely Use of Funds: Expenditure Timeline	<p>Allocated Measures A and W funds are generally expected to be expended on the project within the following time horizons:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Phase</th> <th>Upper Duration (months)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Preliminary Planning Study</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Initiation Document</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Approval/Environmental Document</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design</td> <td>36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>If the scope of work cannot be completed within the time of performance for the phases specified above, Sponsors must submit a request in writing to the TA no later than six months before the end of the time for performance to request a time extension. The TA will review the request and grant an extension if it is deemed to be justified at the TA's discretion.</p>	Phase	Upper Duration (months)	Preliminary Planning Study	18	Project Initiation Document	18	Project Approval/Environmental Document	30	Design	36	Construction	42
Phase	Upper Duration (months)												
Preliminary Planning Study	18												
Project Initiation Document	18												
Project Approval/Environmental Document	30												
Design	36												
Construction	42												
Additional Monitoring and Reporting Submittals	N/A												

Table 19: Highway Program Guidelines Table

## 10.2.4 Additional Requirements or Policies

### GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION AND PROGRAM CATEGORIES

The Highway Program incorporates the following geographic distribution and program category framework to allow the TA to more fairly evaluate projects against projects in similar settings in San Mateo County. The geographic categories follow the geographic distribution framework described in **Section 10.1.3**. The proposed distribution targets are as follows:

- Small/Coastal (15%)
- Mid/Large (50%)
- Countywide Significance (35%)

Projects are eligible to apply under the Countywide Significance category that satisfy the requirements laid out in the definition for Countywide Significance stated below:

- Projects must meet at least two of the following screening criteria:
- Project serves a significant amount of person throughput, inclusive of all modes
- Project serves a significant amount of inter-county traffic
- Project significantly improves connections between two or more geographic areas of the county
- Project is a priority component of a countywide or regional multijurisdictional effort

### PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE HIGHWAY OVERCROSSINGS

“Standalone overcrossings” refers to an individual Pedestrian/Bicycle overcrossing that is not a part of a larger highway interchange, operational or safety project. Both the 1988 and Measure A 2004 TEPs include funding for Pedestrian and Bicycle projects in a category listed separately from the Highway Program category of projects. Only 0.01% of revenues under Original Measure A were set aside for Pedestrian and Bicycle projects. The percentage allocation for these projects increased relatively dramatically to 3% in New Measure A. The 2004 TEP includes a non-exclusive list of potential Pedestrian and Bicycle eligible for part of this 3%, including “paths, trails and bridges over roads and highways,” and specifically names overcrossings of Highway 101 at or near Millbrae Avenue, Hillcrest, Hillsdale Boulevard, Ralston Avenue and Willow Road. This clearly indicates the voters’ intent to fund standalone overcrossings for bicycle and pedestrian use from the 3% portion of Measure A funds in this Pedestrian and Bicycle program and not as singular projects from the Measure A Highway Program. As with under Measure A, Measure W enumerated that a standalone Pedestrian and Bicycle overcrossing would not be eligible under the Measure W Highway Program separately from a larger highway or interchange, operational or safety project.

### ACCESSORY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ELEMENTS

Many Highway Program projects include accessory/complementary bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure; examples include US 101/Woodside (State Route 84) Interchange and Highway 1/Manor Avenue Overcrossing. Complete Streets elements that help all users of the transportation are eligible components of projects and are encouraged to address many of the evaluation criteria used in the TA’s Calls for Projects. The New Measure A Supplemental Roadways Category allows for the funding of some projects not directly included in the highway system, such as arterials. Those roadway projects could include Complete Streets elements but may not be solely pedestrian and/or bicycle infrastructure. The Measure W Congestion Relief Plan explicitly states: “Eligible candidate projects

can include bicycle and pedestrian components or facilities that are incorporated or enhance safety for a larger highway or interchange project.” Measure W Highway funds must be spent on projects on or across the highway system; the Congestion Relief Plan does not have a “Supplemental Roadways” subcategory comparable to New Measure A.

### 10.2.5 Evaluation Criteria

Projects submitted to the Highway Program are evaluated and prioritized by a TA-assembled review committee. Evaluation criteria for the Highway program are separated into five thematic areas and are weighted by Measure W core principles. The legend for the abbreviations is in **Appendix H-2**.

