Memorandum

Tab 47

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 20-21, 2016

Reference No.: 4.21
Information

From: WILL KEMPTON
Executive Director

Subject: **DRAFT 2017 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP) GUIDELINES AND APPLICATION**

ISSUE:

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the ATP. The guidelines are developed in cooperation with Caltrans, regional transportation planning agencies, local agencies, and active transportation stakeholders in accordance with Streets & Highways Code 2382. The ATP guidelines may be amended by the Commission after conducting at least one public hearing. For the 2017 ATP, staff is proposing to adopt the project application along with the guidelines.

Staff has received several e-mails and letters with suggestions for changes to the guidelines and application. These are attached to this item. Workshops will be held on January 29 and in early February of this year to discuss possible revisions to the guidelines and application. The topics of discussion at these workshops will likely include evaluation criteria and project scoring, program schedule and application streamlining. The attached draft guidelines and application were prepared as a starting point to generate discussion at the upcoming workshops. Staff intends to bring the Final 2017 ATP Guidelines and Application to the Commission for adoption at the March 2016 meeting.

BACKGROUND:

On September 26, 2013, the Governor signed legislation creating the Active Transportation Program (Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359 and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354). This legislation requires the Commission, in consultation with an Active Transportation Program Workgroup, to develop program guidelines. The Commission guidelines are to describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the Active Transportation Program.

Attachments

DRAFT

2017

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

January xx, 2016

California Transportation Commission

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
2017 ATP GUIDELINES
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page will be revised at Final

I. Introduction 1
1. Background 1
2. Program Goals 1
3. Program Schedule 1

II. Funding 2
4. Source 2
5. Distribution 2
6. Matching Requirements 3
7. Funding for Active Transportation Plans 4
8. Reimbursement 4

III. Eligibility 5
9. Eligible Applicants 5
10. Partnering With Implementing Agencies 6
11. Eligible Projects 6
12. Minimum Request For Funds 8
13. Project Type Requirements 8

IV. Project Selection Process 11
14. Project Application 11
15. Sequential Project Selection 12
16. MPO Competitive Project Selection 12
17. Screening Criteria 13
18. Scoring Criteria 13
19. Project Evaluation Committee 15

V. Programming 16

VI. Allocations 17

VII. Project Delivery 18
20. Federal Requirements 18
21. Design Standards 19
22. Project Inactivity 20
23. Project Reporting 20

VIII. Roles And Responsibilities 21
24. California Transportation Commission (Commission) 21
25. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) 21
26. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) With Large Urbanized Areas 22
27. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) Outside an MPO with Large Urbanized Areas and MPOs without Large Urbanized Areas 23
28. Project Applicant 23

IX. Program Evaluation 23

I. Introduction

1. Background

The Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking.

These guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the Active Transportation Program **(ATP)**. The guidelines were developed in consultation with the ~~Active Transportation Program~~ Workgroup. The workgroup includes representatives from Caltrans, other government agencies, and active transportation stakeholder organizations with expertise in pedestrian and bicycle issues, including Safe Routes to School programs.

~~The California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopted the initial Active Transportation Program guidelines on March 20, 2014.~~ The Commission may amend the **ATP** ~~adopted~~ guidelines after conducting at least one public hearing. The Commission must make a reasonable effort to amend the guidelines prior to a call for projects or may extend the deadline for project submission in order to comply with the amended guidelines.

2. Program Goals

Pursuant to statute, the goals of the Active Transportation Program are to:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users.
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) and Senate Bill 391 (Chapter 585, Statutes of 2009).
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding.
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program.
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

3. Program Schedule

The guidelines for the ~~second~~ **third** program of projects must be adopted by March ~~26, 2015~~**17, 2016**.

~~This second program of projects must be adopted by the Commission by December 2015. Subsequent~~ **Each** programs must be adopted not later than April 1 of each odd-numbered year; however, the Commission may alternatively elect to adopt a program annually.

