



# Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 9

**DATE:** March 26, 2026

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming

**SUBJECT:** 4/14/2026 Board Meeting: Adopt San Francisco’s One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County Framework, Including Recommending Programming \$2,153,000 to the Transportation Authority for Congestion Management Agency Planning, \$5,843,000 to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency’s Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program, and \$48,660,000 to Projects to be Selected Through a Call for Projects

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Information   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action</p> <p>Adopt San Francisco’s OBAG Cycle 4 County Framework, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommending programming \$2,153,000 to the Transportation Authority for Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Planning, \$5,843,000 to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency’s (SFMTA’s) Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Non-Infrastructure Program, and \$48,660,000 to projects to be selected through a call for projects</li> <li>• Project Screening and Prioritization Criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>The Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC’s) OBAG Cycle 4 program directs federal funding to projects and programs that implement the Regional Transportation Plan (Plan Bay Area 2050+), with particular focus on projects that support areas within a mile of Priority Development Areas (PDAs) - places near public transit planned for new homes, jobs, and community amenities - or Transit-Oriented Communities (TOCs) - places within one half-mile from transit stops and stations that are designed to enable people to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fund Allocation</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fund Programming</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Legislation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plan/Study</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capital Project Oversight/Delivery</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Contract/Agreement</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</li> </ul>
---	--



access and use transit more often for more types of trips. MTC has set aside \$319 million in federal funds for the OBAG 4 County Program for a wide range of local priority projects that support shared objectives, with an emphasis on local road safety, complete streets, and state of good repair. As the CMA for San Francisco, the Transportation Authority is responsible for identifying San Francisco's OBAG 4 county priorities and submitting them to MTC which will select projects from a regionwide candidate pool. MTC has requested that by October 31, 2026, counties submit project lists totaling 120% of our nomination targets which are based on a formula considering population and housing production, with an emphasis on affordable housing. San Francisco's 120% target is 14.8% of the funds available regionwide or \$56.7 million over four fiscal years (2026/27-2029/30). The recommended actions include a San Francisco OBAG 4 county framework, with a funding distribution for our \$56.7 million 120% target (Attachment 1) and project screening and prioritization criteria (Attachment 3) for a \$48.7 million competitive call for projects. Similar to previous cycles and as allowed by MTC, we are recommending \$2.2 million for CMA planning activities to supplement our base CMA planning funds from MTC and \$5.8 million for the SFMTA's SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program (Attachment 2), a long standing program funded through MTC-established set asides in prior OBAG cycles and matched with our sales tax funds. At the Board meeting, SFMTA staff will present an update on the SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program. MTC will evaluate nominated projects and select the project priorities in early 2027.

## **BACKGROUND**

In May 2012, MTC adopted the inaugural OBAG Program (Cycle) 1 to better integrate the region's federal transportation program with its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). Pursuant to SB 375 (Steinberg 2008), the SCS aligns regional transportation planning with land use and housing in order to meet state greenhouse gas reduction targets. The OBAG County Program established funding guidelines and policies to reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and that have



historically produced housing. It also promoted transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), which are places near public transit planned for new homes, jobs and community amenities, created and planned by local governments, which nominate eligible areas to the Association of Bay Area Governments for adoption. In November 2015, MTC adopted the OBAG Cycle 2 framework, largely maintaining the same framework and policies as OBAG Cycle 1, with some refinements that attempted to address the region's growing challenge with the lack of housing and affordable housing, in particular. In January 2022, MTC adopted the OBAG Cycle 3 framework, maintaining the same goals as prior OBAG cycles while soliciting nominations for 120% of the available funding capacity for the County Program, from which MTC selected projects to award the available funding. The San Francisco projects funded through OBAG Cycles 1, 2, and 3 are shown Attachment 6.

In February 2026, MTC adopted the OBAG Cycle 4 framework. Like past cycles, the OBAG 4 framework is designed to advance the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan, incorporate recent MTC policy initiatives, address federal planning and programming requirements, advance equity and safety, and emphasize a partnership between MTC and county transportation agencies, like the Transportation Authority, to identify local priorities and administer the program within each county.

As the CMA for San Francisco, the Transportation Authority is responsible for partnering with MTC to identify local priorities and administer San Francisco's OBAG Cycle 4 County Program.

## **DISCUSSION**

**Nomination Target.** As part of the OBAG Cycle 4 County Program, MTC set nomination targets for each county based on a formula that considers population and housing (RHNA, production, and additional weight based on affordability). To ensure a sufficient pool of project nominations, MTC is soliciting nominations for 120% of the available funding capacity for the County Program. San Francisco's estimated share of the OBAG Cycle 4 County Program is 14.8% or \$56.7 million for our 120% target and about \$47.2 million at 100% of available programming over the four-year OBAG Cycle 4 period (Fiscal Years 2026/27-2029/30). MTC's guidelines indicate that targets do not commit or imply a guaranteed share of funding to any individual county.



Our proposed Funding Framework Distribution of those funds is summarized in the table below and detailed in Attachment 1.

Table 1. San Francisco OBAG Cycle 4 County Program Funding Framework Distribution

CMA Planning (supplemental funds)	\$2,153,000
SFMTA SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program	\$5,843,000
Competitive Call for Projects	\$48,660,000
<b>Total Nomination Target (120%)</b>	<b>\$56,656,000</b>

CMA Planning. CMAs are required to perform various planning, fund programming, monitoring, and outreach functions in compliance with regional, state, and federal requirements. As was done in prior OBAG cycles, MTC sets aside a minimum base amount of funds for CMAs’ planning activities which is \$4,958,294 for San Francisco over the four-year OBAG 4 cycle. MTC also continues to allow CMAs to designate additional funding from their County Program to augment this funding for planning efforts. We recommend augmenting CMA planning funds by \$2.2 million, or 3.8% of the 120% target to allow us to support CMA planning efforts at the same expenditure level as recent years. CMA planning efforts over the next four years include, but are not limited to long range planning such as the San Francisco Transportation Plan and follow-on studies, PDA planning, TOC planning, and equity studies, modal market surveys, among others.

SFMTA’s SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program. Consistent with prior OBAG cycles and as permitted by MTC, we recommend prioritizing San Francisco’s SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program for \$5.8 million in OBAG 4 funds. This program provides educational events and outreach activities intended to encourage students, caretakers, and families to use active and shared transportation modes such as walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling to get to and from school. In previous OBAG cycles, MTC established region wide SRTS investment targets and allowed counties to prioritize OBAG funds for SRTS as a set-aside in the County Program Framework. MTC no longer has a regional SRTS investment target for OBAG 4; however, CMAs may continue to recommend an OBAG funding set-aside for SRTS programs by designating funds in the County Program Framework. The recommended funds, along with Prop L match (programmed in the Prop L Safer and Complete Streets 5-Year Prioritization Program) would provide funding stability for



the SRTS Non-Infrastructure program starting July 2027 (when OBAG Cycle 3 and Prop L matching funds are anticipated to be fully expended) through September 2030. The proposed SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program scope, schedule, cost, and funding plan are detailed in Attachment 2.

Competitive Call for Projects. For the remaining \$48.7 million in County Program nomination target funds, we will identify and select projects through a competitive and transparent process, as required by MTC. The following section provides more detail on the call for projects process, including the proposed screening and prioritization criteria staff will use to evaluate project applications, the call for projects schedule, and the outreach plan.

**San Francisco's OBAG Cycle 4 Call for Projects.** OBAG 4 provides a high degree of flexibility in terms of what types of projects can be funded, provided that for urbanized counties like San Francisco, at least 80% of the OBAG 4 County Program funding be invested in projects that are located partially or entirely within a mile of a PDA or TOC. Given the extent of PDA and TOC coverage in San Francisco, functionally all of the city meets this condition. Eligible project types are determined by federal fund source eligibility (Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ)) and MTC policies, and include, but are not limited to, transit reliability and access improvements; safety, streetscape, and complete streets improvements; SRTS capital projects; and PDA and TOC planning and implementation.

Screening and Prioritization Criteria. MTC's OBAG 4 guidelines lay out extensive project selection requirements, including screening and prioritization criteria, eligible project types and sponsors, and public outreach, all of which are intended to comply with federal requirements and meet the goals of OBAG 4. MTC requires CMAs to use its established screening and prioritization criteria but allows CMAs to add criteria to prioritize projects based on the needs of the county. County nominated projects will go into the regionwide pool for evaluation and prioritization by MTC

Attachment 3 includes the proposed project screening and prioritization criteria that staff propose to use to identify San Francisco's OBAG 4 project nominations. In order to maximize funds for San Francisco projects, our evaluation criteria take into consideration the need to position projects to score well regionally. MTC's project evaluation includes up to 75 points for CMA prioritization, 10 points for regional alignment, 5 points for federal performance goals, and 10 points for deliverability. Projects that are eligible for federal air quality improvement funds (CMAQ) can



receive up to 10 additional points in MTC's project evaluation to help ensure MTC has enough projects to use up all the CMAQ funds.

