

Infrastructure Task Force

Jill Bankston, City of Encinitas
Caralee Jaeckels, Kimley-Horn

Kimley»Horn



MEETING AGENDA

1. Review Final Ranking Results
2. Review Draft Purpose and Report Outline
3. Definitions and Infrastructure Ranking Rubric Refresher

RANKING RESULTS REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

RANKING RESULTS REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

- **Purpose of the group ranking review:**
 - Review which projects ranked highest
 - Review significant changes to the ranking results
 - Review projects with a high standard deviation
 - Finalize the ranking results

TOP 20 PROJECTS

Top 20 (1/5/24)

#	12/14 Rank	1/5 Rank	Change	Project Name	Average - Total
6	2	1	1	Coastal Rail Trail, Interim: Vulcan Ped Path (Encinitas Blvd to La Costa, East Side of Tracks) [MAP Bike 1]	88.6
17	17	2	15	Leucadia Boulevard Sidewalk Infill (Neptune to Eolus) [MAP Rank 6, MAP Pedestrian #11]	86.4
8	1	3	-2	Encinitas Blvd Multi-use Path (West) (Moonlight Beach to Saxony) [MAP Rank 4, MAP Bike #29]	85.7
18	28	4	24	Leucadia Streetscape Segment A South (A Street to Marcheta) [Donut Chart DD]	85.7
19	29	5	24	Leucadia Streetscape Segment B (Basil to Jupiter) [Donut Chart EE]	85.6
27	6	6	0	Quail Gardens Dr Class IIB /Westlake St Class II Bike Lanes (Leucadia to Requeza) [MAP Rank 2, MAP Bike #23]	84.1
4	4	7	-3	Coast Highway 101 Sidewalk Infill (J St to K St) [MAP Rank 8, MAP Pedestrian #42]	83.6
20	8	8	0	Manchester Avenue Class II Bike Lanes (Via Poco to Encinitas Blvd) [MAP Rank 3, MAP Bike #43]	83.4
1	19	9	10	ADA Curb Ramp Project (Annual Project/Citywide) [Donut Chart Annual]	83.3
46	5	10	-5	Electric Fleet Vehicles (30+) (incl. Plug-In Electric Fire Engine) & EV Charging for City Fleet/Facilities (CAP Measure MCET-1)	82.1
2	11	11	0	Coast Highway 101 Sidewalk Infill (A St to Marcheta)	82.0
16	7	12	-5	Leucadia At-Grade Crossings [Donut Chart JJ: Rail Safety Study At-Grade Crossings (Leucadia)]	81.9
3	9	13	-4	Coast Highway 101 Sidewalk Infill (Chesterfield Dr to South Cardiff)	81.9
59	15	14	1	USACE 50-Year Storm Damage Reduction Project (San Diego County, CA Project)	81.4
45	22	15	7	Vulcan Avenue/Coast Hwy 101 & Encinitas Boulevard Pedestrian Scramble [MAP Rank 10, MAP Pedestrian #69]	79.4
33	54	16	38	Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Program (Annual Project) [Donut Chart Annual]	79.3
13	10	17	-7	La Costa Avenue Pedestrian Path Construction (I-5 to 101)	78.3
5	23	18	5	Coastal Rail Trail (Encinitas Blvd to La Costa, East Side of Tracks)	78.3
81	13	19	-6	Fire Station #1 Replacement	78.0
108	65	20	45	Leucadia Blvd Roundabout at Hygeia (Roundabout and Pedestrian Improvements) [Donut Chart Y and Donut Chart Z]	78.0

Top 20 (12/14/23)

