



# Major Project Advancement Policy

MTC Major Projects Workshop – Day 2 Session 3 May 26, 2022

### **MAP Components**

### **Funding Strategy**

Full funding plans for MAP projects

Identify and prioritize discretionary funding requests

#### **Policy Reinforcements**

Benefit/cost

Equity

Land use

Connected mobility

### **Risk Management**

Evaluate and monitor risks from early project development through construction including risks related to network coordination

## **MAP Funding Envelope**

- Based on PBA 2050 Financial Forecast
- Adjusted for recent BIL and State Budget surplus funding assumptions
- Includes <u>\$10.6B</u> in "Anticipated/ Unspecified" funding as proxy for future new funding streams/programs

Project Type/Mode	FY 2022 - FY 2035 Funding Forecast
Total	\$37B
 Transit	(\$26B net of Anticipated funding) \$18.5B
Hallsit	Ş10.Jb
Multi-Modal	\$13B
Roads/Bridges	\$5B
Bike/Ped	\$0.5B

### Tier 1 MAP Project Submittals

- Eligible Tier 1 Projects are in the first time period or "bin" of PBA2050 and have a total cost of \$250M or more
- MAP funding need is significantly larger than forecasted funding envelope when accounting for "Anticipated" funding

	Anticipated Based on PBA2050 Project Listing	Eligible MAP Project Submittals
# of Projects	33	65
Total Project Cost	\$33B	\$50B
Funding Gap	~\$12B	\$36B

## Tier 2 MAP Project Submittals

- Eligible Tier 2 projects are in the second time period or "bin" of PBA2050 and have a total cost of \$1B or more
- Tier 2 projects are not expected to enter the construction phase until after 2035 and are therefore not the focus of the MAP
- Tier 2 projects may be listed in the MAP for early project phases only

	Anticipated Based on PBA2050 Project Listing	Eligible MAP Project Submittals
# of Projects	12	18
Total Project Cost	\$59B	\$68B

### **Evaluation Approach**

- Development of proposed evaluation criteria underway
  - Funding commitment levels and magnitude of funding gap percentage of capital cost secured, remaining need, and <u>screening of proposed operating funding plan</u>
  - Schedule
  - Plan Bay Area 2050 benefit-cost ratios and equity scores assessed in three distinct futures to identify investments that are resilient to uncertain future conditions
  - Alignment with Plan Bay Area 2050 Guiding Principles affordable, connected, diverse, healthy and vibrant.
  - Project dependencies impacting network connectivity
  - Potential other criteria tailored to programmatic categories

### **Draft Evaluation Criteria**

- Evaluation will inform sequencing of projects for over-subscribed funding programs in the MAP
- Criteria weighting and scoring methodology still under development
- Scoring is subject to change with project progression / changes

Funding Commitment	Funding Gap Magnitude	Schedule	PBA2050 Benefit-Cost Ratio	PBA2050 Equity Score	PBA2050 Guiding Principles Assessment	Project Dependencies/ Connectivity
More than 75% Committed	Less than \$250M		Greater than 1 in at least 2 of 3 futures	Advances equity in at least 2 of 3 futures	•	0 Dependency/ Connectivity Conflicts
Between 50% and 75% Committed	Between \$250M and \$1B	Construction start date 5-10 years away	Between 0.5-1 in at least 2 of 3 futures	Even equity effects in at least 2 of 3 futures	1 Guiding Principles flag	1 -2 Dependency/ Connectivity Conflicts
Under 50% Committed	Over \$1B	data ovar 10 vaare		• , ,	2 or more Guiding Principles flags	Greater than 2 Dependencies

### **Draft Framework – Endorsement Table**

- Proposed adoption in September 2022 to inform near-term federal and state grant opportunities
- Focus on PBA 2050 Tier 1
  - Named projects greater than \$1 Billion
  - Programmatic Categories to Support Investments and Initiatives less than \$1B
    - Grade Separations
    - Rapid Bus Initiatives
    - Zero Emission Bus Transition
    - Regional Express Lane Network
    - Transportation Modernization
- Identification of PBA 2050 Tier 2 Project Development Activities
  - Projects or programs greater than \$1B
  - Potential updates based on project development schedules