The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the **2017** ~~2015~~ Active Transportation Program (ATP):

Draft ATP Guidelines **and Application** presented to Commission	~~January 22, 2015~~ **January 20-21, 2016**
Commission adopts ATP Fund Estimate	~~March 26, 2015~~ **March 17, 2016**
Commission hearing and adoption of ATP Guidelines **and Application**	~~March 26, 2015~~ **March 17, 2016***
Call for projects	~~**March 26, 2015**~~ **March 30, 2016**
Project applications to Caltrans (postmark date)	~~June 1, 2015~~ **June 15, 2016**
Large MPOs submit optional guidelines to Commission	~~June 1, 2015~~ **June 1, 2016**
Commission approves or rejects MPO guidelines	~~June 24-25, 2015~~ **June 29-30, 2016***
Staff recommendation for statewide and small urban and rural portions of the program	~~Sept. 15, 2015~~ **October 28, 2016**
Commission adopts statewide and small urban and rural portions of the program	~~Oct. 21-22, 2015~~ **December 7-8, 2016***
Projects not programmed distributed to large MPOs based on location	~~Oct. 22, 2015~~ **December 7-8, 2016**
Deadline for MPO project programming recommendations to the Commission	~~Nov. 16, 2015~~ **January 27, 2017**
Commission adopts MPO selected projects	~~Dec. 9-10, 2015~~ **March 2017**

*Dates coincide with the Commission's adopted 2016 CTC meeting calendar.

II. Funding

4. Source

The Active Transportation Program is funded from various federal and state funds appropriated in the annual Budget Act. These are:

- 100% of the federal Transportation Alternative Program funds, except for federal Recreation Trail Program funds appropriated to the Department of Parks and Recreation.
- $21 million of federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds or other federal funds.
- State Highway Account funds.

In addition to furthering the goals of this program, all Active Transportation Program projects must meet eligibility requirements specific to at least one Active Transportation Program funding source.

5. Distribution

State and federal law segregate the Active Transportation Program into multiple, overlapping components. The Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate must indicate the funds available for each of the program components. Consistent with these requirements, the Active Transportation Program funds must be distributed as follows:

- Forty percent to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000.

  These funds must be distributed based on total MPO population. The funds programmed and allocated under this paragraph must be selected through a competitive process by the MPOs in accordance with these guidelines.

  Projects selected by MPOs may be in large urban, small urban, or rural areas.

  A minimum of 25% of the funds distributed to each MPO must benefit disadvantaged communities.

  The following statutory requirements apply specifically to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

  - SCAG must consult with county transportation commissions, the Commission, and Caltrans in the development of competitive project selection criteria.
  - The criteria used by SCAG should include consideration of geographic equity, consistent with program objectives.
  - SCAG must place priority on projects that are consistent with plans adopted by local and regional governments within the county where the project is located.
  - SCAG must obtain concurrence from the county transportation commissions.

- Ten percent to small urban and rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less, with projects competitively awarded by the Commission to projects in those regions. Federal law segregates the Transportation Alternative Program into separate small urban and rural competitions based upon their relative share of the state population. Small Urban areas are those with populations of 5,001 to 200,000. Rural areas are those with populations of 5,000 or less.

  A minimum of 25% of the funds in the Small Urban and Rural programs must benefit disadvantaged communities.

  Projects within the boundaries of an MPO with an urban area with a population of greater than 200,000 are not eligible for funding in the Small Urban or Rural programs.

- Fifty percent to projects competitively awarded by the Commission on a statewide basis.

  A minimum of 25% of the funds in the statewide competitive program must benefit disadvantaged communities.

  Additional minimums may be applied, such as a minimum for safe routes to schools projects, subject to the annual State Budget Act.