#	12/14 Rank	1/5 Rank	Change	Project Name	Average - Total
8	1	3	-2	Encinitas Blvd Multi-use Path (West) (Moonlight Beach to Saxony) [MAP Rank 4, MAP Bike #29]	86.5
6	2	1	1	Coastal Rail Trail, Interim: Vulcan Ped Path (Encinitas Blvd to La Costa, East Side of Tracks) [MAP Bike 1]	84.0
83	3	22	-19	Fire Station #6	81.8
4	4	7	-3	Coast Highway 101 Sidewalk Infill (J St to K St) [MAP Rank 8, MAP Pedestrian #42]	81.5
46	5	10	-5	Electric Fleet Vehicles (30+) (incl. Plug-In Electric Fire Engine) & EV Charging for City Fleet/Facilities (CAP Measure MCET-1)	80.5
27	6	6	0	Quail Gardens Dr Class IIB /Westlake St Class II Bike Lanes (Leucadia to Requeza) [MAP Rank 2, MAP Bike #23]	80.3
16	7	12	-5	Leucadia At-Grade Crossings [Donut Chart JJ: Rail Safety Study At-Grade Crossings (Leucadia)]	80.2
20	8	8	0	Manchester Avenue Class II Bike Lanes (Via Poco to Encinitas Blvd) [MAP Rank 3, MAP Bike #43]	79.3
3	9	13	-4	Coast Highway 101 Sidewalk Infill (Chesterfield Dr to South Cardiff)	78.2
13	10	17	-7	La Costa Avenue Pedestrian Path Construction (I-5 to 101)	78.2
2	11	11	0	Coast Highway 101 Sidewalk Infill (A St to Marcheta)	77.2
62	12	28	-16	Drainage Projects (Annual Project/Citywide)	77.2
81	13	19	-6	Fire Station #1 Replacement	77.0
60	14	25	-11	CMP Lining/Replacement (All City)	76.7
59	15	14	1	USACE 50-Year Storm Damage Reduction Project (San Diego County, CA Project)	76.0
64	16	24	-8	Lake Drive Storm Drain Replacement [Donut Chart HH]	75.0
17	17	2	15	Leucadia Boulevard Sidewalk Infill (Neptune to Eolus) [MAP Rank 6, MAP Pedestrian #11]	74.5
37	18	27	-9	Saxony Road Sidewalk Infill (La Costa to Leucadia Blvd) [MAP Ranks 7 & 20, MAP Bike #4 & #8]	74.3
1	19	9	10	ADA Curb Ramp Project (Annual Project/Citywide) [Donut Chart Annual]	72.5
82	20	31	-11	Fire Station #4 Replacement	72.0

NOTABLE CHANGES

Greatest increases

#	12/14 Rank	1/5 Rank	Change	Project Name	Average - Total
101	70	23	47	Birmingham Drive Complete Streets [Donut Chart AA]	76.6
108	65	20	45	Leucadia Blvd Roundabout at Hygeia (Roundabout and Pedestrian Improvements) [Donut Chart Y and Donut Chart Z]	78.0
33	54	16	38	Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Program (Annual Project) [Donut Chart Annual]	79.3
40	87	57	30	Solana Beach 101 Crosswalk/Signal [Donut Chart KK: S Coast Highway 101 Pedestrian Crossing & Mobility Enhancements at Solana Beach]	62.0
12	73	48	25	Innovative Bike Lanes (Annual Project/Citywide) [Doughnut Chart Annual]	66.7
44	78	53	25	Verdi Pedestrian Crossing [Donut Chart BB]	63.7
18	28	4	24	Leucadia Streetscape Segment A South (A Street to Marcheta) [Donut Chart DD]	85.7
19	29	5	24	Leucadia Streetscape Segment B (Basil to Jupiter) [Donut Chart EE]	85.6
42	96	72	24	Trail 82 on Rancho Santa Fe Road (Encinitas Blvd to El Camino Del Norte)	53.0
114	74	51	23	Traffic Safety and Calming (Annual Project/Citywide) [Donut Chart Annual]	64.7
112	50	29	21	Santa Fe Drive Corridor Improvements (Roundabout at Crest and Other enhancements) [Donut Chart W]	74.6
30	52	32	20	Rancho Santa Fe Road (Calle Santa Catalina to Encinitas), Cole Ranch Road (Chelsea to Lone Jack) Trail [MAP Rank 32, MAP Pedestrian #32]	72.6
67	58	40	18	North Coast Highway 101 Drainage Improvements (South to Cottonwood Creek)	70.6
29	38	21	17	Rail Corridor Cross Connect Grant (And Implementation) [Donut Chart MM]	77.7
28	71	55	16	Quail Gardens Drive Sidewalk Infill (Ecke Ranch to Kristen Ct)	62.9
17	17	2	15	Leucadia Boulevard Sidewalk Infill (Neptune to Eolus) [MAP Rank 6, MAP Pedestrian #11]	86.4
10	81	66	15	General Mobility Improvements (Annual Project/Citywide) [Donut Chart Annual]	59.7
109	82	69	13	Leucadia Blvd. I-5 Bridge Rail Repair [Donut Chart OO]	56.1
115	84	71	13	Traffic Signal Modifications & Upgrades (Annual Project/Citywide) [Donut Chart Annual]	53.4
65	41	30	11	North Coast Highway 101 Drainage Improvements (North End) [Donut Chart X]	74.3