### Draft Framework – Sample Endorsement Table

(in Billions \$)				REGIONAL DISC	RETIONA	RYTARGETS
DDOJECT av Catamana	Ducio at Coat	Committed	Uncommitted	Fadaval	Chaha	Other
PROJECT or Category	Project Cost	Funding	Funding	Federal	State	Other
Tier 1 - Megaprojects						
Caltrain Electrification	2.4	2.0	0.4			
BART Core Capacity	3.8	3.3	0.6			
BART to Silicon Valley - Phase 2	7.3	4.3	3.1	/.		
Caltrain Downtown Extension	5.0	0.8	4.2	nda		
Valley Link - Bay Area Segment	1.9	0.7	1.2	Ter Da		
Tier 1 – Programmatic Categories				Onder Develo		
Grade Separation Program	5.0	0.5	4.5		PMent	
Rapid Bus Program	2.5	0.2	2.3		, 617F	
Zero Emission Bus Transition Program	5.0	0.0	5.0			
Regional Express Lanes Network	3.3	0.3	3.0			
Other Transportation Modernization	6.5	1.0	5.5			
Other Programs - TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD			
TOTAL TIER 1	50	14	36	19	7	11
TIER 2 - PROJECT PHASES - UNDER DEVELOPMENT	TBD	TBD	TBD			

• Regional discretionary target columns will be expanded to include specific funding categories and may contain estimated amounts or ranges.

## Funding Targets – Under Development

- Establish Ambitious but Realistic Targets
  - TIRCP/State Funding second stage
  - Federal BIL Funding
  - Regional and/or Local Transportation Revenue initiatives
- Establish Priority and Sequencing Strategies for Oversubscribed Funding Sources
- Continue Advocacy and Revise as Appropriate

### Risk Management – New Thinking

- MTC past practice has included project oversight and policies aimed at prudent investment of regional funds and meeting regional goals
  - e.g. Resolution 3434 and Regional Measure 2 policies and procedures
- Focused efforts have taken a more involved role, usually prompted by a funding or other delivery challenge
  - e.g. SMART IOS Review; Transit Center and DTX Cost Reviews; and Transit Center Cracked Beam Peer Review
- As part of the MAP, staff is proposing to develop a regional risk management approach to evaluate and monitor risks throughout project lifecycles, from early project development and network coordination through construction
- Staff is exploring whether the approach should follow past practice or consider a deeper role and looks forward to Commissioner input

### Risk Management – Example Concept

#### **Definitions:**

- Stage Gates are key points or milestones in the development of a project
- A stage gate process identifies key actions that need to be taken at important milestones
- A regional risk management overlay could include implementation of a "stage gate process" that identifies key actions that need to be taken at major milestones in order to minimize and mitigate risk
- The stage gates could determine readiness to proceed with funding. Stage gate examples related to risk include:
  - Has the project undergone a *peer review* of cost and design alternatives?
  - Does the project have a reasonable and sustainable operating plan?
  - Is there a *stable project governance structure* with required agreements in place?

## Policy Reinforcements – Under Development

- Intent of the Policy component of the MAP is to monitor project progress and consistency with policy commitments in Plan Bay Area 2050 and other regional policies such as:
  - Land use / TOC
  - Blue Ribbon Action Plan implementation
  - Participation in equity programs
  - Other
- Project endorsement/funding could be conditioned on alignment with regional policies

## **Timeline and Engagement Strategy**

- **Today**: Commission Workshop (to seek input from public and Commissioner direction)
- Ongoing engagement with transit operators and County Transportation Authorities
- Engagement with federal, state and local funding partners and sponsors.
   Additional engagement and outreach to be developed.
- MAP funding framework expected to be presented for information in July and approval in September
- Recommendations on Policy and Risk components to be presented in late Fall
   2022 and proposed for inclusion in MAP