Caltrans System Investment Strategy (CSIS)

PUBLIC WORKSHOP – JAN/FEB 2024





Opening Remarks

Marlon Flournoy

Division Chief Division of Transportation Planning



Agenda

1 – CSIS Overview

2 – Metric Overview and Proposed Changes

3 – Q&A/Discussion

4 – Updated CSIS Timeline



CSIS Overview

Why Develop the Caltrans System Investment Strategy (CSIS)?

- Implement the California Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) Key Action S4.1
- Align Caltrans project nominations with CAPTI through a dataand performance-driven approach
- What is the CSIS?
 - Caltrans investment framework to prioritize projects for state & federal discretionary programs
 - Establishes methodologies & processes
 - Prioritizes post-PID projects based on Program Fit and CAPTI alignment
 - Enhances transparency and collaboration in the decisionmaking process
- What CSIS Does <u>NOT</u> Do
 - Does not prevent local partners from proceeding in project development and applying for state and federal discretionary programs
 - Does not affect projects funded by the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)
 - Does not impact proposals to develop a Project Initiation Document (PID)
- 4 CALTRANS | DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING



CSIS Updates

1. Interim CSIS

- Released December 2021
- Qualitative Approach
- Implemented for SB 1 Cycle 3, ATP Cycle 6, and federal grant programs

2. CSIS Update (Main Document & Metrics) - DRAFT

Recent Changes

- Removing 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 versions in CSIS nomenclature
- Disassociating pre-PID CAPTI alignment from CSIS
 - State-sponsored PID Project Nomination Guidance
 - Local-Sponsored PID Evaluation Guidance (DRAFT)
- Transition Qualitative Metrics to Quantitative for CAPTI alignment
- Pilot metrics on Caltrans project nominations for SB 1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) and Solutions for Congested Corridor (SCCP)
- Target Completion: June 2024

CSIS Prioritization (Post-PID Projects)

Program Fit

Program Eligibility & Requirements Program Objectives Scored as High - Medium – Low Ranked by Highest in Competitiveness



CAPTI Alignment

Quantitative & Qualitative Metrics Averaged Score for Each Metric and Combined for Total Scores Secondary Ranking

CAPTI ► Interim CSIS ► CSIS Metrics Update

10 CAPTI Principles



7

Safety Vehicle Miles Traveled Mode Shift Public Engagement Benefits to DAC Climate Resiliency Natural & Working Lands Infill Development Zero-Emission Vehicle Infrastructure

Interim CSIS

CSIS Metrics Update



★ Proposed Transition to Quantitative \mid 🔶 Remain Qualitative



CSIS Metrics Update

Hunter Owens, Data and Digital Services

8 CALTRANS | PLANNING & MODAL PROGRAMS

Comment Summary

- 38 unique comment letters
 - 3 State Agencies
 - 25 Local or Regional Agencies
 - 6 Coalition
 - 4 NGO / Other State Agency
- 781 (and counting) total Comments
 - 200+ Clarifications
 - 50+ Changes Proposed
 - 10+ Individual Meetings Conducted



Common Theme Feedback Received

CSIS Framework

- Consideration for project location, local context, voter approved projects, buildout of regional managed lane networks, geographic equity, etc.
- Request for timeline for the 10-Year Multimodal Investment Plan timeline and how projects get added
- Concerns that rural projects would likely score low overall and unable to be competitively as urban
- Reinforce freight benefits in general
- Allow improvements that support an efficient supply chain and overall economic competitiveness, including
 interchange and bottleneck improvements

Metrics

- Clarify how data is used and thresholds established
- Add more metrics, such as evacuation routes, partnership, completion of a corridor/overall network, housing development, and economic development
- Have consistent score scale across all metrics and clarify if criteria will be weighted
- Concerned with VMT inconsistencies with CAPTI and seems to overshadow other guiding principles, such as safety
- Provide rural context consideration for VMT, other modes, and accessibility
- Safety Metric doesn't push far enough on reductions in fatal/SI crashes
- Need to meet CARB Scoping Plan goals on VMT Reduction
- Clarification of the various tools and data need for quantitative metrics

Metric-wide Updates

What We've Heard

- Metrics had varying, inconsistent scales
- Small changes in outcomes could result in substantial score changes
- Unclear how weights, cost information is used
- Normalization by project cost, request size