The proposed San Francisco-specific prioritization criteria are essentially the same as the Board-approved criteria used for the previous OBAG cycle, such as multi-modal benefits, multiple project coordination, and safety. We have also incorporated additional San Francisco guidance (examples) for projects that reduce emissions, improve the resilience of the transportation system to climate change, and manage stormwater, as these considerations were added to MTC's County Program guidelines for OBAG 4. Given the challenge of meeting the timely use of funds requirements associated with federal OBAG funds and MTC's emphasis on deliverability, we will give strong consideration to project readiness when evaluating projects. For instance, applications must demonstrate that the project will obligate OBAG 4 funds, or transfer funds to the Federal Transit Administration, by the September 30, 2031 obligation deadline. As administrator of a variety of fund sources, we also will consider the amount and timing of funding availability for other sources, as well as their specific requirements and purposes, in order to match projects with the most fitting funding sources as part of the application evaluation.

Call for Projects Schedule. Following the Board's first approval of the proposed framework on April 14, we will release the call for projects contingent upon final approval by the Board on April 28. Attachment 4 shows the schedule by which we propose soliciting projects from sponsors, evaluating applications, and recommending the project list to the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and Board in October in order to meet MTC's October 31 deadline.

Outreach Plan. Consistent with MTC's OBAG Cycle 4 guidelines, our public outreach will build on outreach from recent comprehensive San Francisco efforts, including for the San Francisco Transportation Plan. These efforts include outreach regarding priorities for transportation investments in San Francisco, with an emphasis on Equity Priority Communities (see Attachment 5 for map) and disadvantaged populations. In addition, for the OBAG 4 call for projects, our public outreach approach will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Public meetings of the Transportation Authority CAC and Board
- Presentations and information sharing with the Bicycle Advisory Committee (which will also satisfy OBAG 4 requirements to make Complete Streets Checklists for OBAG projects available to Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees prior to project selection)



- Commissioner engagement (e.g., briefings) and coordination with project sponsors, constituents, community-based organizations, and other stakeholders
- Outreach tools including our OBAG website ([www.sfcta.org/funding/one-bay-area-grantprogram](http://www.sfcta.org/funding/one-bay-area-grantprogram)), email, social media
- Multilanguage translations of materials and meetings, as requested

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The recommended action would not have an impact on the Fiscal Year 2025/26 budget. A portion of the proposed \$2,153,000 in OBAG Cycle 4 CMA Planning funds would be included in the Fiscal Year 2026/27 budget and the remainder in future budgets to support CMA planning activities in those respective fiscal years.

### **CAC POSITION**

The CAC considered this item at its March 25, 2026 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Proposed OBAG Cycle 4 Funding Framework Distribution
- Attachment 2 - Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Application
- Attachment 3 - Screening and Prioritization Criteria
- Attachment 4 - Call for Project Schedule
- Attachment 5 - Map of Equity Priority Communities
- Attachment 6 - OBAG Cycles 1 - 3 County Program Awarded San Francisco Projects List
- Attachment 7 - Resolution

**Attachment 1.**  
**Proposed San Francisco One Bay Area Grant 4 Funding Framework Distribution**

<b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Phase(s)</b>	<b>District(s)</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>OBAG 4 Funds Proposed</b>
FY 2026/27- FY 2029/30	SFCTA	Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Planning	This request would augment CMA Planning baseline funds for long range planning such the San Francisco Transportation Plan and follow-on studies, as well as Priority Development Area (PDA) planning, Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) planning, equity studies, modal market surveys, and water front planning, among other planning efforts.	Planning	Citywide	N/A	\$ 2,153,000
FY 2026/27- FY 2029/30	SFMTA	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Non-Infrastructure Program	This request would fund San Francisco's SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program for approximately three years, from July 2027 after the current OBAG Cycle 3 grant is exhausted through September 2030 which is the end of the OBAG 4 cycle. Led by the SFMTA and in partnership with the San Francisco Unified School District, the program's goals are to increase students commuting to school by walking, bicycling, taking transit, and carpooling, and reduce school-related collisions and injuries. OBAG 4 funds will fund planning, program administration and evaluation, in addition to implementing specific SRTS programming. Priority is given to the SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program given the history of support for SRTS in all of the prior OBAG cycles and the limited discretionary funding opportunities for such ongoing programs.	Construction	Citywide	\$ 6,694,400	\$ 5,843,000
FY 2026/27- FY 2029/30	TBD	Call for Projects	The Transportation Authority will release a call for projects inviting eligible project sponsors to apply for OBAG 4 funds. Projects will be evaluated and scored based on the screening and prioritization criteria adopted by the Transportation Authority Board. Staff will present the list of recommended projects to the Board for approval, prior to submitting the list to MTC on October 31, 2026.	TBD	TBD	TBD	\$ 48,660,000
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 56,656,000</b>

Project Nomination Target (120%)<sup>2</sup> \$ 56,656,000

Project Nomination Target (100%)<sup>2</sup> \$ 47,213,000

<sup>1</sup> Sponsor abbreviations include: San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA).

<sup>2</sup> MTC has established a target funding amount for each county based on population and housing production. San Francisco's target share is 14.8%, or approximately \$47.2 million of the \$319 million available regionwide. To ensure a sufficient pool of project nominations for regional project selection, MTC is soliciting nominations for 120% of the available funding for the County Program. With a total of \$319 million available for programming, the nomination target for the call for projects totals \$389 million (120%) and San Francisco's targeted share of \$389 million is approximately \$57 million. MTC will award \$319 million to projects selected from the larger nomination pool.

## Attachment 2

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Request Form

<b>Project Name:</b>	Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program
<b>Primary Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

<b>Supervisory District</b>	Citywide
-----------------------------	----------

### REQUEST

#### Brief Project Description

The San Francisco Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Non-Infrastructure program supports San Francisco families by providing access to the tools, skills and knowledge to build student independence and increase safe travel to and from schools. Led by the SFMTA and in partnership with the SFUSD, the program's goals are to increase students commuting to school by walking, bicycling, taking transit, and carpooling, and to reduce school-related collisions and injuries. Prop L funds would provide the local match to federal One Bay Area Grant cycle 4 funds covering July 2027 through September 2030.

#### Detailed Scope, Project Benefits and Community Outreach

See attached scope.

#### Project Location

Citywide

<b>Is this project in an Equity Priority Community?</b>	Yes
<b>Does this project benefit disadvantaged populations?</b>	Yes

#### Project Phase(s)

Construction (CON)

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Request Form

<b>Project Name:</b>	Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program
<b>Primary Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

<b>Environmental Type:</b>	Categorically Exempt
----------------------------	----------------------

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

Phase	Start		End	
	Quarter	Calendar Year	Quarter	Calendar Year
Planning/Conceptual Engineering (PLAN)				
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)				
Right of Way				
Design Engineering (PS&E)				
Advertise Construction				
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)	Jul-Aug-Sep	2027		
Operations (OP)				
Open for Use				
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)			Jul-Aug-Sep	2030

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Request Form

<b>Project Name:</b>	Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program
<b>Primary Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT REQUEST

Fund Source	Planned	Programmed	Allocated	Project Total
Prop L Sales Tax	\$516,000	\$335,400	\$0	\$851,400
One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4	\$5,843,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,843,000
<b>Phases In Current Request Total:</b>	\$6,359,000	\$335,400	\$0	\$6,694,400

## COST SUMMARY

Phase	Total Cost	Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$0	
Environmental Studies	\$0	
Right of Way	\$0	
Design Engineering	\$0	
Construction	\$6,694,400	Existing contract and SFMTA staff estimates
Operations	\$0	
Total:	\$6,694,400	

<b>% Complete of Design:</b>	N/A
<b>As of Date:</b>	N/A
<b>Expected Useful Life:</b>	N/A

**PROJECT BUDGET - CONSTRUCTION**

**MAJOR LINE ITEM BUDGET**

<b>SUMMARY BY MAJOR LINE ITEM (BY AGENCY LABOR BY TASK)</b>				
<b>Budget Line Item</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>SFUSD</b>	<b>SFMTA</b>	<b>Contractor</b>
SFMTA				
Program Management	\$ 1,781,300		\$ 1,781,300	
SFUSD				
Outreach and coordination	\$ 461,400	\$ 461,400		
Contractor/Professional Service Contract	\$ 4,451,700			\$ 4,451,700
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>	<b>\$ 6,694,400</b>	<b>\$ 461,400</b>	<b>\$ 1,781,300</b>	<b>\$ 4,451,700</b>

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Request Form

<b>Project Name:</b>	Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program
<b>Primary Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## SFCTA RECOMMENDATION

### Deliverables

1. Annually, SFMTA staff will provide a report on how the SRTS Non-Infrastructure program is doing with respect to achieving the established goals of reducing single-family vehicle trips to school to 30% by 2030 and school-related collisions by 50% from an annual average of 2 severe- and 32 total-injury collisions. The next annual report, covering the 2025-26 school year, is expected in December 2026.

