

PROJECT NAME/ DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	TOTAL PROJECT COST	SELECTION CRITERIA & SCORING											TOTAL SCORE	NOTES	CUMULATIVE SUM
				Improve LOS (15)	Impr. Access to Regnl. facility (10)	Preserve Existing facility (5)	Impr. Safety & Sec. (10)	Mult Model (5)	Local Match (5)	TCM (10)	CMP (10)	Equitable Distribution (0-15)	Project Readiness (0-15)	Prior Delivery Record (negative)			
Highway Investment Study	VCTC	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	15	10	0	10	5	0	0	10		15		65		\$ 500,000
Pleasant Valley Rd at Sturgis Rd Intersection Improvements	County of Ventura	\$ 335,000	\$ 560,000	15	10	0	10	10	5	10	0		0		60		\$ 835,000
Pleasant Valley Rd at East Fifth St Intersection Improvements	County of Ventura	\$ 1,425,000	\$ 1,780,000	15	10	0	10	10	0	10	0		0		55		\$ 2,260,000
Pleasant Valley Rd Bikelanes	County of Ventura	\$ 360,000	\$ 450,000	0	10	0	10	0	5	10	0	15	0		50		\$ 2,620,000
Hueneme Rd Bike Lanes	County of Ventura	\$ 168,000	\$ 280,000	0	10	0	10	0	5	10	0	15	0		50		\$ 2,788,000
Erringer Rd at Cochran St Right Turn Lane	Simi Valley	\$ 575,445	\$ 650,000	5	10	0	10	5	0	10	0		5	-5	40		\$ 3,363,445
Rice Ave at Wooley Rd Intersection Improvements	County of Ventura	\$ 200,000	\$ 250,000	10	10	0	10	0	0	10	0		0		40		\$ 3,563,445
Road Resurfacing	Ojai	\$ 354,120	\$ 400,000	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	15	15		40		\$ 3,917,565
Madera Rd Widening between Country Club West and Wood Ranch Pkwy	Simi Valley	\$ 885,300	\$ 1,000,000	0	10	0	10	5	0	0	0		15	-5	35		\$ 4,802,865
Rice Corridor Bridge at Fifth St	Oxnard	\$ 1,760,000	\$ 2,000,000	5	10	0	10	5	0	0	0		5		35	PE only	\$ 6,562,865
Pavement Rehab - Moorpark	Moorpark	\$ 637,416	\$ 720,000	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	15		35		\$ 7,200,281
Pancho Rd Improvements	Camarillo	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,694,500	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	15	0		35		\$ 8,700,281
Madera Rd Widening between Simi Village Dr and Los Angeles Ave	Simi Valley	\$ 531,180	\$ 600,000	5	10	0	10	5	0	0	0		5	-5	30		\$ 9,231,461
Kanan Rd Pavement Rehab	County of Ventura	\$ 648,000	\$ 1,080,000	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	0		15		30		\$ 9,879,461
Hueneme Rd Pavement Rehab	County of Ventura	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,330,000	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	0	15	0		30		\$ 10,679,461
Etting Rd Pavement Rehab	County of Ventura	\$ 360,000	\$ 600,000	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	0	15	0		30		\$ 11,039,461
West LA Ave Bike Lanes	Simi Valley	\$ 2,213,250	\$ 2,500,000	0	10	0	10	5	0	10	0		0	-5	30		\$ 13,252,711
Pavement Rehab Various Streets Phase I	Camarillo	\$ 500,000	\$ 565,000	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	15	0		25		\$ 13,752,711
Street Rehab	Simi Valley	\$ 3,629,730	\$ 4,100,000	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0		15	-5	25		\$ 17,382,441
Rose Ave Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 2,162,328	\$ 2,442,480	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		15		25	CON	\$ 19,544,769
Del Norte Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 2,688,479	\$ 3,036,800	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		15		25		\$ 22,233,248
Fifth St Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 1,062,360	\$ 1,200,000	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		15		25		\$ 23,295,608
Rose Ave Bridge at Fifth St	Oxnard	\$ 26,400,000	\$ 30,000,000	5	0	0	10	5	0	0	0		0		20		\$ 49,695,608
Fleet Maintenance Facility Canopy	Thousand Oaks	\$ 300,000	\$ 375,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0		5		15		\$ 49,995,608