- Proposing all Metrics on a 0-10 score
 - When Metric can have both a positive and negative impact, set the midpoint: 5
- Elimination of step-functions, continuous scale
- Introduction of curve within a scoring cycle
- Final scores will be presented with the overall project cost and value of the request but full cost/benefit calculations will wait until nomination and completion of Cal BC

Metric-wide Updates

What We've Heard

- Add Economic Development Metric / Capture Economic Development / Jobs
- Consider Rural Context
 - Both including a specific rural bonus and making sure rural projects can score well inside each metric
- Merge VMT & Mode Shift
 - Many VMT specific comments will be covered in the VMT section of the presentation
- Capture value of partnering and completion of a corridor or network

- While Economic Development is a key goal of Caltrans, it is not a CAPTI principle. Both the program fit rubric and the access to jobs metrics will capture economic development.
- While all the Metrics are designed to be competitive for rural applicants and consider the context, no plans to implement rural specific scoring
- VMT and Mode Shift represent different targets inside CAPTI, and we see substantial variation in the directionality of those metrics
- If applicable, partnering and completing corridor would be included inside Program Fit, but is not a CAPTI Principle

Draft Metric

- $_{\rm O}\,$ Evaluates the following
 - Proven safety countermeasures' crash reduction factors
 - Counts of relevant crashes in a 5-year lookback period in project area from SWITRS/TIMS/TASAS

Data Required

- $_{\odot}\,$ Project location for each mode/intervention
- Safety countermeasures
- o Crash reduction factors (CRFs) with references
- Count of relevant crashes in a 5-year lookback period in project area (optional)

Project Info

- Projects score well by providing the following
 - Proven Need (history of crashes)
 - FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures

Key Notes

- Metric requires District/Local Engineer to review and provide countermeasures, crash reduction factors, crash counts
- $_{\odot}\,$ Source safety data covers on and off system



What We've Heard

- Consider evaluating projected
 decline in FSI
- Account for risk profile changes reduction in likelihood of collisions if decline
- Account for non-auto safety benefits
 - le, Rail, Grade Crossing
- Focus on higher risk areas

- Rail Grade Crossings, which are not a CMF, will be presumed to have a significant safety benefits
- High Risk areas will be prioritized
- Potential Transition to continuous
 metric under discussion with SMEs

- Project Scoring
 - 0: Project area has crashes and no safety countermeasures identified
 - 2: Project area has no crashes, no safety countermeasures identified
 - 4: Project area has no fatal or serious injury crashes, low (less than 10%) crash reduction factor
 - 6: No fatal or serious injury crashes, high (greater than or equal to 10%) crash reduction factor
 - 8: High (Has either fatal or serious injury) crashes, low crash reduction factor
 - 10: high (Has either fatal or serious injury) crashes, high (greater than or equal to 10%) crash reduction factor or is a Rail Grade Crossing Project
- Remains discrete

Vehicle Miles Traveled

INDUCING OR REDUCING TRAFFIC

- Draft metric:
 - Evaluate increase or reduced annual VMT
 - Score from 0 to 10 based on increase or decrease
 - Prefer environmental document
 over NCST Calculator
- Data required
 - VMT estimate from project proposal
 - Project description and location

- Project Details
 - Projects score well by reducing VMT, poorly by increasing VMT
 - Rural Projects that increase VMT will perform better than urban projects, since the absolutely value will be lower
 - VMT Mitigations can be included if in project scope
- Key Notes:
 - Projects must be at phase where they developed precise VMT estimate
 - Otherwise, a VMT range can be submitted, but we will use the worst number in range

VMT Update

What We've Heard

- Too much emphasis on VMT
 - Range of "negative scores" should be reduce, projects should only score poorly if increasing, regardless of magnitude of increase.
- Too little emphasis on VMT
 - Projects should not be CAPTI aligned unless VMT is decreasing, no matter what
- Do "per-capita" VMT
- Do "relative change" in VMT
- Include VMT Mitigations

- VMT now 0-10, no negative score
 - 5: No change in VMT
- Kept: VMT mitigations, if funded & in scope, will be included in score
- Formula:
 - If VMT decreasing, scored 5-10, scaled based on a 10 representing 10 million annual VMT decrease
 - If VMT increasing, scored 0-5, with 0 representing 10 million annual VMT increase

Accessibility

- Accessibility, in the CSIS context, represents how many destination a person can reach within a 2 hour time thresholds
 - Destinations farther away are awarded less weight using a decay function
- Utilize Conveyal Platform + hundreds millions of trip level calculations to determine the net gain
- Gains in auto-accessibility are harder to realize because the auto-network is more built out than the multimodal network in most cases but measures all modes



Accessibility

ACCESS TO DESTINATIONS – JOBS & OTHER

- Draft metric:
 - Estimate the percentage increase of jobs + destinations that residents can access post project implementation
 - Score from 0 to 10 based on population-weighted percentage increase value
- Data required
 - Project location for each mode/intervention
 - Project description (mode, type of project component)

- Project Detail
 - Projects score well by increasing the relative number of destinations somebody can get to within a time threshold
 - Population Weights account for where accessibility benefits are occurring relative to where people live
 - Rural Projects have the opportunity to score well because % increase in access, not absolute number of jobs and destinations.