## CONTACT INFORMATION

	<b>Project Manager</b>	<b>Grants Manager</b>
<b>Name:</b>	Ben Frazier	Kathryn Studwell
<b>Title:</b>	Transportation Planner III	Grant Administration Manager
<b>Phone:</b>		(415) 517-7015
<b>Email:</b>	ben.frazier@sfmta.com	kathryn.studwell@sfmta.com

# SF Safe Routes to School

## OBAG Cycle 4 Project Scope



### Program Objectives:

#### SF SRTS Outcomes (City Goals)

- Reduction of single-family car trips to 30%
- Reduce School collisions by 50% from 2018 baseline

#### SF SRTS - NI Behavior Change model objectives to achieve:

- Increasing individual positive perceptions of safe routes to schools and the Four Fun Ways: walking, biking and rolling, taking transit, and carpooling
- Increase access to safe and active transportation modes
- Support program participants engage in active use of the Four Fun Ways

#### Key participation Goals: with no funding increase (a net resource reduction due to increased costs):

- 275-300 events/activities a year
- 18,000-20,000+ annual engagements

### Scope:

The SRTS non-infrastructure program (Safe Routes Program/SRTS) supports San Francisco families by providing access to the tools, skills and knowledge to build student independence and increase safe travel to and from schools for families. By providing increased access to safe, easy and convenient transportation of children to schools in San Francisco while providing greater transportation options to families, this application would fund the SRTS non-infrastructure program (Safe Routes Program) for an additional three years (July 2027 to October 2030). Led by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and in robust partnership with the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) the program will coordinate across all of the city's school transportation services, including planning, operations, education, outreach, and capital improvement activities.

An iteration of this program is currently funded through School Year 2026/2027, and the proposed scope of work would build on the foundation of the current Safe Routes Program which includes educational, encouragement, experiential, and evaluation activities. In coordination with the SFMTA's larger Safe Routes to School Project, the Safe Routes Program would work to increase the percentage of students actively commuting or commuting in non-single-family vehicles to San Francisco's schools, to improve safety of walking and bicycling routes for all San Francisco school children, support families, reduce city congestion and air pollution, and to inspire the next generations of confident walkers, bicyclists, and transit users.

Specific tasks to be accomplished through the grant include:

- Identify and implement opportunities for in-school education related to transportation safety and choices
- Hold neighborhood skill building, encouragement, and outreach events to help reach and support parent/guardian champions, age-appropriate Muni transit-trainings parent-led walking school buses and bike trains; weekend bike classes at shared schoolyards; annual Take Muni to School week Walk and Roll to School Day, and Bike and Roll to School week

# SF Safe Routes to School

## OBAG Cycle 4 Project Scope



- Identify clusters of schools with common routes to school and connect parents and community members to joint resources for walking, bicycling, carpooling, and transit use
- Provide technical assistance and education on personal safety in school communities where real and perceived environmental hazards are barriers to families walking and biking to school
- Coordinate between SFUSD and SFMTA's school-serving programs to streamline communication and agency response to traffic and safety needs on and around school sites, including receiving and responding to parent and community concerns, safety assessments related to existing infrastructure, identifying needs for improvements, and engaging in ongoing planning processes

To achieve this, the program will be updated through a new call for contracting support via an RFP in the Fall of 2026, with final program design selected from proposals submitted by interested respondents. When developed, the RFP will provide clear guidance on outcomes and areas of focus, but will retain flexibility for interested respondents to propose how they will achieve best-practice outcomes is selected. The following framework outlines the principles for this:

### 1. School Assessment and Engagement

- a. The Safe Routes Program will assess and evaluate SFUSD public, non-charter, schools to determine a ranked list of 30-35 "Focus Schools" that will be prioritized for program activities and support. Prioritization shall elevate both serving underserved communities and Safe Routes Program mode shift goals.
  - i. Potential evaluation criteria can include: socio-economic/demographic data, student distance from school data, student travel tallies, school/student location with PDAs/TOCs/etc., and others.
- b. The Safe Routes Program will operate under a structure that will distribute program resources across the city:
  - i. The Safe Routes Program will prioritize activities at the selected Focus Schools, reserving an allotment for SFUSD non-Focus Schools.
  - ii. The Safe Routes Program will generate communication and other engagement touchpoints with *ALL* non-charter SFUSD schools.

### 2. Program Activity Implementation

- a. The Safe Routes Program will have a catalog of educational, experiential, and engaging activities that will:
  - i. Implement age-appropriate in-school education related to transportation safety, choices, and best practices.
  - ii. Provide school and neighborhood skill building, encouragement, and outreach events to help reach and support parent/guardian champions, such as weekend bike classes at shared schoolyards; parent-led walking school buses and bike trains; annual Walk and Roll to School Day, Ride Muni to School Week and Bike and Roll to School week, and carpool coordination.

# SF Safe Routes to School

## OBAG Cycle 4 Project Scope



- iii. Provide technical assistance and education on personal safety in school communities where real and perceived environmental hazards are barriers to families walking and biking to school.
    - iv. Provide technical assistance to schools with drop-off/ circulation concerns, and coordination with SFMTA staff as needed.
    - v. Work towards building student travel confidence and independence.
  - b. Safe Routes Program activities will also work towards implementing selected recommendations from the SFCTA School Access Plan (2023), such as:
    - i. Infrastructure Safety Improvements (continue coordination, see 2.e.i)
    - ii. Pickup/ Drop-off Zone Guidance (continue)
    - iii. Transit Trainings (continue/modify existing activities)
    - iv. Fare Program Awareness (continue activities such as Free Muni for Youth Outreach)
- c. The Safe Routes Program, in close coordination with the SFUSD will develop two sets of in-classroom/schoolyard/assembly educational class modules. One module will be geared towards younger students and one towards high school students. The intent of these modules is to have a lesson or series of lessons that every student in grades X and Y would receive.
  - i. These modules will convey engaging, age-appropriate safety and encouragement information/content about walking, biking, transit, and carpooling. Content will be interactive/physically active (experiential) when possible.
  - ii. Modules will work towards building student travel confidence and independence.
  - iii. The high school module will include a greater focus on public transit, transportation decision making, and understanding their built environment.
- d. Parent-Focused Programing
  - i. The Safe Routes Program will create educational and general promotional engagement and communication strategies targeted at parents and guardians. This messaging will be used to promote safety, travel options, programming opportunities, and other types of communications.
- e. Infrastructure and Agency Coordination
  - i. The SFMTA will continue to coordinate all school-related efforts in the broader Safe Routes to School Project with the Safe Routes Program. These efforts would be led by the SFMTA Schools Manager and Schools Coordinator.
    - 1. The SFMTA will share updates on street safety or transit improvement projects near schools (including those from the School Walk Audit Program) with the Safe Routes Program who will coordinate with schools to propose

# SF Safe Routes to School

## OBAG Cycle 4 Project Scope



activities to educate the students/school community about the changes and encourage them to use/experience them.

2. Coordinate updates/needs with Muni Transit Assistance Program (MTAP), SFMTA engineering staff, crossing guards, parking control officers, SFUSD Transportation, and other groups/services.
  3. Respond to requests for assistance from School District to support transportation services for students (including homeless and foster youth).
- f. Program Incentives for Student and Community Participations (Purchasing)
- i. The Safe Routes Program can provide age-appropriate incentives for participation in program activities. Incentives can include items like bike lights, reflective stickers, reflective backpack straps, etc.
  - ii. The Safe Routes Program can also provide safety equipment, like helmets, to students and class participants when needed.
  - iii. Incentives will have a safety benefit when reasonable.
- g. Program Communications
- i. The Safe Routes Program will develop fun, audience-appropriate communications for interactions with school administrators and staff, school district staff, the general public (when appropriate), and students.
3. Program Evaluation
- a. The Safe Routes Program will revise its 2023-2027 Evaluation Framework and will conduct annual evaluations based on the updated Framework.
  - b. The Safe Routes Program will plan and help implement bi-annual (every other year) student travel tallies surveys to all SFUSD schools with support from SFUSD.
    - i. Student travel tallies shall cover all grades across the district and occur during the fall of even numbered years.