All potential candidate projects submitted for funding consideration will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria listed in Table 21. Note that planning studies and environmental phase requests will be evaluated solely based on the Need, Equity & Community Engagement, Readiness, and Funding Leverage categories given the lack of technical analysis likely not completed until the completion of the more detailed environmental document. However, point values will be reweighted for comparison with all projects. The pre- and post-environmental phase evaluation category weights for the Highway program are detailed in Table 20.

Strategic Plan Evaluation Categories	Pre-Environmental Phases	Post-Environmental Phases
Need	50%	25%
Effectiveness	N/A	40%
Equity & Community Engagement	30%	25%
Readiness	10%	5%
Funding Leverage	10%	5%

Table 20: Highway Program Evaluation Criteria Weightings

Highway Program Evaluation Criteria (Measures A and W)	Applicable Measure W Core Principles	Applicable Measure A Goals	Maximum Points Available
<b>Need</b>			<b>25</b>
Severity of current and projected congestion	W1, W2, W4, W5, W6, W8, W10	A1	5
Need to improve access and connections to jobs, housing, transit hubs and other high activity centers, supporting existing economic activity and spurring new economic development in the vicinity	W1, W2, W4, W8, W9, W10, W11	A2	5
Project recognized in adopted statewide, regional, county or local planning and fund programming documents and demonstrates coordination with adjacent projects/integration of inter-related projects	W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W8, W9	A4	5
Identified safety issue (e.g., documented collision history due to site conditions that is average for the facility type) higher than	W1, W6, W8, W9, W10	A3	4
Project is primarily an operational improvement (e.g., safety or ITS) rather than infrastructure expansion (e.g., adding general purpose lanes)	W1, W2, W4, W6, W8	A4	3
Regional/Countywide significance, including where applicable, location and relevance on the State Highway Congestion & Safety Performance Assessment for San Mateo County	W1, W2, W6, W8	A1, A2	3
<b>Effectiveness</b>			<b>40</b>
Potential increase in person through-put through accommodating multiple transportation modes (e.g., pedestrian & bicycle access as well as transit infrastructure) where contextually appropriate and to the extent feasible (Complete Streets), including infrastructure for transit (e.g., express lanes, bus only lanes)	W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W8, W9, W10, W11	A2, A4	7
Ability to relieve congestion/performance improvement (e.g., reduces/eliminates bottleneck) and associated potential travel time savings	W1, W2, W4, W5, W8, W10, W11	A1	7
Potential VMT reduction per capita	W2, W3, W4, W8, W9, W10, W11	A1	7
Ability to address safety issue (e.g., project improves site conditions to reduce potential for collisions)	W1, W6, W8, W9, W10	A3	7
Value: Benefit relative to the amount of funding requested (high impact, low cost - "bang for the buck")	W1, W3, W4, W5, W6, W7, W8		5
Degree to which project reduces GHG emissions and improves air quality	W1, W3, W5, W6, W8, W9, W10	A1	4
Innovative low environmental impact/green infrastructure, including resiliency elements to address climate change	W2, W3, W6, W9	A3, A4	2
Project accounts for long term repair/maintenance needs and ownership (e.g., uses materials with long life cycles, low maintenance costs & has a funding plan for maintenance)	W7	A4	1
<b>Equity &amp; Community Support</b>			<b>25</b>
Location Based Equity: Project improves transportation options for disadvantaged communities/areas	W2	A4	8
User Based Equity: Project Improves transportation affordability, access, or mobility for disadvantaged users	W2	A4	5
Environmental Justice: Degree to which project mitigates pollution and/or improves public health conditions for vulnerable populations	W3, W6, W8	A3, A4	7
Impact project has on low income, transit dependent, and/or other historically disadvantaged communities	W3, W6, W8	A4	0*

Highway Program Evaluation Criteria (Measures A and W)	Applicable Measure W Core Principles	Applicable Measure A Goals	Maximum Points Available
Demonstrates stakeholder support, community engagement, and CBO/advocacy involvement			5
<b>Readiness</b>			<b>5</b>
Clear and complete proposal			2
Project status and schedule			1
Has a credible cost estimate and funding plan			1
Ease and speed of implementation			1
<b>Funding</b>			<b>5</b>
Percent of matching fund contribution			4
Private sector contribution, including public/private partnerships			1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 21: Highway Program Evaluation Criteria