PROJECT NAME/ DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	TOTAL PROJECT COST	SELECTION CRITERIA & SCORING											TOTAL SCORE	NOTES	CUMULATIVE SUM
				Improve LOS (15)	Impr. Access to Regnl. facility (10)	Preserve Existing facility (5)	Impr. Safety & Sec. (10)	Mult Model (5)	Local Match (5)	TCM (10)	CMP (10)	Equitable Distribution (0-15)	Project Readiness (0-15)	Prior Delivery Record (negative)			
Sturgis Rd Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 1,472,560	\$ 1,663,345	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		0		10		\$ 51,468,168
Vineyard Ave Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 1,866,655	\$ 2,108,500	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		0		10		\$ 53,334,823
Harbor Blvd Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 2,787,808	\$ 3,148,998	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		0		10		\$ 56,122,631
Channel Islands Blvd Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 3,733,091	\$ 4,216,752	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		0		10		\$ 59,855,722
Camino Del Sol Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 4,216,043	\$ 4,762,276	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		0		10		\$ 64,071,765
Pavement Rehab Various Streets Phase II	Camarillo	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,130,000	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0		0		10		\$ 65,071,765

PROJECT NAME/DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	TOTAL PROJECT COST	SELECTION CRITERIA & SCORING						TOTAL SCORE	COMMENTS	CUMULATIVE TOTAL
				Improve Mobility (Up to 25)	Improve Air Quality (Up to 25)	Multi-modal/HOV (10)	Funding Match (10)	Equitable Distribution (Up to 15)	Project Readiness (Up to 15)			
Victoria Ave Corridor Transit Service	Gold Coast	\$ 1,369,559	\$ 2,352,000	25	25	10	0		15	75	2 yrs of funding. 3rd yr in "shelf."	\$ 1,369,559
Rideshare Programs	VCTC	\$ 886,000	\$ 886,000	25	25	10	0		15	75		\$ 2,255,559
Traffic/Trip Demand Management Plan	Oxnard	\$ 132,795	\$ 150,000	25	25	10	0		15	75	PE	\$ 2,388,354
Victoria Ave Bus Stops	Oxnard	\$ 374,962	\$ 423,542	25	25	10	0		15	75		\$ 2,763,316
Moorpark City Transit Extended Hours	Moorpark	\$ 602,004	\$ 680,000	25	20	10	0		15	70		\$ 3,365,320
Erbes Rd Improvements	Thousand Oaks	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 5,250,000	20	20	10	0		15	65	CON	\$ 7,565,320
VCTC Marketing/Community Outreach	VCTC	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	20	15	10	0		15	60		\$ 8,565,320
Bike Facilities for the NECSP	Oxnard	\$ 643,896	\$ 727,320	25	25	10	0		0	60		\$ 9,209,216
Extended Bus Service	Thousand Oaks	\$ 170,000	\$ 212,500	25	20	0	0		15	60		\$ 9,379,216
Extended Trolley Service Hours	Ojai	\$ 132,795	\$ 150,000	25	20	0	0		15	60		\$ 9,512,011
C Street Bike Facilities	Oxnard	\$ 306,075	\$ 345,730	20	20	10	0		0	50		\$ 9,818,086
Arneill Rd/Dunnigan St Traffic Signal	Camarillo	\$ 250,000	\$ 282,500	15	10	10	0	15	0	50		\$ 10,068,086
Transit Stops Enhancement	Oxnard	\$ 271,769	\$ 306,979	20	15	10	0		5	50		\$ 10,339,855
Saturday Bus Service	Thousand Oaks	\$ 600,000	\$ 750,000	20	10	0	0	15	5	50		\$ 10,939,855
Rose Ave Sidewalk	Oxnard	\$ 434,555	\$ 490,856	15	15	10	0		5	45		\$ 11,374,410
Las Posas Rd Bike Lanes	County of Ventura	\$ 230,000	\$ 380,000	20	15	0	10		0	45		\$ 11,604,410
Citywide Sidewalk Survey	Oxnard	\$ 177,060	\$ 200,000	15	15	10	0		5	45		\$ 11,781,470
Trapeze Software Upgrades	Thousand Oaks	\$ 100,000	\$ 120,000	20	10	0	0		15	45		\$ 11,881,470
Ventura Blvd Sidewalk	Oxnard	\$ 913,346	\$ 1,037,680	15	10	10	0		5	40		\$ 12,794,816
Three Replacement CNG Buses	Simi Valley	\$ 1,460,745	\$ 1,650,000	10	5	10	0		15	40		\$ 14,255,561
Four Replacement Paratransit Vans	Simi Valley	\$ 354,120	\$ 400,000	10	5	10	0		15	40		\$ 14,609,681
Transportation Center Improvements	Thousand Oaks	\$ 600,000	\$ 750,000	10	10	10	0		5	35		\$ 15,209,681
CNG Fuel Station at Transportation Center	Thousand Oaks	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,000,000	5	15	10	0		0	30		\$ 16,009,681
Oxnard Bike/Ped Trail Fifth St Segment	Oxnard	\$ 2,570,025	\$ 2,903,000	5	5	10	0		5	25	PE, ROW	\$ 18,579,706
Multi-Modal Shoreside Power Project	Port of Hueneme	\$ 6,060,367	\$ 10,100,612	0	?	0	10		15	25		\$ 24,640,073
Santa Clara River Trail, Victoria Ave Segment	Oxnard	\$ 1,425,426	\$ 1,610,105	5	5	10	0		0	20		\$ 26,065,499