## OBAG 4 County Program Base Application

### Instructions

Agencies applying for One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County Program funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) must complete and submit the following grant application to the appropriate County Transportation Agency (CTA), along with any required attachments, by the deadline established by the CTA. Applications should be completed and submitted as a fillable PDF form, separate from any attachments, and should not be scanned, signed, or otherwise modified to remove form fields.

Additional information on the OBAG 4 program is available on [MTC's website](#).

### General Information

<b>Agency Name</b>	
<b>Contact Name/Title</b>	
<b>Contact Email</b>	
<b>Contact Phone</b>	

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>TIP ID if applicable</b>

<b>Project Location</b>
<i>Specify street names where applicable, including the closest cross streets (e.g. Main St from 2nd Ave to 7th Ave). Provide a project overview map as an attachment, if available.</i>

<b>Project Scope</b>
<i>Provide a brief description of activities to be funded (limited to 250 characters for consistency with TIP listing if awarded).</i>

<b>Project Mode(s):</b>	<b>Pedestrian</b>	<b>Bicycle</b>	<b>Transit</b>	<b>Auto</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Percent Share</b> <i>Portion of total project cost</i>					

## Project Eligibility

### Project Eligibility

*Specify applicable federal fund source(s) and confirm regional eligibility requirements*

Project is eligible for the following OBAG 4 federal fund sources:

- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) ([23 U.S.C. § 133](#))
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) ([23 U.S.C. § 149](#))

*Note: applications for \$1 million or more in OBAG 4 funds for CMAQ-eligible projects must include a completed [Air Quality Input Form](#) as an attachment.*

Project meets regional eligibility requirements:

- Project is consistent with *Plan Bay Area 2050+* (included as a named project or consistent with a programmatic listing in the Transportation Project List, see link on MTC's [OBAG 4 webpage](#)).
- Project consists of eligible activities for OBAG 4 county funds as listed in MTC Resolution No. 4740, Attachment A (available on MTC's [OBAG 4 webpage](#)), which excludes air quality non-exempt projects, new roadways, roadway extensions, right of way acquisition for future expansion, operations, and routine maintenance.

## Need and Benefits

### Need and Benefits

*Describe how the project will address transportation and related needs and provide clear benefits, with specific consideration for safety, multi-modal accessibility, emissions reduction, resilience, stormwater management, and state of good repair as applicable.*

**Local Priority**
**Community Support**

*Describe community support for the project, including any letters of support and/or applicable local plans that prioritize the project, such as Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs), Priority Development Area (PDA) Plans (e.g. Specific Plan, PDA Investment and Growth Strategy), Countywide Transportation Plans (CTPs), or other local plans/project prioritization processes. Include descriptions of public outreach responses specific to this project, including comments received at public meetings or hearings, feedback from community workshops, or survey responses.*

**Letters of Support**

*List any individuals (with affiliations) and/or organizations providing letters of support for this project (attach copies if applicable).*

<b>Plan Name</b> <i>List any local plans that identify or prioritize the application project</i>	<b>Plan Year</b> <i>Completed or last updated</i>	<b>Plan Type</b> <i>CBTP, PDA, CTP, or other</i>	<b>Plan Link</b> <i>Attach copy if not available</i>	<b>Reference</b> <i>Page(s) with named project</i>

**Equity Impacts**

**Equity Impacts**

*If applicable, describe how the project will provide demonstrated benefits to historically marginalized or underserved groups, including benefits to [Equity Priority Communities \(EPCs\)](#) or similar local designations, and/or align with applicant [Americans with Disabilities Act \(ADA\) Transition Plans](#).*

**EPC Relationship**

*Indicate the project's relationship to MTC-designated EPCs or similar local designations. Projects located outside of these areas remain eligible for funding.*

- Project is located within an MTC-designated EPC and is designed to benefit this population as described above
- Project is located within a similar local designation and is designed to benefit this population as described above
- Project is not located within an EPC or similar local designation but is designed to specifically benefit historically marginalized or underserved groups as described above
- Project is not located within an EPC or similar local designation and is not designed to specifically benefit historically marginalized or underserved groups (not disqualifying)

<b>Applicant ADA Transition Plan Link</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<i>Required for all applications, attach copy if not available</i>	<i>Page reference(s) if applicable</i>

**Regional Alignment****Plan Strategies**

Briefly describe how the project supports Plan Bay Area 2050+ strategies, linked on [OBAG 4 webpage](#).

**Safety/Vision Zero**

Briefly describe how the project supports MTC's [Regional Safety/Vision Zero Policy](#), if applicable.

**Complete Streets**

Briefly describe how the project supports MTC's [Complete Streets Policy](#), if applicable.

**Transit Transformation**

Briefly describe how the project supports MTC's [Transit Transformation Action Plan](#), if applicable.

**Transit Priority**

Briefly describe how the project supports MTC's [Transit Priority Policy for Roadways](#), if applicable.

## Federal Performance

### Federal Performance Measures

Select the [\*federal performance measures \(23 U.S.C. § 150\)\*](#) that are supported by the project.

- Safety:** significantly reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads and improve safety of public transportation systems.
- Infrastructure Condition:** maintain the condition of Interstate and National Highway System (NHS) assets and public transit assets in a state of good repair.
- Congestion Reduction:** significantly reduce congestion on the NHS in urbanized areas.
- System Reliability:** improve the reliability of the Interstate system and NHS.
- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality:** improve the reliability of the Interstate system for truck travel.
- Environmental Sustainability:** improve emission reductions from the transportation system, specifically from CMAQ-funded projects.

## Deliverability and Risk

### Delivery Risks

Identify any known risks to project delivery and briefly describe planned mitigation efforts, as applicable, including the status and timeline for any environmental and/or right-of-way approvals.

### Environmental Approval and Right-of-Way

Specify applicable fund source(s) and confirm other eligibility requirements.

Select the anticipated NEPA class of action for the project:

- Categorical Exclusion (CE)
- Environmental Assessment (EA)
- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Select applicable right-of-way and utility challenges for the project:

- Project area is not located entirely on applicant right-of-way
- Project may require temporary use of areas outside of the applicant right-of-way
- Project is adjacent to or may impact the operations of a railroad, light rail, or Caltrans facility
- Project may require utility relocation

### Schedule and Funding Plan

Phase	Fiscal Year <i>Phase start</i>	OBAG 4 Request	Other Amount	Other Description <i>Fund source name(s), secured/unsecured</i>
Preliminary Engineering (PE)				
Right-of-Way (ROW)				
Construction (CON)				
Non Infrastructure (NI)				
<b>Total</b>	<i>Latest 2031</i>			<i>Non-federal share must be ≥11.47%</i>

#### Funding and Schedule Requirements

*Confirm that the project schedule and funding plan meet the following requirements.*

- Total requested award amount meets the minimum applicable threshold:
  - \$500,000 or more for projects in Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara Counties
  - \$250,000 or more for projects Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, and Sonoma Counties
  - \$150,000 or more with a request for an exception to the standard minimum
- Non-federal share of the project total meets or exceeds the federal 11.47% minimum local match
- Applicant will obligate any awarded OBAG 4 funds by the September 30, 2031 obligation deadline
- Requested award amount is rounded to the nearest \$1,000

### Contribution to Geographic Minimum

#### PDA and TOC Relationship

*A minimum share of each county's projects must support a Priority Development Area (PDA) and/or Transit Oriented Community (TOC), generally defined as projects within a mile or less of a PDA and/or TOC (see [reference map](#)). Projects located outside of these areas remain eligible for funding. Indicate the location of the project relative to PDAs/TOCs.*

- Project is located within a mile or less of a PDA and/or TOC
- Project is countywide or otherwise not confined to a fixed location
- Project is not located within a mile or less of a PDA or TOC (not disqualifying)

## Applicant Acknowledgements

### Applicant Acknowledgements

*Affirm understanding of, and intent to comply with, OBAG 4 requirements as summarized below and detailed in MTC Resolution No. 4740, Revised (available on MTC's [OBAG 4 webpage](#)).*