\* No associated positive point value, up to 2 possible negative points (-2 – 0 range)

## SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Project Inventory  
June 3, 2021

**Table 4-1. Previously Submitted Project Details**

TA Project #	Project Name	Sponsor (Agency)	Next Feasible Phase	Total Project Cost	Cost of Next Feasible Phase	Measure A Category	Countywide Significance?
<b>PLANNING &amp; FEASIBILITY STUDIES</b>							
TA-000625	US 101 Candlestick Point Interchange Environmental Studies	Brisbane	Project Initiation Document	\$47,700,000	\$500,000	SR	
TA-000710	Geneva Avenue Extension	Brisbane	Preliminary Planning Study	\$95,000,000	\$500,000		
TA-000733	SR 92 from US 101 to I-280	San Mateo	Preliminary Planning Study	\$551,000,000	\$1,000,000		Yes
TA-000792	SR 92/South Delaware Interchange Improvement	San Mateo	Preliminary Planning Study	\$76,600,000	\$1,000,000	KCA	
TA-000796	I-380 Congestion Improvements	San Bruno	Preliminary Planning Study	\$146,000,000	\$500,000		
TA-100321	Route 1/Manor Drive Overcrossing Project	Pacifica	Preliminary Planning Study	\$24,236,885	\$1,720,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$940,536,885</b>	<b>\$5,220,000</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</b>							
TA-000801	US 101/ Peninsula Avenue Interchange Project	San Mateo	Final Design (PS&E)	\$120,000,000	\$6,557,000	SR	
TA-000803	US 101 / Produce Avenue Interchange Project	South San Francisco	Environmental	\$94,150,000	\$8,000,000	SR	
TA-100302	US 101 Managed Lanes North Project (I-380 to SF/SM Co Line)	TA & C/CAG	Final Design (PS&E)	\$349,600,000	\$16,800,000	KCA	Yes
TA-100318	US 101 / SR 92 Interchange Area Improvements Project	TA & C/CAG	Final Design (PS&E)	\$30,017,000	\$2,817,000	KCA	Yes
TA-100319	US 101 / SR 92 Direct Connector Project	TA & C/CAG	Final Design (PS&E)	\$194,400,000	\$12,200,000	KCA	Yes
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$788,167,000</b>	<b>\$46,374,000</b>		

KCA – Key Congested Areas; SR – Supplemental Roadways

## SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN

Project Inventory  
June 3, 2021

**Table 4-1. Previously Submitted Project Details (continued)**

TA Project #	Project Name	Sponsor (Agency)	Development Phase	Total Project Cost	Cost of Next Feasible Phase	Measure A Category	Countywide Significance?
<b>ENGINEERING DESIGN</b>							
TA-000768	US 101/ Woodside Road (SR 84) Interchange Project	Redwood City	Right-of-Way	\$279,450,000	\$60,000,000	KCA	Yes
TA-000794	SR 1 (Mid Coast) Congestion, Throughput & Safety Improvements	San Mateo County	Preliminary Engineering	\$16,219,815	\$1,000,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$295,669,815</b>	<b>\$61,000,000</b>		
<b>RIGHT-OF-WAY &amp; CONSTRUCTION</b>							
TA-000791	US 101 Express Lanes Project (SCL/SM Co Line to I-380)	TA & C/CAG	Construction	\$581,136,036	5,000,000	SR	Yes
TA-000793	SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvement Project at Gray Whale Cove	San Mateo County	Final Design (PS&E)	\$3,179,505	\$925,000	SR	
TA-000795	US 101/ Holly Street Interchange Project	San Carlos	Construction	\$18,970,000	\$18,070,000	SR	
TA-000800	US 101/ University Avenue Interchange Improvements	East Palo Alto	Final Design (PS&E)	\$15,660,000	\$15,660,000		
TA-000822	SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvement Project: Wavecrest Road to Poplar St	Half Moon Bay	Project Closeout	\$5,090,000	\$4,040,000		
TA-000823	SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvement Project: Main Street to Kehoe Avenue	Half Moon Bay	Construction	\$11,162,290	\$9,893,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$635,197,831</b>	<b>\$53,588,000</b>		
<b>LANDSCAPING/CLOSEOUT</b>							
TA-000621	US 101 / Broadway Interchange Project	Burlingame	Landscaping	\$2,080,000	\$2,080,000	KCA	
TA-000622	US 101 / Willow Road Interchange Landscaping	Menlo Park	Landscaping	\$6,360,000	\$5,560,000	KCA	
TA-000805	SR 92 / SR 82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Project	San Mateo	Landscaping	\$2,000,000	\$1,870,000	KCA	
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$10,440,000</b>	<b>\$9,510,000</b>		
<b>TOTAL COST</b>				<b>\$2,670,011,531</b>	<b>\$175,692,000</b>		