Greatest decreases

#	12/14 Rank	1/5 Rank	Change	Project Name	Average - Total
49	40	61	-21	Public EV Charging Stations (200-400) (Supports CAP Measures CET-4 and CET-5)	61.1
51	44	64	-20	Cardiff State Beach Living Shoreline Project	60.1
83	3	22	-19	Fire Station #6	77.4
9	25	43	-18	F Street/Requeza Street Sidewalk Infill (Vulcan to Devonshire) [MAP Rank 26, MAP Pedestrian #33]	69.9
7	49	67	-18	Crest Drive Trail (ECR to Melba) [MAP Rank 24, MAP Pedestrian #50]	58.7
50	39	56	-17	Batiquitos Lagoon Dredging	62.3
48	45	62	-17	Microtransit Study and Program	61.0
76	51	68	-17	Encinitas Community Center Gym	56.1
62	12	28	-16	Drainage Projects (Annual Project/Citywide)	75.1
54	35	50	-15	San Elijo Lagoon Annual Dredging	65.3
74	64	79	-15	Community & Senior Center Renovations	47.1
87	66	81	-15	Leo Mullen Turf Replacement	46.7
15	27	41	-14	Lake Drive Sidewalk Infill (Santa Fe to Woodgrove) [MAP Rank 11, MAP Pedestrian #52]	70.1
57	31	45	-14	Scoop-Sand Compatibility Opportunistic Use Program	68.7
75	46	60	-14	D Street Access Refurbishment	61.3
79	62	76	-14	Facilities Condition Assessment and Implementation	49.0
26	60	73	-13	Power Line Multi-use Path (Garden View to Willow Spring) [MAP Rank 25, MAP Bike #36]	51.6
96	61	74	-13	Grandview Lifeguard Tower IT Infrastructure	50.4
60	14	25	-11	CMP Lining/Replacement (All City)	76.1
82	20	31	-11	Fire Station #4 Replacement	74.1

HIGHEST STANDARD DEVIATIONS

#	12/14 Rank	1/5 Rank	Change	Project Name	Average - Total	SD - Total
38	110	99	11	Saxony Road/Union Street Intersection Improvements: Option B (Mini-Roundabout)	30.0	34.6
22	76	84	-8	N. Vulcan Ave Buffered Class II Bike Lanes and Sidewalk	44.7	32.1
100	95	94	1	Rail Corridor Trenching at Leucadia Boulevard	35.9	31.6
12	73	48	25	Innovative Bike Lanes (Annual Project/Citywide) [Doughnut Chart Annual]	66.7	22.9
90	83	92	-9	Playground Replacement	36.6	22.2
107	90	91	-1	La Costa Bridge Replacement	37.6	21.9
28	71	55	16	Quail Gardens Drive Sidewalk Infill (Ecke Ranch to Kristen Ct)	62.9	21.8
44	78	53	25	Verdi Pedestrian Crossing [Donut Chart BB]	63.7	21.7
78	102	106	-4	Encinitas Library Community Room	23.7	21.1
14	91	88	3	La Costa Pedestrian Bridge over Rail Corridor	40.3	20.8
31	77	78	-1	Rancho Santa Fe Roundabouts	47.9	20.6
69	53	59	-6	Vulcan Ave Drainage Improvements	61.6	20.5
70	88	93	-5	100% Affordable	36.0	20.5
80	93	97	-4	Facility Maintenance	33.1	20.0
33	54	16	38	Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Program (Annual Project) [Donut Chart Annual]	79.3	19.8
56	37	46	-9	SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP III)	68.0	19.7
40	87	57	30	Solana Beach 101 Crosswalk/Signal [Donut Chart KK: S Coast Highway 101 Pedestrian Crossing & Mobility Enhancements at Solana Beach]	62.0	19.4
35	79	80	-1	San Elijo Bridge Sidewalk	47.0	19.3
112	50	29	21	Santa Fe Drive Corridor Improvements (Roundabout at Crest and Other enhancements) [Donut Chart W]	74.6	18.6
113	68	63	5	Saxony Road Realignment	60.6	18.2

**DRAFT PURPOSE
AND
DRAFT REPORT OUTLINE**

ITF MISSION AND GOALS

The Council Subcommittee identified a draft mission and overarching goals for the ITF:

1. Identify the City's capital improvement backlog and future needs for the 2025 to 2035 timeframe.
2. Define criteria and clarify processes for identifying and prioritizing future city CIP needs, projects, and funding opportunities.
3. Ensure that the CIP program and prioritization is linked to the City's policies and planning priorities.
4. Ensure transparency in communications about infrastructure needs, challenges, and the work of the ITF.
5. Make recommendations regarding funding the City's infrastructure backlog at the conclusion of the task force work.