- Complete Streets Checklist:** applicant has submitted a checklist for this project in MTC's [Complete Streets Portal](#) to demonstrate consistency with MTC's [Complete Streets Policy](#) and [Transit Priority Policy for Roadways](#), including project review by a local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and/or transit agency/ies as applicable.
- Project Delivery Policy:** if awarded OBAG 4 county funds, applicant will comply with MTC's [Regional Project Delivery Policy](#), including designation of a staff Single Point of Contact (SPOC), adoption of a [Resolution of Local Support](#), project inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and MTC's associated TIP management platform, and participation in the Annual Obligation Plan (AOP) process.
- Jurisdiction Requirements:** jurisdiction applicants, or applicants requesting OBAG 4 funds on behalf of one or more jurisdiction(s), acknowledge the following ongoing requirements for jurisdiction recipients:
  - State Housing Element certification, Annual Progress Report (APR) submission, and compliance with select state housing laws
  - Updated Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) or equivalent plan as defined by California Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) guidelines
  - Pavement Management Program (PMP) certification and participation in statewide local streets and roads needs assessment surveys
  - Federal Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) traffic count reporting
- Attachments:** applicant will provide the following attachments with this application, as applicable:
  - Project overview map (if available)
  - CMAQ [Air Quality Input Form](#) (for eligible applications requesting over \$1 million)
  - Letter(s) of support (if referenced above)
  - Local plan(s) (if referenced above but no link is provided)
  - Applicant ADA Transition Plan (required, attach if no link is provided above)


# San Francisco Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program Area Map

March 2026

Map of San Francisco Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure program area, including all public schools in San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) from the California Department of Education.

## LEGEND

- SFUSD School (public non-charter)



Scale 1:51,345  
Date Saved: 3/17/2026

For reference contact: [Ben.Frazier@sfmta.com](mailto:Ben.Frazier@sfmta.com)

By downloading this map, you are agreeing to the following disclaimer: "The City and County of San Francisco ("City") provides the following data as a public record and no rights of any kind are granted to any person by the City's provision of this data. The City and County of San Francisco ("City") makes no representation regarding and does not guarantee or otherwise warrant the accuracy or completeness of this data. Anyone who uses this data for any purpose whatsoever does so entirely at their own risk. The City shall not be liable or otherwise responsible for any loss, harm, claim or action of any kind from any person arising from the use of this data. By accessing this data, the person accessing it acknowledges that she or he has read and does so under the condition that she or he agrees to the contents and terms of this disclaimer."





## Background & Instructions

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is required to calculate and report on air quality improvements associated with projects awarded federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding. Project sponsors applying for and/or awarded CMAQ funding from MTC must provide the following inputs for use by MTC staff to calculate associated air quality improvements.

This form must be completed and submitted in Word document form. Sponsors must complete the General Information section for all CMAQ-eligible projects, along with any applicable subsequent section(s) based on project type. Measurements of current conditions (e.g. existing traffic volume) should use the most recent available data. For current transit ridership, FTA's [National Transit Database](#) (NTD) is the preferred data source. Projected future conditions (e.g. future traffic volume) should use the sponsor's best estimates given the information available.

For assistance completing this form, please contact Harold Brazil at [hbrazil@bayareametro.gov](mailto:hbrazil@bayareametro.gov).

## General Information (All CMAQ-Eligible Projects)

<b>Project Name:</b>	San Francisco Safe Routes to School – Non-infrastructure Program
<b>Location:</b> <i>County</i>	San Francisco
<b>Funding Request:</b> <i>CMAQ amount</i>	\$5,843,000
<b>Completion Year:</b>	2030
<b>General Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>General notes (optional)</i>

## Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities

### Facility Length/Type

Facility Type <i>Complete one row per facility type</i>	Project Length <i>Include units</i>	Total Facility Length <i>Include units</i>
<i>Select facility type</i>	<i>Project length</i>	<i>Total facility length (incl. project)</i>
<i>Select facility type</i>	<i>Project length</i>	<i>Total facility length (incl. project)</i>
<i>Select facility type</i>	<i>Project length</i>	<i>Total facility length (incl. project)</i>
<i>Select facility type</i>	<i>Project length</i>	<i>Total facility length (incl. project)</i>

### Crossing County/Type

Crossing Type <i>Complete one row per crossing type</i>	Crossing Count
<i>Select crossing type</i>	<i>Crossing count</i>
<i>Select crossing type</i>	<i>Crossing count</i>

### Additional Project Information

<b>Bike Station Count:</b> <i>Number added</i>	<i>Bike station count</i>
<b>Roadway Type:</b> <i>Functional class, for on-street facilities</i>	<i>Roadway type</i>
<b>Roadway Lanes:</b> <i>Both directions</i>	<i>Lane count</i>
<b>Posted Speed Limit:</b> <i>MPH</i>	<i>Posted speed limit</i>
<b>Daily Traffic:</b> <i>Average annual daily traffic volume (AADT), both directions</i>	<i>Average daily traffic</i>
<b>Daily Traffic Year:</b> <i>Year AADT measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>

## MTC CMAQ Air Quality Calculation Inputs

Version 1.2



<b>Parallel Roadway Type, if Applicable:</b> <i>Functional class of adjacent corridor</i>	<i>Roadway type</i>
<b>Parallel Roadway Lanes, if Applicable:</b> <i>Both directions</i>	<i>Lane count</i>
<b>Parallel Posted Speed Limit, if Applicable:</b> <i>MPH</i>	<i>Posted speed limit</i>
<b>Parallel Daily Traffic, if Applicable:</b> <i>Average annual daily traffic volume (AADT), both directions</i>	<i>Average daily traffic</i>
<b>Parallel Daily Traffic Year, if Applicable:</b> <i>Year parallel AADT measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Nearby Destinations:</b> <i>Activity centers within ½ mile of project, including banks, churches, hospitals/ clinics, light rail stations, office parks, post office, libraries, shopping areas, universities/colleges</i>	<i>Destination count</i>
<b>Nearby Colleges/ Universities:</b> <i>Within 2 miles of project</i>	<i>College and/or university count</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Rideshare Programs

<b>Average Current Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Average number of weekday riders prior to project implementation</i>	<i>Average current ridership</i>
<b>Ridership Year:</b> <i>Year ridership measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Ridership Source:</b> <i>Source of ridership data (NTD preferred)</i>	<i>Ridership source</i>
<b>Projected Future Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Estimated number of weekday riders after project implementation</i>	<i>Projected future ridership</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Carshare Programs

<b>Vehicles Available:</b> <i>Number of carshare vehicles available</i>	<i>Carshare vehicle count</i>
--	-------------------------------



<b>Conventional Membership:</b> <i>Number of monthly members</i>	<i>Conventional carshare monthly member count</i>
<b>One-Way Membership:</b> <i>Number of one-way monthly members</i>	<i>One-way carshare monthly member count</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Bike Share & Scooter Share Programs

#### Micromobility Fleet Size/Ridership

<b>Micromobility Fleet Type</b> <i>Complete one row per micromobility mode</i>	<b>Fleet Size</b> <i>Number of micromobility devices</i>	<b>Ridership</b> <i>Number of average weekday riders</i>
<i>Select fleet type</i>	<i>Fleet size (count)</i>	<i>Daily ridership</i>
<i>Select fleet type</i>	<i>Fleet size (count)</i>	<i>Daily ridership</i>
<i>Select fleet type</i>	<i>Fleet size (count)</i>	<i>Daily ridership</i>

#### Additional Project Information

<b>Ridership Year:</b> <i>Year ridership measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Ridership Source:</b> <i>Source of ridership data</i>	<i>Ridership source</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Transportation Demand Management/Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Programs

<b>New Walking Trips:</b> <i>Number of new walking trips per weekday, replacing SOV trips</i>	360 new trips (2% growth)
<b>New Biking Trips:</b> <i>Number of new biking trips per weekday, replacing SOV trips</i>	20 new trips (1% growth)
<b>New Carpool Trips:</b> <i>Number of new carpool trips per weekday, replacing vehicle trips</i>	30 new trips (1% growth)
<b>Carpool Ridership:</b> <i>Average number of riders per new carpool</i>	<i>Riders per carpool</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	300 new transit trips (1% growth). Student transit ridership is very significant in San Francisco.

