

APPLICATION FORM FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) FUNDS
Cycle 3 – 2009/2010 Federal Fiscal Year

Applicants seeking Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds must use this form. Applicants that do not provide information that is required or do not prepare the application in accordance with general instructions may have their application disqualified. See Exhibit 9-B ‘[Application Form Instructions for HSIP Funds](#)’ for assistance in completing this form.

This entire [Application Form](#) must be submitted. Applicants should download the Application Form from the Division of Local Assistance HSIP website at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/apply_now.htm.

Limit the application to ten (10) pages plus attachments. Do not provide brochures and samples of materials unless they are directly related to a response.

Date: 10/8/09 **Caltrans District:** 4 **MPO:** MTC

Agency: City of Oakland

Total number of applications being submitted by your agency: 3

Rank of this project (each project application must have a different rank): 1

Contact Information:

Position/Title of Contact Person: Transportation Engineer

Name: Philip Ho

Mailing Address: 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4344

City: Oakland **County:** Alameda **Zip:** 94612

Telephone: 510-238-6256

Email: pho@oaklandnet.com

Project Category: ☐ Safety Index ☒ Work Type

Project Location (Be brief. See instructions):

Citywide on all non-residential streets where Non-Residential Disabled Parking Zones (DPZ) exist.

Description of Proposed Improvements (Be brief. See instructions):

Remediate all existing on-street non-residential Disabled Parking Zones (DPZs) for compliance with federal, state and local access compliance standards. . The City of Oakland currently has 284 non-residential DPZs. Remediation work includes curb paintings, striping, pavement markings, signage, curb ramps, and wheel stops.

Type of Improvement (check boxes that apply to primary items of work)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway illumination (where no lighting exists) | <input type="checkbox"/> New left-turn lane at signalized intersection (with left-turn phase) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Relocated or breakaway utility poles | <input type="checkbox"/> New left-turn lane at non-signalized intersection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic signs (general) | <input type="checkbox"/> Two-way left-turn lane |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Curve warning arrows | <input type="checkbox"/> Pavement markings and delineation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advance curve warning signs with advisory speed | <input type="checkbox"/> Widen or improve shoulder |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4-way stop control | <input type="checkbox"/> Flatten side slopes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Upgrade posts with breakaway supports | <input type="checkbox"/> Realign roadway |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Upgrade or new median barrier | <input type="checkbox"/> Overlay for skid treatment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Remove obstacles | <input type="checkbox"/> Reconstruction (combinations and miscellaneous) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New traffic signals | <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency vehicle priority systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Upgrade or new guardrail | <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle/pedestrian improvements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Impact attenuators | <input type="checkbox"/> Public transportation facility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Upgrade traffic signals (includes interconnect) | <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic calming |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sight distance improvement | <input type="checkbox"/> Red light running detection system |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construct raised median for traffic separation | <input type="checkbox"/> In-pavement crosswalk lights |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Groove pavement for skid treatment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Describe below) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Turning lanes and traffic channelization | <u>Remediate Disabled Parking Zones</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New left-turn lane at signalized intersection (with no left-turn phase) | |

Do the proposed improvements include Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) components as defined in Chapter 12.6 of the Local Assistance Program Guidelines? ☐ YES ☒ NO

Does the project include improvements on the State Highway System? ☒ YES ☐ NO

If YES, is this a 'joint-funded project' as described under Section 9.6? ☐ YES ☒ NO

(If yes, a letter of support from Caltrans must be attached.)

Is the improvement at an intersection or on a section of road? Select primary one. If it is a road section, indicate section length.

☐ Intersection

☒ Road Section Section Length (Miles): _____

Posted Speed Limit – primary road (mph): 35

Functional Classification (select one): 14-Urban Other Principal Arterial

Visit http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/crs_maps/ to determine the functional classification.

Current Average Daily Traffic (all directions) **Required for Safety Index Project:** _____

Year of Traffic Count: _____

Traffic Collision Information - **Required for Safety Index Project:**

Time Period (3 years min.; 10 years max.)	_____ to _____		
Collision Type	Fatal	Injury	Property Damage Only (PDO)
Number of Collisions (<u>NOT</u> Number of Victims)	_____	_____	_____

Caltrans will calculate the Safety Index for all project applications that contain sufficient data to compete under the Safety Index Project Category. See the [HSIP SI Calculation Procedure](#) for assistance and additional details.