KCA – Key Congested Areas; SR – Supplemental Roadways

Notes: (1) Total project cost includes expenditures incurred prior to FY2021 in the amount of \$612,133,921. (2) For the purposes of Measure A, any newly submitted projects that are non-KCA designated may be assigned an SR designation. For the purposes of this analysis, only previously assigned Pipeline-SR-designated projects in Measure A were included in the SR cost estimate.



**SHORT RANGE HIGHWAY PLAN**

Project Inventory  
June 3, 2021

**Table 4-2. Newly Submitted Project Details**

TA Project #	Project Name	Sponsor (Agency)	Development Phase	Total Project Cost	Cost of Next Feasible Phase	Measure A Category	Countywide Significance?
<b>PLANNING AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES</b>							
UA-000101	I-280/John Daly Boulevard Overcrossing North Side Widening for Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodation	Daly City	Preliminary Planning Study	\$16,650,000	\$1,000,000		
UA-000102	I-380 Connection (via new Haskins Way Bridge)	South San Francisco	Preliminary Planning Study	\$128,000,000	\$1,000,000		
UA-000104	Kelly Avenue & SR 1 Safety Improvement Project	Half Moon Bay	Not initiated	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000		
UA-000105	SR 82 (El Camino Real), Safety and Operational Improvements	Redwood City	Project Initiation Document	\$30,000,000	\$500,000		
UA-000106	SR 84 (Woodside Road), Safety and Operational Improvements	Redwood City	Not initiated	\$40,000,000	\$250,000		
UA-000107	US 101/Sierra Point Pkwy Interchange replacement and Lagoon Way Extension	Brisbane	Preliminary Planning Study	\$24,000,000	\$500,000		
UA-000108	Roadway Facility Improvements between US 101 and Dumbarton Bridge	C/CAG	Not initiated	\$7,000,000	\$500,000		Yes
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$247,150,000</b>	<b>\$5,250,000</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</b>							
UA-000103	ITS Improvements in Daly City, Brisbane, and Colma	C/CAG	Final Design (PS&E)	\$10,885,000	\$350,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$10,885,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>		
<b>TOTAL COST</b>				<b>\$258,035,000</b>	<b>\$5,600,000</b>		

Note: One additional project was submitted by San Mateo County for the Connect the Coastline Operational and Safety Project after the evaluation process was finalized, but it is included in this CIP and will be eligible for highway program funding.

Attachment 1. Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways Candidate Roadways Update (June 2025)