STP

	PROJECT NAME/DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED
1	Del Norte Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 2,688,479
2	Fifth St Resurfacing	Oxnard	\$ 1,062,360
3	Fleet Maintenance Facility Canopy	Thousand Oaks	\$ 300,000

CMAQ

	PROJECT NAME/DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED
1	Victoria Ave Corridor Transit Service 3rd Year	Gold Coast	\$ 712,667
2	Four Paratransit Vans	Simi Valley	\$ 354,120
3	Transportation Center Improvements	Thousand Oaks	\$ 600,000
4	CNG Fuel Station at Transportation Center	Thousand Oaks	\$ 800,000

Distribution of Funds Assuming Population Shares

(Assumes 2011 populations)

	<u>2011 Population</u>	<u>Population Percentage</u>	<u>Population Share</u>	<u>Cost Increases</u>	<u>Remaining Share</u>	<u>Project Above Funding Cut Off</u>	<u>Over/Under</u>
Camarillo	65,830	7.95%	\$3,066,861	\$717,000	\$2,349,861	\$ 2,250,000	(99,861)
Fillmore	15,120	1.83%	\$704,404		\$704,404	\$ -	(704,404)
Moorpark	34,710	4.19%	\$1,617,055		\$1,617,055	\$ 1,239,420	(377,635)
Ojai	7,511	0.91%	\$349,919	\$50,000	\$299,919	\$ 486,915	186,996
Oxnard	199,722	24.11%	\$9,304,567	\$1,342,340	\$7,962,227	\$ 7,861,566	(100,662)
Port Hueneme	21,477	2.59%	\$1,000,562		\$1,000,562	\$ -	(1,000,562)
San Buenaventura	107,124	12.93%	\$4,990,649	\$260,000	\$4,730,649	\$ 3,284,780	(1,445,870)
Santa Paula	29,531	3.56%	\$1,375,778	\$1,110,000	\$265,778	\$ -	(265,778)
Simi Valley	125,026	15.09%	\$5,824,660	\$131,700	\$5,692,960	\$ 9,295,650	3,602,690
Thousand Oaks	127,557	15.40%	\$5,942,574	\$967,000	\$4,975,574	\$ 5,070,000	94,426
City Total	733,608	88.56%	\$34,177,031	\$4,578,040	\$29,598,991	\$29,488,330	(110,661)
County	94,775	11.44%	\$4,415,339		\$4,415,339	\$ 4,526,000	110,661
VCTC						\$ 2,386,000	
TOTAL	828,383	100.00%	\$38,592,370	\$4,578,040	\$34,014,330	\$34,014,330	0
TOTAL+VCTC						\$ 36,400,330	