6. Matching Requirements

Although the Commission encourages the leveraging of additional funds for a project, matching funds are not required. If an agency chooses to provide match funds, those funds cannot be expended prior to the Commission allocation of Active Transportation Program funds in the same

project phase (permits and environmental studies; plans, specifications, and estimates; right-of-way; and construction). Matching funds must be expended concurrently and proportionally to the Active Transportation Program funds. The Matching funds may be adjusted before or shortly after contract award to reflect any substantive change in the bid compared to the estimated cost of the project.

Large MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, may require a funding match for projects selected through their competitive process. Applicants from within a large MPO should be aware that the match requirements may differ between the MPO and statewide competitive programs.

7. Funding for Active Transportation Plans

Funding from the Active Transportation Program may be used to fund the development of community wide active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities, including bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or comprehensive active transportation plans. A list of the components that must be included in an active transportation plan can be found in Section 13, subsection E.

The Commission intends to set aside up to ~~3%~~ **2%** of the funds in the statewide competitive component and in the small urban and rural component for funding active transportation plans in predominantly disadvantaged communities. A large MPO, in administering its portion of the program, may make up to ~~3%~~ **2%** of its funding available for active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities within the MPO boundaries.

The first priority for the funding of plans will be for cities, counties, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, MPOs, school districts, or transit districts that have neither a bicycle plan, a pedestrian plan, a safe routes to schools plan, nor a comprehensive active transportation plan. The second priority for the funding of plans will be for cities, counties, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, or MPOs that have a bicycle plan or a pedestrian plan but not both. The lowest priority for funding of plans will be for updates of active transportation plans older than 5 years.

The Commission intends to ~~decrease this set aside to 2% in the 2017 cycle, and~~ reassess the set aside for plans in future program cycles.

Applications for plans may not be combined with applications for infrastructure or other non-infrastructure projects.

8. Reimbursement

The Active Transportation Program is a reimbursement program for eligible costs incurred. Reimbursement is requested through the invoice process detailed in Chapter 5, Accounting/Invoices, Local Assistance Procedures Manual. Costs incurred prior to Commission allocation and, for federally funded projects, Federal Highway Administration project approval (i.e. Authorization to Proceed) are not eligible for reimbursement.

III. Eligibility

9. Eligible Applicants

The applicant and/or implementing agency for Active Transportation Program funds assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants and/or implementing agencies must be able to comply with all the federal and state laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement). Refer to Chapter 4, Agreements, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on Master Agreements. The following entities, within the State of California, are eligible to apply for Active Transportation Program funds:

- Local, Regional or State Agencies- Examples include city, county, MPO*, and Regional Transportation Planning Agency.
- Caltrans*
- Transit Agencies - Any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds under the Federal Transit Administration.
- Natural Resources or Public Land Agencies - Federal, Tribal, State, or local agency responsible for natural resources or public land administration. Examples include:
  - State or local park or forest agencies
  - State or local fish and game or wildlife agencies
  - Department of the Interior Land Management Agencies
  - U.S. Forest Service
- Public schools or School districts.
- Tribal Governments - Federally-recognized Native American Tribes.
- Private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations may apply for projects eligible for Recreational Trail Program funds recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to non-motorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails. Projects must benefit the general public, and not only a private entity.
- Any other entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails that the Commission determines to be eligible.

A project applicant found to have purposefully misrepresented information that could affect a project's score may result in the applicant being excluded from the program.

For funding awarded to a tribal government, a fund transfer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) may be necessary. A tribal government may also partner with another eligible entity to apply if desired.

* *Caltrans and MPOs, except for MPOs that are also regional transportation planning agencies, are not eligible project applicants for the federal Transportation Alternative Program funds appropriated to the Active Transportation Program. Therefore, funding awarded to projects submitted directly by Caltrans and MPOs are limited to other Active Transportation Program funds. Caltrans and MPOs may partner with an eligible entity to expand funding opportunities.*

10. Partnering With Implementing Agencies

Entities that are unable to apply for Active Transportation Program funds or that are unable to enter into a Master Agreement with the State must partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. Entities that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project may partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement (e.g., letter of intent) must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the first request for allocation.