Jurisdiction	Roadway Name	Extents	Previously Awarded TA Funds?	Work has been Initiated?	Could be Completed by 2030?	Facility is a Highway or Improves Access to Highway?	Proposed Project Accommodates Multiple Modes? (If known)	Estimated Funding Needed	Roadway Classification	Current Project Phase (Spring 2025)
<b>Corridors Recommended for Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways (Met at least three screening criteria)</b>										
Atherton	Marsh Road	Fair Oaks Avenue to Middlefield Road	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
Atherton	Middlefield Road	Encinal Avenue to Ravenswood Avenue	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
Atherton	Alameda de las Pulgas	Stockbridge Avenue to Mills Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)
Belmont	Alameda de las Pulgas	Ralston Avenue to Dartmouth Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$19,849,643	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)
Brisbane	Geneva Avenue	Geneva Avenue/Bayshore Boulevard to US 101/Candlestick Point interchange	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$195,000,000	Arterial or Main St	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Brisbane	Sierra Point Parkway	Lagoon Road/US 101 Ramps to Shoreline Court	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$1,715,000	Arterial or Main St	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Brisbane	Bayshore Boulevard	Tunnel Avenue to Southern City Limit	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$7,500,000	Arterial or Main St	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Brisbane	Tunnel Avenue/Lagoon Road	Bayshore Boulevard to Sierra Point Parkway	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Burlingame	Old Bayshore Highway	Millbrae Avenue to Broadway	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$28,500,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
C/CAG	US 101	North of I-380 to San Mateo/San Francisco Countyline	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	\$327,000,000	State Highway	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Colma	Hillside Boulevard	Serramonte Boulevard to Lawndale Boulevard	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$9,000,000	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)
Colma	Serramonte Boulevard West	El Camino Real (SR-82) to Junipero Serra Boulevard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$6,637,500	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
Colma	Junipero Serra Boulevard/Serramonte Boulevard	Junipero Serra Boulevard-Serramonte Boulevard intersection/I-280 On Ramps	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$3,030,000	State Highway	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
Colma/South San Francisco	El Camino Real (State Route 82)	Albert M. Teglia to Hickey Boulevard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$49,460,000	State Highway	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Daly City	Hillside Boulevard	Mission Street to East Market Street	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$2,335,000	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
Daly City	John Daly Boulevard	Skyline Boulevard to Junipero Serra Boulevard	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$26,150,000	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
East Palo Alto	East Bayshore	Sarratoga Avenue to University Avenue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$4,313,029	Local or Collector	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)
East Palo Alto	Woodland Avenue	University Avenue to West Bayshore Road	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$6,000,000	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
East Palo Alto	Sarratoga Avenue	East Bayshore Road to Newbridge Street	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$1,500,000	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
East Palo Alto	Newbridge Street	Willow Road to Saratoga Avenue	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$400,000	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
Half Moon Bay	Poplar Street	Highway 1 to Railroad Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$6,930,000	Local or Collector	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
Half Moon Bay	Kelly Avenue	State Beach Parking Lot to San Benito Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$13,800,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
Half Moon Bay	Main Street	Highway 1 North to Highway 1 South	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$19,900,000	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)

Attachment 1. Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways Candidate Roadways Update (June 2025)

Jurisdiction	Roadway Name	Extents	Previously Awarded TA Funds? Work has been Initiated? Could be Completed by 2030? Facility is a Highway or Improves Access to Highway? Proposed Project Accommodates Multiple Modes? (If known)						Estimated Funding Needed	Roadway Classification	Current Project Phase (Spring 2025)
			No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes			
Menlo Park	O'Brien Drive	Willow Road to University Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$4,400,000	Local or Collector	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
Menlo Park	Middlefield Road	Ravenswood Avenue to Woodland Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$1,400,000	Local or Collector	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
Millbrae	Millbrae Avenue	Magnolia Avenue to Old Bayshore Highway	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$12,250,000	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
Pacifica	Francisco Boulevard	Highway 1 Off-ramp to Sharp Park Road	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$1,650,000	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
Pacifica	Oceana Boulevard	Milagra Drive to Clarendon Road	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$2,251,926	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
Redwood City	Veterans Boulevard	Whipple Avenue to Woodside Road	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$3,450,000	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
Redwood City	Industrial Way	Whipple Avenue to G St (San Carlos border)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$1,200,000	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
Redwood City	Whipple Avenue	El Camino Real to East Bayshore Road	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$1,900,000	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
Redwood City	Jefferson Avenue	El Camino Real to Farm Hill Boulevard	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$4,350,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
Redwood City	Broadway	Main Street to Woodside Road	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$2,500,000	Local or Collector	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)	
Redwood City/San Mateo County	Bay Road	Woodside Road to 15th Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Local or Collector	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Bruno	San Bruno Avenue	El Camino Real to US 101 Interchange	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$8,605,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Bruno	Huntington Avenue	Herman Street to San Bruno BART Transit Center Exit	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$6,000,000	Local or Collector	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)	
San Carlos	Industrial Road	Quarry Road (Belmont City Limit) to G Street (Redwood City Limit)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
San Carlos	Holly Street	Twin Dolphin Way (Redwood City) to Elm Street	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$57,900,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Carlos	San Carlos Ave	Beverly Drive to Dartmouth Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$2,100,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Carlos	San Carlos Ave	El Camino Real to Prospect Street	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$29,860,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Carlos	Laurel Street	Arroyo Street to San Carlos Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$39,500,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Mateo	Hillsdale Boulevard	Saratoga Drive to South Norfolk Street	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
San Mateo County	State Route 1	Pacifica City Limit to Half Moon Bay City Limit	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$76,100,000	State Highway	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)	
San Mateo County	Alpine Road	La Mesa Drive to Stowe Lane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Mateo County	Hillside Boulevard	East Market Street to Hoffman Street	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$9,350,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Mateo County	Pescadero Creek Road	State Route 1 to State Route 84	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$4,963,490	Local or Collector	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
San Mateo	19th Avenue/ Fashion Island Boulevard	Pacific Boulevard to Mariners Island Boulevard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$11,375,000	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)	
San Mateo/Burlingame	Peninsula Avenue	El Camino Real to Coyote Point Drive	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$21,139,000	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only	
South San Francisco	Hillside Boulevard/Sister Cities Boulevard	Chestnut Avenue to Airport Boulevard	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$8,855,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)	
South San Francisco	Westborough Boulevard/Chestnut Avenue	Skyline Boulevard to Antoinette Lane	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$14,718,500	Arterial or Main St	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)	