Project Cost Estimate

Identify all costs associated with the project, rounded to the nearest \$100.

Preliminary Engineering

Environmental \$0.00
 PS&E \$91,300.00

Right of Way

Engineering \$0.00
 Appraisal and Acquisition \$0.00
 Utilities..... \$0.00

Construction

Construction Engineering \$54,800.00
 Construction \$365,000.00

Subtotal **\$511,100.00**

Contingencies (10% of Subtotal; max) \$51,000.00

Total Project Cost..... **\$562,100.00**

***Federal Funds Requested** \$505,800.00

Local or other funds \$56,300.00

Preliminary Engineering costs should not exceed 25% of Construction costs
Right of Way costs should not exceed 10% of Construction costs
Construction Engineering costs should not exceed 15% of Construction costs

*Amount must not exceed \$900,000 or 90% of Total Project Cost, whichever is less

The following three (3) questions will be used to rate projects competing under the Work Type category. Safety Index projects that do not get funded under the SI category will also be rated as a Work Type project using these questions. All applications should contain answers to these 3 questions.

1. IDENTIFICATION AND DEMONSTRATION OF NEED (20 points)

Provide some background information about the problem. How was the problem identified? How long has the problem existed? Have other countermeasures been deployed? Describe the primary cause(s) of the collisions that have occurred at the location. Are there patterns in the crash types? Given that other problems may exist within the applicant's jurisdiction, explain why this problem was chosen to compete for federal safety funds. Reference any collision data, traffic data, community surveys, reports, plans, etc. to support the problem. Attach pictures, maps, exhibits, data, diagrams, etc. to illustrate the problem.

The City has long recongnized the parking needs of people with disabilities, and established a disabled parking program for non-residential streets in the early 1990's. Non-residential Disabled Parking Zones (DPZs) serve a variety of uses including schools, colleges, hospitals, medical clinics, hospice/senior care/rehabilitation facilities, places of worship, parks and recreational facilities, community centers, libraries, businesses, offices, government buildings, transit stations, and others.

In recent years, the leading federal and state agencies have issued guidance on access compliance in the public right-of-way including standards for on-street disabled parking zones. The City adopted a new DPZ Policy effective July 1, 2009, and subsequently created model standard details for field implementation of DPZs. Existing non-residential DPZ in the City do not comply with the new standards and most must be improved. The new DPZ policy mandates that the City remediate all existing non-residential DPZs to comply with current standards. The new DPZ policy defines eligibility and technical requirements, and courses of action to provide access to and accommodate the needs of people with disabilities for existing streets/conditions as well as for new/future streets/conditions/developments where specific requirements are established for different sidewalk widths. A key element to the City's remediation effort is the reconstruction of curb ramps to meet current ADA standards.

The City has recently received several complaints from persons with disabilities about deficient disabled parking zones in civic and commercial areas. These complaints have brought into focus the importance of and urgency for remediation to provide disability access and to limit the City's exposure to costly litigation. Due to the national and local budget crisis, the City currently has limited funds to implement remediation on a citywide basis. Nevertheless, the City intends to move forward on the DPZ remediation effort as soon as funds are available.

Remediation of DPZ and associated curb ramps shall be performed in accordance with federal, state and local access compliance standards as described below:

1. Install a DPZ symbol sign (R99 CA) and parking fine sign (R99B CA) on a 10-foot pole with a 7-foot vertical clearance above grade. This improves visibility of the DPZ.
2. Paint a minimum 20-foot blue curb and install parking L's and T's striping as applicable. This defines the perimeter of the DPZ.
3. Install the International Symbol of Accessibility (ISA) symbol or "white-on-blue wheelchair" symbol pavement marking. This displays the proper use of the DPZ stall and enhances visibility of the DPZ.
4. For angled DPZ installs, install a wheel stop as required.
5. Construct or re-construct curb ramp. Where feasible under existing conditions, the DPZ should be located adjacent to a corner curb ramp. For new development, a mid-block curb ramp and a buffer zone are also required adjacent to a new DPZ.

In summary, the remediation project would benefit people with disabilities, the general public, and the City of Oakland.