### Transit Improvements – Roadway

<b>Current Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Average number of current weekday riders</i>	<i>Current daily rider count</i>
--	----------------------------------

# MTC CMAQ Air Quality Calculation Inputs

Version 1.2



<b>Ridership Year:</b> <i>Year ridership measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Ridership Source:</b> <i>Source of ridership data (NTD preferred)</i>	<i>Ridership source</i>
<b>Future Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Projected number of weekday riders</i>	<i>Future daily rider count</i>
<b>Daily Revenue Miles:</b> <i>Weekday transit vehicle revenue miles (total)</i>	<i>Daily revenue miles</i>
<b>Project Length:</b> <i>Length of roadway improvements</i>	<i>Project length (include units)</i>
<b>Current Route Length:</b> <i>Length of current route</i>	<i>Current route length (include units)</i>
<b>Future Route Length:</b> <i>Length of completed route</i>	<i>Future route length (include units)</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

## Transit Improvements – Rail/Ferry

<b>Parking Spaces Added/Removed:</b> <i>If applicable</i>	<i>Change in parking spaces</i>
<b>Current Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Average number of current weekday riders</i>	<i>Current daily rider count</i>
<b>Ridership Year:</b> <i>Year ridership measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Ridership Source:</b> <i>Source of ridership data (NTD preferred)</i>	<i>Ridership source</i>
<b>Future Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Projected number of weekday riders</i>	<i>Future daily rider count</i>
<b>Description:</b> <i>List elements resulting in service and/or frequency improvements</i>	<i>Description of improvements</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

## Transit Improvements – Station

<b>Parking Spaces Added/Removed:</b> <i>If applicable</i>	<i>Change in parking spaces</i>
<b>New Stop Count:</b> <i>Number of new bus bays/ stops, rail platforms</i>	<i>New bus stop/bay, rail platform count</i>
<b>Roadway Improvements:</b> <i>List roadway improvements, including intersection improvements, added turn lanes, new capacity, and length</i>	<i>Description of roadway improvements</i>



<b>Active Transportation Improvements:</b> <i>List bicycle/pedestrian access improvements, including length of new path if applicable</i>	<i>Description of bicycle/pedestrian improvements</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Transit Fleet Expansion

<b>Current Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Average number of current weekday riders</i>	<i>Current daily rider count</i>
<b>Ridership Year:</b> <i>Year ridership measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Ridership Source:</b> <i>Source of ridership data (NTD preferred)</i>	<i>Ridership source</i>
<b>Future Daily Ridership:</b> <i>Projected number of weekday riders</i>	<i>Future daily rider count</i>
<b>Additional Vehicles:</b>	<i>Number of new vehicles</i>
<b>Daily Service Miles:</b> <i>Weekday transit vehicle revenue miles per vehicle</i>	<i>Daily service miles per vehicle</i>
<b>Engine Type:</b>	<i>Vehicle engine type</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Zero-Emissions Transit Fleet Replacement

<b>Vehicles Replaced:</b>	<i>Number of new vehicles</i>
<b>Daily Service Miles:</b> <i>Weekday transit vehicle revenue miles per vehicle</i>	<i>Daily service miles per vehicle</i>
<b>Existing Engine Type:</b>	<i>Existing engine type</i>
<b>Replacement Engine Type:</b>	<i>Replacement engine type</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

<b>Station Type:</b>	<i>Charging station type</i>
<b>Station Count:</b>	<i>Charging station count</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

### Traffic Signal Synchronization

<b>AM Peak Volume:</b> <i>Average weekday AM peak hour vehicles/hour</i>	<i>AM peak volume</i>
<b>PM Peak Volume:</b> <i>Average weekday PM peak hour vehicles/hour</i>	<i>PM peak volume</i>
<b>Off-Peak Volume:</b> <i>Average weekday off-peak vehicles/hour</i>	<i>Off-peak volume</i>



<b>Traffic Volume Year:</b> <i>Year traffic volumes measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Current Speed:</b> <i>Current average speed, in MPH</i>	<i>Current average speed</i>
<b>Current Speed Year:</b> <i>Year average speed measured (use most recent data available)</i>	<i>Measurement year</i>
<b>Future Speed:</b> <i>Projected average speed after project, in MPH</i>	<i>Projected average speed</i>
<b>Project Length:</b> <i>Length of impacted roadway segment(s)</i>	<i>Roadway length (include units)</i>
<b>Roadway Type:</b> <i>Functional class</i>	<i>Roadway type</i>
<b>Additional Notes:</b> <i>Optional</i>	<i>Additional notes (optional)</i>

## Roundabouts

### Existing Turn Percentages

<b>Existing Intersection Approach</b> <i>Complete one row per existing approach</i>	<b>Left Turn Percentage</b>	<b>Right Turn Percentage</b>	<b>U-Turn Percentage</b>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Left %</i>	<i>Right %</i>	<i>U-turn %</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Left %</i>	<i>Right %</i>	<i>U-turn %</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Left %</i>	<i>Right %</i>	<i>U-turn %</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Left %</i>	<i>Right %</i>	<i>U-turn %</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Left %</i>	<i>Right %</i>	<i>U-turn %</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Left %</i>	<i>Right %</i>	<i>U-turn %</i>

### Roundabout Entry Lanes

<b>Proposed Roundabout Approach</b> <i>Complete one row per proposed approach</i>	<b>Entry Lane Count</b>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Number of lanes</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Number of lanes</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Number of lanes</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Number of lanes</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Number of lanes</i>
<i>Approach</i>	<i>Number of lanes</i>

### Additional Project Information

<b>Average Daily Volume:</b> <i>Average annual daily traffic volume (AADT), both directions</i>	<i>Average annual daily traffic volume</i>
<b>Truck Percentage:</b> <i>If applicable</i>	<i>Truck percentage</i>
<b>AM Peak Delay:</b> <i>Average weekday AM peak hour intersection delay seconds/vehicle</i>	<i>AM peak delay per vehicle</i>
<b>PM Peak Delay:</b> <i>Average weekday PM peak hour intersection delay seconds/vehicle</i>	<i>PM peak delay per vehicle</i>



<b>Off-Peak Delay:</b> Average weekday off-peak hour intersection delay seconds/vehicle	Off-peak delay per vehicle
<b>Measurement Year:</b> Year traffic volume, composition, delay measured (use most recent data available)	Measurement year
<b>Roadway Type:</b> Functional class	Roadway type
<b>Circulating Lanes:</b> Proposed number of circulating lanes	Number of circulating lanes
<b>Additional Notes:</b> Optional	Additional notes (optional)

### Intersection Improvements

#### Project Area Types

<b>Urban/Rural</b> Select one option	<b>Business District</b> Select one option
<input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Rural	<input type="checkbox"/> Business District <input type="checkbox"/> Not a Business District

#### Intersection Signalization

<b>Existing/ Proposed</b>	<b>Signalization</b> Select as applicable	<b>Turn Phases</b> Select as applicable
<b>Existing:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Signalized <input type="checkbox"/> Unsignalized	<input type="checkbox"/> Left turn phase <input type="checkbox"/> Right turn phase
<b>Propose:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Signalized <input type="checkbox"/> Unsignalized	<input type="checkbox"/> Left turn phase <input type="checkbox"/> Right turn phase

#### Additional Project Information

<b>Daily Peak Hours:</b> AM and PM	Number of peak hours per day
<b>Peak Hour Volume:</b> Average weekday peak hour vehicles/hour, both directions	Peak hour volume
<b>Truck Percentage:</b> If applicable	Truck percentage
<b>Existing Delay:</b> Average weekday intersection delay seconds/vehicle	Average delay per vehicle
<b>Measurement Year:</b> Year traffic volume, composition, delay measured (use most recent data available)	Measurement year
<b>Proposed Signal Time:</b> Cycle length (seconds)	Cycle length
<b>Green Time Ratio:</b> Ratio of green time per cycle time	Green time ratio
<b>Left Turn Lanes Added:</b> Number added, single direction	Number of left turn lanes added
<b>Additional Notes:</b> Optional	Additional notes (optional)



**Revisions**

---

*Version 1.0 (6/28/2022): initial publication*

*Version 1.1 (7/22/2022): document updated to add Transportation Demand Management/Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Programs section, make accessibility modifications to tables*

*Version 1.2 (11/29/2022): background and instructions updated for generic use by project sponsors applying for and/or receiving CMAQ funding from MTC, regardless of grant cycle or project status*

# Attachment 3

## One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4

### Draft San Francisco Screening and Prioritization Criteria

To develop a program of projects for San Francisco's OBAG 4 County Program, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) will first screen candidate projects for eligibility and then will prioritize eligible projects based on evaluation criteria. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) OBAG 4 guidelines set most of the screening and evaluation criteria to ensure the program is consistent with Plan Bay Area and federal funding guidelines. We have added a few additional criteria to better reflect the particular conditions and needs of San Francisco and allow us to better evaluate project benefits and project readiness (as indicated by underlined text).