Public Works Engineering, 305 West Third Street, Oxnard Ca 93030

Feb 8, 2012

Mr. Peter DeHaan
Ventura County Transportation Commission
950 County Square Drive, Suite 207
Ventura Ca. 93003

SUBJECT: Hueneme Road Widening Project (VEN34094) – Reasons for Delays

Mr. HeHaan:

Please consider this information in your review of the recently submitted projects for the February 6, 2012, VCTC Mini-call for projects.

The Hueneme Road project was delayed beyond the target date of June 2011, due to unfortunate timing in the economy, and certain conditions beyond the City's control, specifically, difficulty in securing encroachment permits for a rail road crossing and for a flood control channel.

Hueneme Road is a corridor for many utilities in the planning stage. There were uncertainties regarding the Southshore Development adjacent to Hueneme Road east of the project area and their planned off-site utilities. Southshore was conditioned, via a Development agreement, to pay for the installation of master planned water mains and sewer trunk lines on Hueneme Road. The economy came to a crawl and the developer pulled out of the agreement. The City is also in the construction phase of a new recycled water facility on Perkins Road, with distribution lines planned on Hueneme Road, through the project area. The alignment and sizing of the utility lines was dependent on the Southshore development, so as the conditions changed, the City had to make corresponding adjustments. In addition, Calleguas Water purveyor is currently under construction along Hueneme Road installing a salinity management pipeline. It is scheduled for completion in June 2012. It was the City's intent to install all underground utilities before the surface improvements.

The project involves a Ventura County Rail Road (VCRR) crossing which has required lengthy negotiations with the owner regarding the required improvements and the associated costs. The City and VCRR have tentative reached and agreement and the encroachment permit from VCRR is being processed.

The project has a Ventura County Watershed Protection District channel crossing requiring a bridge widening. The County changed their requirements to reflect new drainage laws and future channel improvements. The City's plans for the crossing had to be redesigned. Likewise, the encroachment permit from the County will be processed.

Mr. DeHaan
Hueneme Rd Project (VEN34094)
Feb 8, 2012

Schedule:

The City of Oxnard has been in contact with Caltrans since late December of 2011 to coordinate the obligation of funds for the Hueneme Road Improvement Project. The City of Oxnard sent a request to Caltrans on February 7, 2012 to recertify the environmental documentation. Once approved by Caltrans the City will submit the paperwork to obligate the funds and move forward on March 6, 2012 with a City Council request to authorize the solicitation of bids. We anticipate starting construction activities in July 2012, with a 9 to 10 month construction period. Completion is projected in the spring of 2013.

Please call me at (805) 340-5358 if you have questions or need additional information, or email at: lou.balderrama@ci.oxnard.ca.us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lou Balderrama", followed by a horizontal line.

Lou Balderrama, P.E.
Public Works City Engineer

LB:lb

CC: VCTC Feb 6, 2012 Mini Call for Projects File

**REVISED CMAQ FUNDING
PROJECT SELECTION GUIDELINES
FOR VENTURA COUNTY
(FOR MINI CALL PURPOSES)**

CMAQ funds are used for projects which mitigate congestion and improve air quality. Types of eligible projects are as follows:

Clean Fuel Bus Fleets and Support Facilities

Improved Public Transit/Ridesharing

Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities

Traffic Management / Congestion Relief Strategies

Clean Fuel Fleet Subsidy Programs

Other Projects that meet the screening criteria

Two sets of criteria are used to evaluate projects proposed for CMAQ funding. First, **Screening Criteria** will be used to determine if a proposed project is an eligible candidate. Projects which do not satisfy all of the screening criteria will not be evaluated any further. Second, **Selection Criteria** will be used to evaluate the relative merits of each project to determine what its score/priority ranking should be.