ITF SCOPE OF WORK

1. Identify the City's infrastructure backlog and future needs.
2. Develop a project scoring rubric that reflects the City's values and priorities.
3. Estimate total cost of the infrastructure backlog including likely escalation in City project construction estimates and budgets, as well as increases in the cost of labor, equipment, and materials due to continuing price changes over time.
4. Estimate cost of a ten-year infrastructure future forecast (beyond the backlog) including likely escalation in City project construction estimates and budgets, as well as increases in the cost of labor, equipment, and materials due to continuing price changes over time.
5. Make recommendations that address funding the infrastructure backlog and 10-year future forecast at the conclusion of the ITF meetings in early 2024 considering:
 - a. Public/private development partners.
 - b. Public agency partners (State, Federal, Regional grant funding).
 - c. Potential financing measures.
 - d. Optimizing and leveraging existing city and partner investments for matching funds, and/or
 - e. Other funding mechanism (assessment district, etc.).
6. Determine if the City's infrastructure needs can be prioritized, financed, and effectively implemented given current staff resources.

DRAFT PURPOSE OF THE ITF REPORT

The purpose of this document is to provide a framework to prioritize City infrastructure projects and summarize the ITF's recommendations. These recommendations will be provided to City Council to help inform planning, staffing, and funding decisions.

The process to develop the scoring rubric, project rankings, and recommended funding sources is anticipated to be repeated and revised periodically to reflect evolving City priorities and initiatives. This document summarizes recommended modifications for future prioritization exercises based on the ITF committee members' experience with the initial process.

DRAFT REPORT OUTLINE

1. Introduction

- Formation of the ITF
- ITF Mission and Goals
- ITF Scope of Work
- Purpose of this Document

2. Project Prioritization Rubric

- Rubric development process
- Final Prioritization Rubric and Scoring Guidelines

3. Comprehensive Infrastructure Projects List

- Projects List Development Methodology
 - Eligible Projects and Key Definitions
 - Final Prioritized List of Projects

4. Financing Infrastructure Needs

- Existing Yearly Budget and 10-Year Revenue Projection
 - Where funding comes from, where it is spent (sheriff, fire, bonds/loans)
 - Existing budget does not align with the improvements the residents of Encinitas are interested in
- Available Funding Sources
- ITF Recommended Funding Sources
 - Grants, Sales Tax (ballot measure), TOT, Public-Private Partnerships
- Future Yearly Budget and 10-Year Revenue Projection with additional recommended funding sources

5. ITF Final Recommendations

- Use of rubric to provide recommendations to Council each year
- Pursuit of a Sales Tax measure as the biggest bang for the buck
- List of projects that could be funded in the 10-year revenue projection

RESULTS REFINEMENT PROCESS REFRESHER

RESULTS REFINEMENT PROCESS REFRESHER

Criteria 1: Risk to Health, Safety, and Regulatory or Mandated Requirements

- **Projects located on a corridor listed in the Local Road Safety Plan as having a pattern of serious injury or fatal collisions**
 - Changed any scores of Low or Medium to High for this criteria
- **Local Road Safety Plan & Vision Zero Improvement Projects**
 - Changed any score of Low or Medium to High for this criteria
- **Electric Fleet Vehicles (30+) (incl. Plug-In Electric Fire Engine) & EV Charging for City Fleet/Facilities (CAP Measure MCET-1)**
 - Changed all scores for this criteria to High due to the requirement by the Advanced Clean Fleets legislation.

RESULTS REFINEMENT PROCESS

Criteria 2: Identified Infrastructure Need and Asset Longevity

- **Projects listed as a City department priority**
 - Changed all scores to High for this criteria
- **Projects that appear in the Donut Chart**
 - Changed all scores to High for this criteria

**KEY DEFINITIONS
AND
RANKING RUBRIC
REFRESHER**

KEY DEFINITIONS

Key definitions within the context of the Encinitas Infrastructure Task Force

- **Infrastructure**

- Physical improvements, assets, and facilities under the jurisdiction of the City of Encinitas
 - » Excluding projects under \$100,000 or useful life under 5 years
 - » Excluding projects that are funded purely by user fees/enterprise funds (all utility projects)
 - » Excluding projects and tasks performed by City workforce (plan checks, reporting, hiring additional staff)

- **Asset longevity**

- How long an asset can reasonably be expected to be used for the benefit of the City
 - » Projects that extend asset longevity include repairs and preventative maintenance, such as resurfacing roadways or fixing a leaky roof.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Key definitions within the context of the Encinitas Infrastructure Task Force

- **Critical function**

- A function that is necessary to effectively utilize an infrastructure asset
 - » Failure to maintain critical function would prevent the asset from being effectively utilized.