The remediation effort includes the following steps:

1. Field data collection of all existing DPZs.
2. Determine if the existing DPZ is ADA compliant.
3. Evaluate whether existing DPZs have adequate access to its closest curb ramp(s).
4. Evaluate if the nearby curb ramp is ADA compliant.
5. Evaluate if the nearby curb ramp can provide adequate access to the existing DPZ.
5. Evaluate if people with disabilities would be better served if the existing DPZs are relocated.
6. Determine if the curb ramp in question need to be reconstructed for ADA compliance.
7. Identify any safety hazards or issues related to relocating DPZs.
8. Prepare scope of work, schedule and cost estimate.
9. Prepare contract documents for bidding purpose.
10. Provide construction management and engineering support as required.

The design and construction cost estimate in this grant proposal represents about two-third of the total cost of the City's remediation effort required for Year 1. The remediation is expected to be completed in two years (Year 1 and Year 2). The City will continue to seek other available funds within the City and from outside sources to complete its remediation effort.

Scoring Rubrics:

- Applicant provides a clear, detailed description of the safety risks and problems for the location; Cites recent collision facts with documentation; Explains primary causes and patterns of collision history; Attaches collision diagram and collision summary table; Includes warrant studies for installing traffic control devices; Explains the methodology used to prioritize and select the location for improvement; References and connects the [Strategic Highway Safety Plan \(SHSP\)](#) Challenge Areas and Safety Needs Action Plans (SNAPs) to the problem; Confirms location is included in California's [5% Report](#). (16-20 points)

- Applicant provides a brief description of the safety risks and problems; cites recent collision facts without documentation; explains primary causes and patterns of collision history; includes some documentation of data sets used to identify the problem and explains the methodology used to prioritize and select the location for improvement. (11-15 points)
- Applicant provides a vague description of the safety risks and problems; cites recent collision facts without documentation; does not explain primary causes and patterns of collision history; does not include documentation of data sets used to identify the problem; does not explain the methodology used to prioritize and select the location for improvement. (6-10 points)
- Applicant provides little or no information regarding the safety risks, problems, causes, patterns, and methodologies; does not cite or provide supporting documentation. (0-5 points)

2. POTENTIAL FOR PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT TO CORRECT OR IMPROVE THE PROBLEM (20 points)

Describe how the proposed solution will improve the traffic safety at or near the project site. Clearly demonstrate the connection between the problem and the proposed solution. What other countermeasures were considered? Does the proposed solution provide safety benefits for all modes of travel? Does the countermeasure reduce speed? Increase visibility? Reduce collision severity? Reduce the occurrence of specific crash types? Enhance safety for persons with disabilities? Explain why the proposed solution is the preferred alternative.

The remediation of non-residential DPZs and curb ramps is expected to improve access for people with disabilities to government and public accommodations. For many people with disabilities, the ability to park in close proximity to their workplace, health care provider, and other essential services is a primary component to living a healthy and independent life. Additionally, the DPZ remediation program will enhance safety and reduce the City of Oakland exposure to costly litigation. In summary, the remediation project would benefit people with disabilities, the general public, and the City.

Scoring Rubrics:

- Applicant provides a clear, detailed description of the potential for the proposed improvement to correct or improve the problem; demonstrates the connection between the problem and how the proposed solution will correct or improve it; cites investigation into other countermeasures to compare costs, collision reduction factors, and benefits; explains how proposed improvements benefit and provide safety to other modes of travel; provides documentation on proposed countermeasures effectiveness in correcting problem and why it is the preferred alternative; cites and correlates actions contained in the Implementation of the [Strategic Highway Safety Plan \(SHSP\)](#) to the proposed solution. (16-20 points)
- Applicant provides a brief description of the potential for the proposed improvement to correct or improve the problem; demonstrates the connection between the problem and how the proposed solution will correct or improve it; does not cite investigation into other countermeasures to compare costs, collision reduction factors, and benefits; briefly explains how proposed improvements benefit

and provide safety to other modes of travel; provides some documentation on proposed countermeasures effectiveness in correcting problem. (11-15 points)

- Applicant provides a vague description of the potential for the proposed improvement to correct or improve the problem; poorly demonstrates the connection between the problem and the how the proposed solution will correct or improve it; does not investigate or document other countermeasures to compare costs, collision reduction factors, and benefits; does not explain how proposed improvements benefit and provide safety to other modes of travel; provides minimal documentation on proposed countermeasures effectiveness in correcting problem. (6-10 points)
- Applicant provides little or no information regarding the potential for the proposed improvement to correct or improve the problem; does not provide documentation or explanations to support the selection of the countermeasure. (0-5 points)

3. POTENTIAL FOR TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT (10 points)

Describe the time frame to implement the project. Identify any potential barriers to a timely implementation. Are there likely environmental issues that could delay the project? Are there seasonal considerations for the construction period? Are all construction improvements within existing public rights of way? Have other local, regional or state funds been targeted for the project that have not yet been secured? Is there community support for, or opposition to the project?