Accessibility

ACCESS TO DESTINATIONS

- Scoring:
 - If no change in Access to Jobs, Destinations
 - 5
 - If increase in Access to Jobs, Destinations
 - Project Percentage Increase in Access is scaled between 5-10 where 10 corresponds to a 1% increase in Access to Jobs, Destinations
 - If decrease in Access to Jobs, Destinations
 - Project Percentage Decrease in Access is scaled between 0-5 where 0 corresponds to a 1% decrease in Access to Jobs, Destinations

Disadvantaged Communities: Access to Jobs/Destinations

- Draft metric:
 - Evaluate DAC population-weighted percent change in accessibility with Conveyal
 - Weighted according to EQI demographic overlay definition (in an AB 1550 low-income household)
 - Work and non/work destinations
- Scoring
 - Same as Accessibility, but DAC-weighted accessibility numbers
- Data required
 - Project location for each mode/intervention
 - Project description

Disadvantaged Communities: Access to Jobs/Destinations

- Jobs and Destinations combined into a single metric to capture both points in CAPTI Principle, so metric averages two scores
- Access metrics will be similar, overall scoring encourages delivering benefits to disadvantaged communities (DAC).
- Rural Projects can score well due to relative access, high proportion of DAC
- Aligns to $\frac{1}{2}$ CAPTI Principle:
 - Strengthening our commitment to social and racial equity by reducing public health and economic harms and maximizing community benefits to disproportionately impacted disadvantaged communities, lowincome communities, and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities, in urbanized and rural regions, and involve these communities early in decision-making. Investments should also avoid placing new or exacerbating existing burdens on these communities, even if unintentional.
 - (Other half, DAC Traffic Impacts Metric)

Accessibility and DAC Accessibility Updates

What We've Heard

- More clarification on EQI
- How does it effect smaller vs
 larger projects
- Include Micromobility
- Consider a rural specific typology
- Eliminate negative scores
- Include upcoming land-use
 developments and changes

- EQI is used to identify members of disadvantaged communities in this context, but all members of DAC count for the purposes of measuring access to jobs and destinations
- By using percentage rather than absolute numbers, smaller and larger projects measure on the same scale, and similar with rural and urban.
- Micromobility currently partially accounted for with "bike" mode, but further research needed
- Negative scores replaced with 0-10, midpoint of 5.
- If provided by applicant, can include updated population figures

Mode Shift

- Draft metric:
 - Evaluate change in ratio of transit/active transportation accessibility to auto accessibility.
 - [sum population-weighted non-auto accessibility] / [population weighted auto accessibility]
- Data required
 - Project location for each mode/intervention
 - Project description
- Key Notes:
 - Projects score well by increasing the ratio of destinations that one can access via non-auto modes
 - Answers: "How many destination can I reach w/o a car vs with?"



Mode Shift

- Scoring:
- No anticipated change in Mode Shift / No change in ratio of auto accessible destinations to non-auto: 5
- Anticipated shift to more non-auto travel:
 - Mode shift ratio is scaled between 5-10 where 10 corresponds to a .004 average change in the ratio
- Anticipated shift to more auto-travel
 - Mode shift ratio is scaled between 0-5 where 5 corresponds to a .004 average change in the ratio



Mode Shift Update

What We've Heard

- Merge VMT and Mode Shift
- Include all, not just max, of non auto modes

- VMT and Mode Shift measure different things, especially with VMT Mitigations include in the scope of the VMT analysis.
- Will include all non-auto mode in ratio, not just max

Disadvantaged Communities: Traffic Impact

- Draft metric:
 - Amount of additional projected truck-weighted AADT occurring impacting EQI traffic exposure screened communities.
 - Truck traffic is weighted at 6x car traffic
 - EQI Traffic Exposure Screen Definition: Census blocks that are:
 - low-income (per AB 1550)
 - at or above the 80th percentile for truck-weighted traffic proximity and volume