- **Identified infrastructure need**

- Project was identified in a City planning document or City budget

- **City department priority**

- Project was identified as a priority by a City department
 - » Note: It is assumed that the City departments applied their subject matter expertise, local knowledge, and good faith judgment to identify priority projects. The ITF may recommend a formal process for identifying priority projects in future applications of the scoring rubric.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Key definitions within the context of the Encinitas Infrastructure Task Force

- **Backlog**

- Backlog projects are associated with existing assets and commitments
 - » Projects that maintain, repair & rehabilitate, or modernize existing assets to conform with an accepted industry standard or state of good repair
 - » Projects that would help the City meet existing local, regional, or state performance targets

- **Future Need**

- Projects that would provide assets that exceed accepted industry standards or performance targets

UPDATED ENCINITAS INFRASTRUCTURE RANKING RUBRIC

Criteria	Maximum Score	Scores		
		No Points	Half Points	Full Points
1. Risk to Health, Safety, and Regulatory or Mandated Requirements	30	Project does not address existing health/safety issues and is not legally mandated.	Project maintains or improves public health/safety. Project may be deferred without impacting existing health/safety and project is not legally mandated.	Project provides an essential service or infrastructure to correct, maintain, or improve an existing deficiency that may directly affect health/safety. Project deferral may impact future risk to health/safety; and/or project is legally mandated.
2. Identified Infrastructure Need and Asset Longevity	28	Project is not an identified infrastructure need and does not improve longevity or reliability of infrastructure.	Project is an identified infrastructure need in a City planning document but was <u>not</u> identified as a priority by a City department or maintains assets nearing the end of their useful lives.	Project appears in the Donut Chart <u>or</u> is identified as a City department priority or corrects existing deficiencies to maintain critical functioning of the asset.
3. Sustainability, Environmental Conservation, and Resilience	16	Project does not improve sustainability, environmental conservation, or resilience (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project improves one of the following: sustainability, environmental conservation, or resilience (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project improves at least two of the following: sustainability, environmental conservation, or resilience (as defined in the scoring guidance).
4. Livability and/or Equitable Community Investment	14	Project does not improve livability, community equity, or existing disparities.	Project improves livability <u>or</u> equity for underserved communities/users of all ages and abilities by addressing disparities in infrastructure.	Project improves livability <u>and</u> equity for underserved communities/users of all ages and abilities by addressing disparities in infrastructure.
5. Consistency with City Priorities	12	Project is not consistent with or is indirectly related to City priorities (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project addresses one City priority (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project addresses multiple City priorities (as defined in the scoring guidance).
Total	100			

1. RISK TO HEALTH, SAFETY, AND REGULATORY OR MANDATED REQUIREMENTS

Criteria	Maximum Score	Scores		
		No Points	Half Points	Full Points
1. Risk to Health, Safety, and Regulatory or Mandated Requirements	30	Project does not address existing health/safety issues and is not legally mandated.	Project maintains or improves public health/safety. Project may be deferred without impacting existing health/safety and project is not legally mandated.	Project provides an essential service or infrastructure to correct, maintain, or improve an existing deficiency that may directly affect health/safety. Project deferral may impact future risk to health/safety; and/or project is legally mandated.

- Project reduces the risk to health and safety associated with the infrastructure based on a condition assessment. Examples include:
 - Reduction in main breaks, sewer spills, or flooding
 - Improved structural integrity and reliability of infrastructure
 - Mitigation of health and environmental hazards
 - Safety improvements that reduce fatalities and severe injuries
 - Reduced emergency response times
- Project deferral may directly affect future risk to public health/safety.
- Project increases compliance with state or federal law.
- Project reduces liability associated with assets that are not consistent with newer regulations, policies, and building standards.
- **Project automatically receives full points if:**
 - It is located on a corridor listed in the Local Road Safety Plan as having a pattern of serious injury or fatal collisions.
 - It is tied to a legislation, executive order, regulation, etc.