The implementing agency will be responsible and accountable for the use and expenditure of program funds.

11. Eligible Projects

All projects must be selected through a competitive process and must meet one or more of the program goals. Because the majority of funds in the Active Transportation Program are federal funds, projects must be federal-aid eligible:

- Infrastructure Projects: Capital improvements that will further the goals of this program. This typically includes the environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction phases of a capital (facilities) project. A new infrastructure project will not be programmed without a complete project study report (PSR) or PSR equivalent. The application will be considered a PSR equivalent if it defines and justifies the project scope, cost and schedule. Though the PSR or equivalent may focus on the project components proposed for programming, it must provide at least a preliminary estimate of costs for all components. PSR guidelines are posted on the Commission's website: http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP.htm.

  A capital improvement that is required as a condition for private development approval or permits is not eligible for funding from the Active Transportation Program.

- Plans: The development of a community wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.

- Non-infrastructure Projects: Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of this program. The Commission intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure projects on pilot and start-up projects that can demonstrate funding for ongoing efforts. The Active Transportation Program funds are not intended to fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students.

- Infrastructure projects with non-infrastructure components.

A. Example Projects

Below is a list of projects considered generally eligible for Active Transportation Program funding. This list is not intended to be comprehensive; other types of projects that are not on this list may also be eligible if they further the goals of the program. Components of an otherwise eligible project may not be eligible. For information on ineligible components, see the Department's Local Assistance/ATP website.

- Development of new bikeways and walkways that improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users.
- Improvements to existing bikeways and walkways, which improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users.
  - Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways and walkways.
  - Preventative maintenance of bikeways and walkways with the primary goal of extending the service life of the facility.
- Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Safe Routes to School projects that improve the safety of children walking and bicycling to school, in accordance with Section 1404 of Public Law 109-59.
- Safe routes to transit projects, which will encourage transit by improving biking and walking routes to mass transportation facilities and school bus stops.
- Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park and ride lots, rail and transit stations, and ferry docks and landings for the benefit of the public.
- Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit, including rail and ferries.
- Establishment or expansion of a bike share program.
- Recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to non-motorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails.
- Development of a community wide bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.
- Education programs to increase bicycling and walking, and other non-infrastructure investments that demonstrate effectiveness in increasing active transportation, including but not limited to:
  - Development and implementation of bike-to-work or walk-to-work school day/month programs.
  - Conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts, walkability and/or bikeability assessments or audits, or pedestrian and/or bicycle safety analysis to inform plans and projects.
  - Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.
  - Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans.
  - Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs.
  - Components of open streets events directly linked to the promotion of a new infrastructure project.
  - Targeted enforcement activities around high pedestrian and/or bicycle injury and/or fatality locations (intersections or corridors). These activities cannot be general traffic enforcement but must be tied to improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
  - School crossing guard training.
  - School bicycle clinics.

- Development and implementation of programs and tools that maximize use of available and emerging technologies to implement the goals of the Active Transportation Program.

12. Minimum Request for Funds

In order to maximize the effectiveness of program funds and to encourage the aggregation of small projects into one larger comprehensive project, the minimum request for Active Transportation Program funds that will be considered is $250,000. This minimum does not apply to non-infrastructure projects, Safe Routes to Schools projects, Recreational Trails projects, and plans.

MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, may use a different minimum funding size. Use of a minimum project size greater than $500,000 must be approved by the Commission prior to an MPO's call for projects.

13. Project Type Requirements

As discussed in the Funding Distribution section (above), State and Federal law segregate the Active Transportation Program into multiple, overlapping components. Below is an explanation of the requirements specific to these components.