Disadvantaged Communities: Traffic Impact

- Scoring
 - If no impact on traffic in disadvantaged communities: 5
 - If decrease in traffic in disadvantaged communities:
 - Score is 5-10 based on scaling the percentage decrease in truck weighted AADT where 10 corresponds to a 10% decrease in truck weighted traffic
 - If increase in traffic in disadvantaged communities
 - Score is 0-5 based on scaling the percentage increase in truck weighted AADT where 0 corresponds to a 10% increase in truck weighted traffic



DAC Traffic Impacts Update

What We've Heard

- Other tools should be used to identify DACs, not just EQI
- Metric should account for net changes in traffic across the region, not just on the facility
- Other data sources should be explored to define disadvantaged communities

- All Metrics now 0-10
- Applicants can submit supporting info on net impacts which will be considered in the metric
- Future versions of the tool/metric will use the best-available data

Land Use and Natural Resources

• Draft metric:

- Evaluate whether project supports non-SOV travel in an urbanized area eligible for infill development according to the OPR Sitecheck tool.
- Projects can have a positive by creating new high-quality transit areas (PRC 21155, 21064.3).
 HQTAs trigger infill-friendly policies:
 - No parking minimums
 - CEQA streamlining
- Projects in a rural context can score well by preserving Natural and Working Lands (Sitecheck tool) and additional areas as defined by sitecheck.
- Data required
 - Project locations for non-SOV elements
 - Project description
 - Projected change in transit schedules



Land Use and Natural Resources

- Projects score well by:
 - Urban/suburban context: creating new HQTAs
 - Rural Context: enhancing natural and working lands
- Key Notes:
 - Definition of urban/suburban: project intersects an incorporated city
 - Definition of "supporting": existence non-SOV travel project element



Land Use and Natural Resources

- Additional Key Notes:
 - Metric is a combination of 2 CAPTI Principles, to incorporate urban and natural land uses
 - Promoting compact infill development while protecting residents and businesses from displacement by funding transportation projects that support housing for low-income residents near job centers, provide walkable communities, and address affordability to reduce the housing-transportation cost burden and auto trips.
 - Protecting natural and working lands from conversion to more intensified uses and enhance biodiversity by supporting local and regional conservation planning that focuses development where it already exists and align transportation investments with conservation priorities to reduce transportation's impact on the natural environment.



Land Use and Natural Resources Update

What We've Heard

- Expand Natural and Working Lands Definition
- Clarify Urban / Rural / neither definitions
- Clarify High Quality Transit Areas

- Increase number of ways to qualify natural/working lands based on input
 - Agricultural land and conservation
 areas
- "Urbanized areas" are standardized from the US Census + other state agencies
- HQTA includes 15-minute peak service bus corridors + all rail/ferry stops regardless of frequency

Land Use and Natural Resources

SCORING – PROJECTS OVERLAPPING URBANIZED AREAS

- If a project creates new HQTA, project is scored on a range from 8-10, with 10 corresponding to 10+ sq miles of new HQTA
- Remaining passenger projects are scored 0-7 based on the combination of miles of transit lanes/rail, active transportation, and car lanes.
 - It will not be possible for a project with new GP lane miles to score higher than a 4.99
- Freight rail or port projects receive a 5





Land Use and Natural Resources

SCORING – PROJECTS OUTSIDE URBANIZED AREAS

- If a project is near natural/working lands and has elements to significantly enhance them, project is scores a 10 based on magnitude of the enhancement
- If a project is near natural/working lands and reports only other environmental mitigations not on the list, project scores 7
- A project reporting neither will score 5 or below based on its traffic impact.

 A project neither near Natural / Working Lands NOR overlapping an Urbanized Area receives a 5



Multimodal and Clean Freight Updates

What We've Heard

- Consider Freight Throughput & Economic Competitiveness
- Make Projections of additional clean freight, freight throughput
- Metric does not address environmental justice concerns
- Clarify Freight Efficiency Metric
- Split Freight Metric in "Efficiency" and "Clean / Multimodal"
- Consider a TEU projection-based metric

- Freight throughput is not a CAPTI guiding principle but considered inside the program fit rubric for TCEP, other freight programs (more important)
- EJ Concerns focused elsewhere in the Metric
- Goal to transition to a future ZEV throughput calculation in future cycles.
- Splitting Freight Metric into two, weighed at .5 – no change in overall scoring

Freight Metrics

- Projects score well by:
 - Focusing on sustainable freight elements as a large proportion of construction budget
 - Providing specific metrics on increased freight efficiency or promoting a shift to modal freight
 - Metric split into two, weighted at .5
- Key Notes:
 - CAPTI Principle: Developing a zero-emission freight transportation system that avoids and mitigates environmental justice impacts, reduces criteria and toxic air pollutants, improves freight's economic competitiveness and efficiency, and integrates multimodal design and planning into infrastructure development on freight corridors.