2. IDENTIFIED INFRASTRUCTURE NEED AND ASSET LONGEVITY

Criteria	Maximum Score	Scores		
		No Points	Half Points	Full Points
2. Identified Infrastructure Need and Asset Longevity	28	Project is not an identified infrastructure need and does not improve longevity or reliability of infrastructure.	Project is an identified infrastructure need in a City planning document but was not identified as a priority by a City department or maintains assets nearing the end of their useful lives.	Project appears in the Donut Chart or is identified as a City department priority or corrects existing deficiencies to maintain critical functioning of the asset.

- Project addresses substandard asset conditions.
- Project improves the overall reliability of the capital asset and infrastructure system and extends the useful life of the asset.
- Project reduces maintenance expenditures.
- Project addresses an infrastructure or facility need that was identified as a priority by a City planning document or City staff.
- Project serves areas with higher population densities and areas experiencing the most growth.

- **Project automatically receives full points if:**
 - It appears in the Donut Chart.
 - It was identified as a priority by a City department.
 - » Note: It is assumed that the City departments applied their subject matter expertise, local knowledge, and good faith judgment to identify priority projects. The ITF may recommend a formal process for identifying priority projects in future applications of the scoring rubric.
- **Project receives (at least) half points if:**
 - It was identified in a City planning document such as MAP, ATP, CAP, or other planning documents

3. SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION, AND RESILIENCE

Criteria	Maximum Score	Scores		
		No Points	Half Points	Full Points
3. Sustainability, Environmental Conservation, and Resilience	16	Project does not improve sustainability, environmental conservation, or resilience (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project improves one of the following: sustainability, environmental conservation, or resilience (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project improves at least two of the following: sustainability, environmental conservation, or resilience (as defined in the scoring guidance).

Sustainability is defined as the satisfaction of basic social and economic needs, both present and future, and the responsible use of natural resources, all while maintaining or improving the well-being of the environment on which life depends.

- Examples include promoting multi-modal transportation, decarbonization of facilities and assets (such as city-owned fleet vehicles).

Environmental Conservation is defined as the careful maintenance and upkeep of a natural resource to prevent it from disappearing. A natural resource is the physical supply of something that exists in nature, such as soil, water, air, plants, animals, and energy.

- Examples include protecting natural habitats, improving air quality, improving water quality and runoff management, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Resilience is defined as the capacity of a community, business, or natural environment to prevent, withstand, respond to, and recover from a disruption.

- Examples include reducing heat island effect, increasing tree canopy and green space, reducing effects of sea level rise, or increasing local energy or water resource independence.

4. LIVABILITY AND/OR EQUITABLE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT

Criteria	Maximum Score	Scores		
		No Points	Half Points	Full Points
4. Livability and/or Equitable Community Investment	14	Project does not improve livability, community equity, or existing disparities.	Project improves livability <u>or</u> equity for underserved communities/users of all ages and abilities by addressing disparities in infrastructure.	Project improves livability <u>and</u> equity for underserved communities/users of all ages and abilities by addressing disparities in infrastructure.

- Project contributes to community development and enhancement efforts.
- Project contributes to accessibility to employment opportunities, schools, community services, or recreation.
- Project addresses disparities in infrastructure or improves neglected assets.
- Project promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion by providing new and/or improved services and amenities to underserved communities.
- Project improves access for people of all ages and abilities.

5. CONSISTENCY WITH CITY PRIORITIES

Criteria	Maximum Score	Scores		
		No Points	Half Points	Full Points
5. Consistency with City Priorities	12	Project is not consistent with or is indirectly related to City priorities (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project addresses one City priority (as defined in the scoring guidance).	Project addresses multiple City priorities (as defined in the scoring guidance).

Environmental Health & Leadership: commitment to good stewardship of our natural resources, including decarbonization, mobility mode shift, clean air and water, responsible solid waste disposal, storm and wastewater reuse, shoreline, and open space preservation.

Engagement and Education: listen and learn from the community using diverse and inclusive communication tools that continually adapt and build relationships with our community stakeholders. Communication and engagement are characterized as fair, civil, timely and transparent.

Fiscal Stewardship: use resources in a prudent and efficient manner consistent with City goals. Effective City Services means services are provided respectfully, responsibly, timely and predictably.

Mobility and Alternative Modes: strive to be a nation-wide leader in mode shift by providing data driven solutions to create a safe transportation network along with programs that educate and empower people to reach destinations by active transportation and micro-mobility.

Evolving & Preserving Community Character: managing growth while maintaining an accessible, innovative, and welcoming unique beach city; ensuring that diversity of the community includes a great mix of businesses, people, housing and open space that results in a high quality of life.