Screening Criteria

The screening criteria are divided into three categories. Proposed projects must meet **all** of these screening criteria in order to move to the next phase of the process.

1. Project Eligibility

- A. Proposed project is eligible for CMAQ funds (see list of eligible project types on page 4-5 of these guidelines)
- B. Project applicant is a city, the County, a transit operator, or other public transportation agency, or a non-profit organization capable of funding and delivering the project, or is a private/public partnership (possibly with some private funding) subject to approval of FHWA and FTA.
- C. Proposed project mitigates measurably improves air quality.

2. Planning Consistency

- A. Project is consistent with the goals and policies of the adopted RTP (i.e. SCAG's 2008 RTP).
- B. Project is consistent with the most-recently adopted general plan(s).

- C. Project is consistent with the most-recently adopted District Air Quality Management Plan.
- D. Traffic flow improvement projects must be on roadways eligible for federal funding, which include projects on rural major collectors (and above) and urban collectors (and above).
- E. Transit improvement projects must be consistent with the policies and standards in the adopted Congestion Management Program.

3. Financial Feasibility

- A. Recipient of funds must have the financial capacity to complete, operate and maintain the project.
- B. Funds required from other sources (for local match) must be reasonably expected to be available.
- C. Project can be implemented within Federal delivery requirements.

Selection Criteria

There are eight selection criteria to be used to evaluate projects which have been found to meet the above screening criteria. Each of the criteria has a specific number of "points" assigned to them; these are maximums and as such 100 points represents a "perfect score" for any project.

Because a priority list of project categories has been established, it is difficult to evaluate projects across categories (i.e. how is a project to improve public transit compared to a traffic flow improvement, or a bicycle facility). Therefore, the criteria below provide a basic framework for ranking projects within each individual category. To a lesser extent, the criteria will help determine project "worthiness" and, in broad terms, the relative strength of each project.

In general, projects will be evaluated against each criteria to determine the degree to which they accomplish the stated goal or purpose.

A. Improve mobility. (0 to 25 points)

- Project improves mobility Up to 25 points
- Project does not provides mobility improvement 0 points

B. Improve air quality. (Based on consultation with APCD staff.) (0 to 25 points)

- Reduction in vehicle emissions Up to 25 points
- No reduction in vehicle emissions 0 points

C. Address multi-modal or HOV needs. (10 points)

- Project improves coordination between, and access to, more than one mode of travel or HOV 10 points
- Project provides little or no improvement to coordination between, or access to, more than one mode of travel or HOV 0 points

D. Funding Leverage (10 points)

- Applicant provides at least 20% local match over the required match 10 points
- Applicant does not provide at least 20% local match over 0 points

E. Equitable Distribution of Funds (0 to 15 points)

- Funding the project moves a local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding. Up to 15 points
- Funding does not move local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding 0 points

F. Project Readiness (0 to 15 points)

- Funds can be obligated by Dec 31, 2012 15 points
- Funds can be obligated by April 30, 2013 5 points

**REGIONAL STP FUNDING
PROJECT SELECTION GUIDELINES
FOR VENTURA COUNTY**

Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds are used for transportation capital projects of "regional" significance.

Program Goals

The goal of this regional or countywide program is to provide funds for improvement projects which benefit more than a single community and/or improve access to "regionally significant" facilities. The objectives of the program are summarized as follows:

- o Reduce congestion and improve mobility in Ventura County.
- o Support Ventura County in its efforts to attain Federal and State air quality standards.
- o Serve as an "alternative" funding source for projects beyond the capability of any one jurisdiction to fund.
- o Provide for an equitable distribution of funds across Ventura County.

Two sets of criteria are used to evaluate projects proposed for "regional" STP funding. First, **Screening Criteria** will be used to determine if a proposed project is an eligible candidate. Projects which do not satisfy all of the screening criteria will not be evaluated any further. Second, **Selection Criteria** will be used to evaluate the relative merits of each project to determine if it should be selected for funding and what its priority ranking should be.