Multimodal and Clean Freight Metric

• Sustainability Scores

- Scored 0-10, where 10 corresponds to 100% of project capital construction cost* being spent on CSFAP Action Plan Typologies
- These are: Alternative Fuel Infrastructure, Bridge Improvements, Bridge Replacements, and Intermodal At-grade Crossing Reduction, Modal (Non-highway Mode) Freight Mobility, Freight Safety, Resiliency, and Security, Freight Technology-based Approaches, Sustainable Trucking, and Other Modal and Sustainable Approaches.
 - Other modal and sustainable approaches will require additional review by the Headquarters Freight team to determine alignment with the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan Typologies.

*Smartsheet Form is changing!



Freight Efficiency Metric

- If the Project has no impact on freight, project will be scored a 0
- If the project has projected positive impact on truck efficiency or is modal freight
 - The Truck Travel Time reliability index will be measured, and the project will be awarded up to 10 points, scaled to where 10 points corresponds to a TTTRI of 3, representing highly unreliable truck travel times in the project area currently
 - 10 points will be awarded for modal freight projects





ZEV Updates

What We've Heard

- Technically a quantitative metric
- Include ZEV Transit
- Address rural areas where power may not be available

- Eliminating distinction, total of 11 Metrics with 10-point scores
- Adding ZEV Transit
- Working with SMEs to address rural areas where utilities not permitting the installation

Zero-Emission Vehicles

The purpose of this metric is to evaluate the project scope for zero emission vehicle infrastructure. Rail projects that provide Zero emission freight will be prioritized and automatically receive 10 points.

Applicant requirements:

- Provide information on the number of chargers, power levels, location, and the estimated cost with a 20% contingency.
- All installations will follow NEVI guidelines regarding the following: installation requirements, interoperability, data sharing, public availability, and smart network connectivity

Scoring:

ZEV Scoring is on a 0-10, scaled with 10.

First a ratio of Chargers / Infrastructure per fifty million dollars in request value is established. This ratio is then scaled 0-10 based on max values, shown in the following slide.



Zero-Emission Vehicles





Climate Resilience

What We've Heard

- Consideration for county-wide assessment if there is no project-level climate risk assessment
- Tools for Assessment [Climate Adaptation and Sustainability Plan (CASP)/Cal Adapt] or other federal assessment tool–CMRA
- Timing: PID/Env Documents and Climate Adaptation for CSIS evaluation
- Alignment with PIR/PID guidance
- Response to Climate stressors that are not part of the Cal Adapt [wind events, land subsidence, others]
- Clarity on long-term adaptation strategies, and other terms/definitions

- Projects can leverage countywide assessment but should provide project focused analysis
- Continue to work with SME to address comments



Public Engagement

PREVIOUS DRAFT METRIC

- Original Scoring [Sept-Oct 2023]
 - 0-5 Points
- Rubric definition ranges from 0 to 5 based on Qualitative and Quantitative attributes within each point system
 - 5 = Superior performing PE
 - 0 = Unsatisfactory and None

oints Rubric Definition

5	 Demonstrates that the project scope changed to accommodate needs and perspectives provided by the public engagement process. Documents outreach to community leaders of underrepresented groups and targeted outreach to disadvantaged communities. Documents public engagement at different phases of project development for ongoing engagement. Superior documentation of project specific public engagement process. Documents high level of resources were allocated to the public engagement process.
	 Public engagement plan outlines engagement process.
3	 Does not adequately demonstrate that the project scope changed to accommodate needs and perspectives provided by the public engagement process. Does not document outreach to community leaders of underrepresented groups and/or targeted outreach to disadvantaged communities. Documents public engagement at different phases of project development for ongoing engagement. Superior documentation of project specific public engagement process. Documents high level of resources were allocated to the public engagement process. Public engagement plan outlines engagement process.
	· robic engagement plan oonines engagement plocess.
	 Does nor adequately demonstrate that the project scope changed to accommodate needs and perspectives provided by the public engagement process. Does not document outreach to community leaders of underrepresented groups and/or targeted outreach to disadvantaged communities. Does not document public engagement at different phases of project development for ongoing engagement. Good documentation of project specific public engagement process. Documents high level of resources were allocated to the public engagement process. Public engagement plan outlines engagement process.
)	Project does not include adequate public outreach and engagement. No public engagement plan is provided or has an unsatisfactory level of detail. Little or unsatisfactory technical planning methods, techniques, and/or tools are used. Unsatisfactory documentation of resources allocated for outreach and engagement beyond what is required by California Environmental Quality Act.