#### OBAG 4 Screening Criteria

Projects must meet all screening criteria in order to be considered further for OBAG funding. The screening criteria will focus on meeting the eligibility requirements for OBAG funds and include:

##### Screening Criteria for All Types of Projects

1. Project sponsor is eligible to receive federal transportation funds.
2. Project must be eligible for STP or CMAQ funds, as detailed in 23 USC Sec. 133 and at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/stbgfs.cfm> (STP), and in 23 USC Sec. 149 and at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/cmaqfs.cfm> (CMAQ).
3. Project scope must be consistent with the intent of OBAG and its broad eligible uses. For more information, see [MTC Resolution 4740](#) Attachment A: OBAG 4 Project Selection and Programming Policies and Attachment A, Appendix A-1: County & Local Program Call for Projects Guidelines.
4. Project must be consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050+, available at <https://www.planbayarea.org/> and the [San Francisco Transportation Plan \(SFTP 2050 or the underway SFTP 2050+ update\)](#).
5. Project must demonstrate the ability to meet all OBAG 4 programming policy requirements described in MTC Resolution 4740, including timely use of funds requirements.
6. Project sponsor is requesting a minimum of \$500,000 in OBAG funds.
7. Project has identified the required 11.47% local match in committed or programmed funds, including in-kind matches for the requested phase. Alternatively, for capital projects the project sponsor may demonstrate fully funding the pre-construction phases (e.g. project development, environmental or design) with local funds and claim toll credits in lieu of a match for the construction phase. In order to claim toll credits, project sponsors must still meet all federal requirements for the pre-construction phases even if fully-funded.
8. Sponsors shall follow the selection and contracting procedures in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual.

## Additional Screening Criteria for Street Resurfacing Projects

1. Project selection must be based on the analysis results of federal-aid eligible roads from San Francisco's certified Pavement Management System.
2. Pavement rehabilitation projects must have a PCI score of 70 or below. Preventive maintenance projects with a PCI rating of 70 or above are eligible only if the Pavement Management System demonstrates that the preventive maintenance strategy is a cost-effective method of extending the service life of the pavement.

## **OBAG 4 Prioritization Criteria**

Projects that meet all of the OBAG screening criteria will be prioritized for OBAG funding based on, but not limited to the factors listed below. The Transportation Authority reserves the right to modify or add to the prioritization criteria in response to additional MTC guidance and if necessary to prioritize a very competitive list of eligible projects that exceed available programming capacity.

Based on MTC Resolution 4740 and Transportation Authority Board priorities, points will be awarded to projects that:

1. Are located in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit-Oriented Communities (TOCs). OBAG established a minimum requirement that 80% of OBAG funds in San Francisco be used on projects that are partially or entirely within a mile or less of a PDA or TOC. On a case-by-case basis and at the request of a CTA, MTC may consider additional projects as PDA- or TOC-supportive which are not located within a mile or less of either geography but otherwise have a clear and direct connection to PDA(s) and/or TOC(s).
2. Increase safety. Projects that address corridors on the High Injury Network or other locations with a known safety issue will be given priority. Project sponsors must clearly define and provide data to support the safety issue that is being addressed and how the project will improve or alleviate the issue.
3. Have multi-modal benefits. Projects that support complete streets, including directly benefiting multiple system users (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, transit passengers, motorists), will be prioritized.
4. Improve environmental sustainability. Projects that achieve one or more of the objectives below will be prioritized:
  - a. Reduce emissions by supporting mode shift to non-polluting or low-polluting modes, such as walking, bicycling, and transit; project sponsors must provide evidence and/or data to support the projected mode shift of the project.
  - b. Improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure to the effects of climate change, such as with physical protection from or adaptation to adverse climate impacts or redundant or relocated infrastructure.
  - c. Manage stormwater, such as by constructing bioswales or permeable ground surfaces.

5. Maintain transportation infrastructure in a state of good repair.
6. Demonstrate public support, as demonstrated through Community-Based Transportation Plans, PDA plans, other local planning or project prioritization processes, letters of support, and/or other means identified by the Transportation Authority. Projects with clear and diverse community support, including from disadvantaged populations (e.g., communities historically harmed by displacement, transportation projects and policies that utilized eminent domain, people with low incomes, people of color) and/or identified through a community-based planning process will be prioritized. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, or station area plan that is community driven.
7. Provide demonstrated benefits to historically marginalized or underserved groups, including benefits to Equity Priority Communities or similar local designations, alignment with agency Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plans, and/or other means identified by the Transportation Authority. Priority will be given to projects that directly benefit disadvantaged populations, whether the project is directly located in an Equity Priority Community or can demonstrate benefits to disadvantaged populations.
8. Demonstrate project readiness and deliverability. In determining the ability to meet project delivery requirements, the Transportation Authority will consider the project sponsor(s)' project delivery track record for federally funded projects. The Transportation Authority will also evaluate project readiness, including but not limited to project is ready to proceed in fiscal year of programming; adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. more detail and certainty will be expected for a project about to enter construction than for a project about to enter design); whether prior project phases are completed or when they are expected to be completed; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.
9. Take advantage of construction coordination. Projects that are coordinated with other construction projects, such as making multi-modal improvements on a street that is scheduled to undergo repaving, will receive priority. Project sponsors must clearly identify related improvement projects, describe the scope, and provide a timeline for major milestones for coordination (e.g. start and end of design and construction phases).
10. Improve transit reliability and accessibility. Priority will be given to projects that increase transit accessibility, reliability, and connectivity (e.g. stop improvements, transit stop consolidation and/or relocation, transit signal priority, traffic signal upgrades, travel information improvements, wayfinding signs, bicycle parking, and improved connections to regional transit). Additional priority will be given to projects that support the existing or proposed rapid network or rail, including projects identified in transit performance plans or programs such as the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Muni Forward program.

11. Improve access to schools, senior centers, and other community sites. Priority will be given to infrastructure projects that improve access to schools, senior centers, and/or other community sites.
12. Have limited other funding options. Sponsors should justify why the project is ineligible, has very limited eligibility, or competes poorly to receive other discretionary funds.
13. Demonstrate higher fund leveraging. Priority will be given to projects that can demonstrate leveraging of OBAG funds above and beyond the required match of 11.47%.

### **Additional Considerations**

1. Project Sponsor Priority: For project sponsors that submit multiple OBAG applications, the Transportation Authority will consider the project sponsor's relative priority for its applications.
2. Geographic Equity: Programming will reflect fair geographic distribution that takes into account the various needs of San Francisco's neighborhoods. This factor will be applied program-wide and to individual projects with improvements at multiple locations, as appropriate.

The Transportation Authority will work closely with project sponsors to clarify scope, schedule and budget; and modify programming recommendations as needed to help optimize the projects' ability to meet timely use of funds requirements.

If the amount of OBAG funds requested exceeds available funding, we reserve the right to negotiate with project sponsors on items such as scope and budget changes that would allow us to develop a recommended OBAG project list that best satisfies all of the aforementioned prioritization criteria.

In order to nominate the most competitive list of San Francisco priority projects, we may not recommend projects strictly in score order if, for example, we, working with MTC, are unable to match the project to OBAG 4 fund sources eligibility (e.g. CMAQ vs. STP).

## Attachment 4.

### San Francisco One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 Call for Projects Schedule\*

March 25, 2026	Transportation Authority Community Advisory Committee - ACTION OBAG 4 County Framework
April 14, 2026	Transportation Authority Board - PRELIMINARY ACTION OBAG 4 County Framework  Transportation Authority issues conditional OBAG 4 Call for Projects (conditioned on final Board action, anticipated April 28, 2026)
April 28, 2026	Transportation Authority Board - FINAL ACTION OBAG 4 County Framework
May 7, 2026	Transportation Authority Call for Projects Workshop
<b>July 7, 2026, 5 PM</b>	<b>Applications due to the Transportation Authority</b>
September 23, 2026	Transportation Authority Community Advisory Committee - ACTION OBAG 4 Program of Projects
October 6, 2026	Transportation Authority Board - PRELIMINARY ACTION OBAG 4 Program of Projects
October 27, 2026	Transportation Authority Board - FINAL ACTION OBAG 4 Program of Projects
October 31, 2026	Transportation Authority submits OBAG 4 Project List to Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Early 2027	Metropolitan Transportation Commission programs OBAG 4 funds

\*Transportation Authority Board and Community Advisory Committee meeting dates are subject to change. Please visit <https://www.sfcta.org/events> for the most up to date information.

# Map of San Francisco Equity Priority Community Areas (2025 vintage)


Map of San Francisco Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) inclusive of 2021 and 2025 definitions. 2025 definitions are Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050 Plus EPC geographies (2025 vintage, Census ACS 2018-2022, Census Tract geographies). 2021 definitions are San Francisco EPC areas (2021 vintage, Census ACS 2014-2018, Census Tract and Block Group geographies).