Screening Criteria

The screening criteria are divided into three categories. Proposed projects must meet **all** of these screening criteria in order to move to the next phase of the process.

1. **Project Eligibility**

- A. Proposed project is eligible for STP funds (see page 7 for list of eligible projects).
- B. Project applicant is a city, the County, a transit operator, or other public transportation agency.

2. **Planning Consistency**

- A. Project is consistent with the goals and policies of the adopted RTP (i.e. SCAG's 2008 RTP).
- B. Project is consistent with the most recently-adopted general plan(s).
- C. Project is consistent with the most-recently adopted Air Quality Management Plan.

- D. Roadway improvement projects must be on roadways eligible for federal funding, which includes projects on rural major collectors (and above) and urban collectors (and above).
- E. Transit improvement projects must be consistent with the policies and standards in the adopted Congestion Management Program.

3. Financial Feasibility

- A. Recipient of funds must have the financial capacity to complete, operate and maintain the project.
- B. Funds required from other sources (for local match) must be reasonably expected to be available.
- C. Project can be implemented within Federal delivery requirements.

Selection Criteria

There are nine selection criteria which are used to evaluate projects which have been found to meet the above screening criteria. Each of the criteria has a specific number of "points" assigned to them; these are maximums and as such 100 points represents a "perfect score" for any project.

Projects will be evaluated against each criterion to determine the degree to which they accomplish the stated goal or purpose. To further guide the scoring process, specific points are assigned within each criteria (e.g. Low = 5 points, Moderate = 10 points, High = 15 points). This is intended to simplify the ranking process and focus review on the substantive issues rather than finite point differentials. The ten criteria are described below.

- A. Improve existing level of service (roadway or system) through reduced delay and/or travel time. (15 points)
- B. Improve access to regional facilities such as ports, airports, universities, state & national parks, historic sites or military/government facilities. (10 points)
- C. Preservations of existing facilities including overlay. (5 points)
 - Project preserves, replaces or rehabilitates a transportation facility 5 points
 - Does not preserve, replaces or rehabilitates a transportation facility 0 points
- D. Improve safety or security on roadways or at transit and transportation facilities. (10 points)
 - Project has high impact on a safety or security problem 10 points

- Project has moderate impact on a safety or security problem
5 points
 - Project has little or no impact on a safety or security problem
0 points
- E. Address multi-modal or HOV needs. (5 points)
- Project improves coordination between, and access to, more than one mode of travel or HOV
5 points
 - Project does not improve coordination between, or access to, more than one mode of travel or HOV
0 points
- F. Funding Leverage (5 points)
- Applicant provides at least 40% local match
5 points
 - Applicant does not provide at least 40% local match
0 points
- G. Transportation control measure (TCM) in the latest District-approved Air Quality Management Plan. (10 points)
- Is the project on the TCM list
10 points
 - The project is not on the TCM list
0 points
- H. CMP Deficiency (10 points)
- The project is on the CMP deficiency list (pg. 86 of the CMP)
10 points
 - Project not on the CMP deficiency list
0 point
- I. Equitable Distribution of Funds. (0-15 points)
- Funding the project moves a local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding
Up to 15 points
 - Funding the project does not move a local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding
0 points
- J. Project Readiness (0 to 15 points)
- Funds can be obligated by Dec 31, 2012
15 points
 - Funds can be obligated by April 30, 2013
5 points

K. Prior Delivery Record (negative points)

- VCTC will consider subtracting up to five points from an agency's scores for each 2010 Mini-Call STP Project for which construction funds were to be obligated by July 1, 2011 per the project application, but were not as of September 30th. (See Draft List on page 4 of Technical Appendix.) Agencies having such projects should include in their Application Package a letter describing the project's current schedule and explaining why the project is behind schedule. The reduction of points for an agency's project will be based on the legitimacy of the rationale for the project delay being beyond the project sponsor's control.

NOTE: "Obligated" means the funds are no longer shown in the unobligated apportionment balance, due to FHWA either providing E-76 approval or transferring funds to FTA for a transit project.