The City of Oakland plans to complete all proposed work described in this grant proposal in 12 months from the date the City request Authorization to proceed with preliminary engineering as noted in the implementation schedule below.

Complete the Implementation Schedule below. Assume the project is amended into the FTIP on January 1, 2010.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Request Authorization to Proceed with Preliminary Engineering	<u>February 1, 2010</u>
Request Authorization to Proceed with Construction	<u>August 1, 2010</u>
Complete Construction of Project	<u>January 31, 2011</u>

Scoring Rubrics:

- Applicant provides evidence that there are no barriers or issues that will delay the project; implementation schedule is realistic and consistent with the barrier assessments provided by applicant. (7-10 points)
- Applicant identifies barriers or issues that may delay the project; explains actions and time it will take to remediate and resolve; estimates maximum and minimum durations of the delay; implementation schedule is realistic and consistent with the barrier assessments provided by applicant. (4-6 points)

- Applicant provides little or no information on barriers or issues that may delay the project; does not explain actions it would take to resolve potential issues; implementation schedule is optimistic and inconsistent when compared to other similar projects. (0-3 points)

In addition to the 3 questions above, the following factors will also be used to rate project applications:

Agency's Past Performance of Delivering Federal-aid Projects (5 points)

Scoring Rubrics:

- Caltrans will review the delivery history of the applicant to determine the score. Agencies that have had a federal-aid project on the Inactive List during the last 4 quarters (July 2008 through June 2009) will receive zero points. Applicants that have not had a project on the Inactive List will receive 5 points.

Application Attachments (10 points)

1. Vicinity map
2. Project map showing existing and proposed conditions
3. Photographs
4. Warrant studies (required when applicable to proposed improvement)
5. Collision diagram and collision summary report (required for Safety Index projects)
6. [Detailed Engineer's Estimate](#) (required for all projects)
7. Letter of Support from Caltrans (required for joint funded projects only)

Scoring Rubrics:

- Caltrans will review the attachments to determine the score. 10 points will be awarded to applications that contain all of the attachments applicable for the type of improvement. Two (2) points will be deducted for each attachment that is missing from the list above, up to a maximum of 10 points, resulting in a net score of zero (0).
- Any application that does not include a Detailed Engineer's Estimate will be disqualified.
- Any application that does not include a Warrant Study for an improvement that requires a warrant study to justify the installation of a particular traffic control device will be disqualified.
- Any application submitted as a joint funded project with Caltrans that does not include a letter of support will be disqualified.
- Any application submitted as a Safety Index project that does not include a collision diagram and collision summary report will be placed under the Work Type category and will not be eligible to compete for SI funding.

APPLICATION SIGNATURES

An agency official representing the applicant must sign the application. The undersigned affirms that the statements contained in the application package are true and complete to the best of the applicant's knowledge. The undersigned also affirms that the applicant's agency owns, operates and maintains the facility upon which the proposed improvements will be constructed. If portions of the improvements extend into areas where the applicant has no jurisdictional authority, a notation must be made that officials representing the affected local agencies support the project. In the notation, provide names and telephone

numbers of whom to contact for corroboration. Only one agency official needs to sign the application. "Agency Official" means Director, Assistant Director, Executive Director, Assistant Executive Director, or their respective designated administrators, engineers, or planners.

Agency Official Name: City of Oakland

Signature _____ Date _____

Title: Wladimir Wlassowsky, P.E., Transportation Services Division Manager

Phone Number: 510-238-6383

E-mail: wwlassowsky@oaklandnet.com (*If available*)

Notation: (*If applicable*) _____

Submit original plus one copy of your application to your [District Local Assistance Engineer](#) (DLAE) by the due date.