Public Engagement

What We've Heard

- Context-specific level of Public Engagement [Rural vs. Urban]
- Changes to Project Scope vs.
 Inclusive Process
- Level of Resources (lack of)
- Use recognized Best Practices in PE
- Specific criteria scoring to reflect tailored public engagement approach

- Public engagement beyond environmental document [CEQA/NEPA] process
- Composite scoring for quantitative and qualitative attributes
- Checklist Approach (Performance based)
- PE Plan and feedback loop from public engagement internal to each project to ensure context and validity of the PE process



Public Engagement

Scoring: Performance-based public engagement will be evaluated on a 0 to 10 continuous scale. The following scores represent descriptive values.

0= Unacceptable Overall Public Engagement 2= Inadequate Overall Public Engagement 4 = Adequate Overall Public Engagement 6 = Average Overall Public Engagement 8 = Excellent Overall Public Engagement 10 = Superior Overall Public Engagement



Public Engagement Checklist (draft)

Scoring: Performance-based public engagement will be evaluated on a 0 to 10 continuous scale

A. Public Engagement Plan = 2 Points

A1. Informative v/s Outcome-oriented Approach/Tailored Approach = 1 Point A2. Explicit Procedures, Engagement Strategies, Timing and Desired Outcomes = 1 Point

B. Project Development through Public Engagement = 2 Points

B1. Quality of Project Outreach and Engagement Materials = 1 PointB2. Participation Rate for Input with Feedback Survey Results [Refinements to Project] = 1 Point

C. Public Engagement Modes & Methods = 6 Points

C1. Audience: Includes Targeted Audience = 2 Points C2. Outreach and Participation Methods = 2 Points C3. Participation Venues/Formats = 2 Points



Scoring Cycle: Curve

Within a scoring cycle, we want to make sure that all metrics are weighted equally, or with the appropriate weighting factors. Certain metrics may be easier or harder to achieve for certain project typologies with high program fit.

Therefore, a curve is introduced on each metric to move the highest scoring project to a 10. All other projects are adjusted to distribute along a continuous distribution, however, project scores are not adjusted downwards.

Metric	Cycle Max	Cycle Min	Adjustm ent Factor (Highest Scoring)
Accessi bility	8.4	3.5	1.6
Safety	8	1	2
DAC Traffic Impacts	10	4	0
Mode Shift	10	0	0



Scoring Cycle - Example

Project	Program Fit	CAPTI Alignment Score – Provisional	CAPTI Alignment Score – Curved	Project Cost	Request Size	Rank
Alpha	High	100	105	10 Million	5 Million	1
Beta	High	90	90	7.5 Million	7.5 Million	2
Delta	Medium	60	65			Unranked
Gamma	High	20	30			Unranked*
Epsilon	High	65	68	15 Million	6 Million	3*
Zeta	High	60	65	8 Million	3 Million	4*
Eta	Medium	110	110			Unranked*
₅ Theta	Low	90	90			Unranked

-





Metrics will guide and influence decision making for nominations and prioritization

Iterative Approach

CSIS Metrics Pilot on Caltrans Project Nominations for SB 1 Cycle 4





Flexibility and adaptability are themes as we're moving forward



Demonstrate progress on our goals and commitments in the CAPTI Annual Report while being sensitive and responsive to feedback

Updated CSIS Timeline



CSIS Survey

We want your feedback on the CSIS updates and proposed changes. Please respond to our survey.

Survey link: <u>https://forms.office.com/g/qW2jN2k2</u> <u>MF?origin=lprLink</u>



CONTACT Us!

Sinara Pheng CSIS Chief Program Manager (916) 307-0809 Sinarath.Pheng@dot.ca.gov

CSIS Feedback & Inquiries: <u>CSIS@dot.ca.gov</u>

Workshop recordings and materials will be posted on our <u>CSIS website</u>. (https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/division-of-transportation-planning/corridor-and-system-planning/csis)