Attachment 1. Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways Candidate Roadways Update (June 2025)

Jurisdiction	Roadway Name	Extents	Previously Awarded TAF Funds?	Work has been Initiated?	Could be Completed by 2030?	Facility is a Highway or Improves Access to Highway?	Proposed Project Accommodates Multiple Modes? (If known)	Estimated Funding Needed	Roadway Classification	Current Project Phase (Spring 2025)
South San Francisco	Junipero Serra Boulevard	Hickey Boulevard to Avalon Drive	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$14,718,500	Arterial or Main St	Preliminary Engineering/Environmental Clearance (PE/ENV)
South San Francisco	Airport Boulevard/Bayshore Boulevard	Grand Ave to Tower Place/City Limits (North)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$30,150,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
South San Francisco	Grand Avenue/East Grand Avenue	Spruce Ave to Haskins Way	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$65,800,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
South San Francisco	Gateway Boulevard	Oyster Point Boulevard to East Grand Avenue	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$13,100,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
South San Francisco	Oyster Point Boulevard	Airport Boulevard to Gull Drive	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$35,656,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
South San Francisco	Gateway Boulevard/South Airport Boulevard	East Grand Avenue to Bay Trail/North Access Road	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$30,547,500	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
South San Francisco	Utah Avenue	South Airport Boulevard to Bay Trail	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$10,785,000	Arterial or Main St	Corridor Plan/Feasibility Study (PLAN)
South San Francisco	Utah Avenue Overcrossing	Utah Avenue to San Mateo Avenue	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	\$126,000,000	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)
South San Francisco	US 101/Produce Avenue	San Mateo Avenue/Produce Avenue to Airport Boulevard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$15,000,000	Arterial or Main St	Final Design - Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)
<b>Corridors Not Recommended for Measure A Highway Program Supplemental Roadways (Did not meet at least three screening criteria)</b>										
Menlo Park	Bay Road	Marsh Road to Willow Road	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	\$2,100,000	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
San Carlos	Alameda De Las Pulgas	San Carlos Avenue to Eaton Avenue	No	No	No	No	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
San Carlos	Brittan Avenue	Leslie Drive to US 101 SB Ramps	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
San Carlos	Crestview Drive	Malabar Court to Edmonds Drive	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
San Carlos	Cedar Street	Eaton Avenue to Walton Street	No	No	No	No	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
San Carlos	Arroyo Street	El Camino Real to Tamrack Street	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Local or Collector	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only
San Carlos	Old County Road	Quarry Road (Belmont City Limit) to Bing Street (Redwood City Limit)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Estimate Unknown	Arterial or Main St	Not Initiated - Identified improvements in citywide or similar plan only