## Legend

 San Francisco EPCs (2025)

Background by cartodb

0 1 2 mi



## Attachment 6

### San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant 4 County Program Cycles 1, 2, and 3 Projects Funded <sup>1</sup>

Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Project Name	OBAG Funds	Total Project Cost <sup>3</sup>
<b>Cycle 1 Completed</b>			
SFPW	Broadway Chinatown Streetscape Improvement	\$ 3,477,537	\$ 7,102,487
SFPW	ER Taylor Elementary School Safe Routes to School	\$ 400,115	\$ 604,573
SFPW	Longfellow Elementary School Safe Routes to School	\$ 670,307	\$ 852,855
SFPW	Second Street Streetscape Improvement	\$ 10,567,997	\$ 15,415,115
SFMTA	Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement (for SFMTA's Masonic Avenue Complete Streets)	\$ 10,227,540	\$ 175,000,000
SFMTA	Lombard Street US-101 Corridor (for SFPW's Broadway Chinatown Streetscape Improvement)	\$ 1,910,000	\$ 24,263,920
SFMTA	Mansell Corridor Improvement	\$ 1,762,239	\$ 6,807,348
SFMTA	Masonic Avenue Complete Streets	\$ -	\$ 22,785,900
TJPA	Transbay Transit Center Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 11,480,440
<b>Cycle 1 Total</b>		<b>\$ 35,015,735</b>	<b>\$ 264,312,638</b>

Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Project Name	OBAG Funds	Total Project Cost <sup>3</sup>
<b>Cycle 2 Completed</b>			
SFPW	John Yehall Chin Elementary Safe Routes to School	\$ -	\$ 4,200,000
SFMTA	Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1	\$ 6,939,000	\$ 64,656,000
SFMTA	San Francisco Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Project, 2019-2021 <sup>4</sup>	\$ 2,813,264	\$ 3,177,752
SFMTA	Central Subway	\$ 15,980,000	\$ 1,931,000,000
SFPW	Better Market Street (for SFPW's John Yehall Chin Elementary Safe Routes to School)	\$ 3,366,000	\$ 603,720,000
Caltrain	Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project	\$ 11,187,736	\$ 1,980,253,000
<b>Cycle 2 Work Progressing</b>			
BART	Embarcadero Station: Platform Elevator Phase 1	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 24,817,461
<b>Cycle 2 Total</b>		<b>\$ 42,286,000</b>	<b>\$ 4,611,824,213</b>

## Attachment 6

### San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant 4 County Program Cycles 1, 2, and 3 Projects Funded <sup>1</sup>

Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Project Name	OBAG Funds	Total Project Cost <sup>3</sup>
<b>Cycle 3 Work Progressing</b>			
SFMTA	29 Sunset Improvement Project Phase 1	\$ 5,976,000	\$ 13,661,000
SFMTA	Central Embarcadero Safety	\$ 6,320,000	\$ 10,695,000
SFMTA	Light Rail Vehicles (for SFCTA West Side Bridges)	\$ 14,899,000	\$ 1,126,960,331
SFMTA	Light Rail Vehicles (for SFCTA Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path and Related Improvements)	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,126,960,331
SFMTA	San Francisco Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Project	\$ 7,082,000	\$ 8,000,000
BART	Elevator Modernization Phase 1.3 (Embarcadero, Montgomery St, Powell St, Civic Center/UN Plaza, Glen Park)	\$ 13,300,000	\$ 42,900,000
SFCTA	Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 120,441,000
<b>Cycle 3 Total</b>		<b>\$ 50,577,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,449,617,662</b>

Notes

<sup>1</sup> Additional details on San Francisco's OBAG program of projects are accessible at <https://www.sfcta.org/funding/one-bay-area-grant-program#panel-program-delivery>.

<sup>2</sup> Sponsor acronyms include: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA).

<sup>3</sup> Total Project Cost at time of programming.

<sup>4</sup> In addition to the County Program funds awarded to Safe Routes to Schools Non-Infrastructure, this program was awarded \$2,100,000 in OBAG Cycle 2 Regional Program funds through the Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike Program.

## ATTACHMENT 7



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

BD041426

RESOLUTION NO. 26-XX

---

RESOLUTION ADOPTING SAN FRANCISCO'S ONE BAY AREA GRANT CYCLE 4 COUNTY FRAMEWORK, INCLUDING RECOMMENDING PROGRAMMING \$2,153,000 TO THE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY PLANNING, \$5,843,000 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY'S SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, AND \$48,660,000 TO PROJECTS TO BE SELECTED THROUGH A CALL FOR PROJECTS

WHEREAS, In May 2012, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted the first One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG Cycle 1) funding and policy framework for programming the region's federal transportation funds in an effort to better integrate the region's federal transportation program with its Sustainable Communities Strategy; and

WHEREAS, The OBAG County program established funding guidelines and policies to reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations and that have historically produced housing, and promoted transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), which are places near public transit planned for growth; and

WHEREAS, In November 2015, MTC adopted the OBAG Cycle 2 framework, which largely maintained the same funding guidelines and policies as OBAG 1 and built on progress made by OBAG 1 by making some refinements that attempted to address the region's growing challenge with the lack of housing and affordable housing, in particular; and

WHEREAS, In January 2022, MTC adopted the OBAG 3 Cycle framework, which maintained the same goals as prior OBAG cycles while soliciting nominations for 120% of the available funding capacity for the County Program, from which MTC selected projects to award the available funding; and



WHEREAS, In February 2026, MTC adopted the OBAG Cycle 4 framework and expanded upon prior OBAG cycles' minimum geographic investment thresholds to include Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs), which are places within one half-mile of transit stops and stations that are designed to enable people to access and use transit more often for more types of trips, as an eligible geography, in addition to PDAs, reflecting the need to support both geographies; and

WHEREAS, The OBAG Cycle 4 framework made \$319 million in federal funds available for the OBAG County Program to support a wide range of projects and fund local, PDA and TOC supportive priorities such as transit reliability and access improvements, safety and complete streets improvements, state of good repair, and PDA Planning; and

WHEREAS, As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Francisco, the Transportation Authority is responsible for identifying San Francisco's OBAG Cycle 4 County Program priorities and submitting them to MTC by October 31, 2026; and

WHEREAS, In early 2027, MTC will select projects from a regionwide candidate pool and has set project nomination targets for each county based on a formula that considers population and housing (planned and produced) with San Francisco's share at 14.8% of funds available regionwide; and

WHEREAS, MTC is soliciting nominations from each county for up to 120% of its share of available funding capacity to ensure a sufficient pool of project nominations; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's estimated share of revenues is \$56.6 million for the 120% target and about \$47.2 million at 100% of available programming over the next four fiscal years (2026/27-2029/30); and

WHEREAS, CMAs are required to comply with MTC's requirements, including screening and prioritization criteria but have flexibility to include additional criteria that reflect local priorities; and



WHEREAS, Staff recommended an OBAG 4 funding framework including a funding distribution for San Francisco's \$56,656,000 target shown in Attachment 1 and project screening and prioritization criteria, which include the addition of some San Francisco-specific criteria as detailed in Attachment 2; and

WHEREAS, Consistent with San Francisco priorities established for prior OBAG cycles and as allowed by MTC's OBAG guidelines, staff recommends programming \$2,153,000 in OBAG 4 County Program funds for CMA planning activities and \$5,843,000 to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program as described in detail in Attachment 3 leaving the remaining \$48,660,000 for a competitive call open to all OBAG-eligible projects; and

WHEREAS, MTC requires Transportation Authority Board approval of the recommended OBAG 4 programming for CMA Planning and the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program; and

WHEREAS, Transportation Authority staff will conduct San Francisco's OBAG 4 County Program call for projects consistent with MTC's OBAG 4 guidelines and will seek Board approval of San Francisco's priorities this fall, in time to submit them to MTC by its October 31, 2026 deadline with the draft call for projects schedule shown in Attachment 4; and

WHEREAS, At its March 25, 2026 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee was briefed on the subject request and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts San Francisco's OBAG 4 County Framework, including recommending programming \$2,153,000 to the Transportation Authority for CMA Planning, \$5,843,000 to SFMTA's Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program, and \$48,660,000 to projects to be selected through a call for projects; and be it further



RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to communicate this information to MTC and all other relevant agencies and interested parties.

Attachments:

1. Proposed OBAG Cycle 4 Funding Framework Distribution
2. Screening and Prioritization Criteria
3. Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Application
4. Call for Projects Schedule