A. Disadvantaged Communities

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a **disadvantaged** community. **To count as providing a benefit, a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community. For a project to qualify as benefiting a disadvantaged community, the community served by the project must meet at least one of the following criteria:**

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at:

  http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml

- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the latest version of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. This list can be found at the following link under SB 535 List of Disadvantaged Communities:

  http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/

- At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp.asp. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefiting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative

assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged, or how the project connects a disadvantaged community to outside resources or amenities.

MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, may use different criteria for determining which projects benefit Disadvantaged Communities if the criteria are approved by the Commission prior to an MPO's call for projects.

B. Safe Routes to School Projects

For a project to contribute toward the Safe Routes to School funding requirement, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure projects must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.

C. Recreational Trails Projects

Trail projects that are primarily recreational should meet the federal requirements of the Recreational Trails Program as such projects may not be eligible for funding from other sources (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/).

D. Technical Assistance Resource Center

Typical Technical Assistance Resource Center roles include:

- Providing technical assistance and training resources to help agencies deliver existing and future projects and to strengthen community involvement in future projects including those in disadvantaged communities.
- ~~Developing and providing educational materials to local communities by developing a community awareness kit, creating an enhanced Safe Routes to Schools website, and providing other educational tools and resources.~~
- ~~Participating in and assisting with the Safe Routes to Schools Advisory Committee.~~
- Assisting with program evaluation.

The Commission intends to fund a state technical assistance center by programming funds to the Department, who will administer contracts to support all current and potential Active Transportation Program applicants.

E. Active Transportation Plan

A city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan (bicycle, pedestrian, safe-routes-to-school, or comprehensive). An active transportation plan prepared by a city or county may be integrated into the circulation element of its general plan or a separate plan which is compliant or will be brought into compliance with the Complete Streets Act, Assembly Bill 1358 (Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008). An active transportation plan must include, but not be limited to, the following components or explain why the component is not applicable:

- The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips resulting from implementation of the plan.
- The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all

collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.

- A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other destinations.
- A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities, including a description of bicycle facilities that serve public and private schools and, if appropriate, a description of how the five Es (Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation) will be used to increase rates of bicycling to school.
- A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities.
- A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments.
- A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, bicycle parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.
- A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities, including those at major transit hubs and those that serve public and private schools and, if appropriate, a description of how the five Es (Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation) will be used to increase rates of walking to school. Major transit hubs must include, but are not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.
- A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle and pedestrian networks to designated destinations.
- A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, ADA level surfaces, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.
- A description of bicycle and pedestrian safety, education, and encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians.
- A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.
- A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.
- A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.

- A description of past expenditures for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses.
- A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.
- A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district. If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.

A city, county, school district, or transit district that has prepared an active transportation plan may submit the plan to the county transportation commission or transportation planning agency for approval. The city, county, school district, or transit district may submit an approved plan to Caltrans in connection with an application for funds for active transportation facilities which will implement the plan.

Additional information related to active transportation plans can be found in the sections on Funding for Active Transportation Plans and Scoring Criteria.

IV. Project Selection Process

14. Project Application

Active Transportation Program project applications will be available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html.

This section may be revised pending the development of the electronic application.
A project application must include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant's governing board. Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, documentation of the agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency must be submitted with the project application. A project application must also include documentation of all other funds committed to the projects.

Project applications should be addressed or delivered to:

Caltrans
Division of Local Assistance, MS-1
Attention: Chief, Office of Active Transportation and Special Programs
P.O Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 95814

Except for applications submitted through an optional MPO supplemental call for projects, the Commission will consider only projects for which five hard copies and one electronic copy (via cd or portable hard drive) of a complete application are postmarked by the application deadline. By the same date, an additional copy must also be sent to the Regional Transportation Planning Agency or County Transportation Commission within which the project is located and to the MPO

(a contact list can be found at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/). The copy may be hard copy or electronic – check with your regional agency or county commission for their preference.

15. Sequential Project Selection

All project applications, except for applications submitted through an optional MPO supplemental call for projects, must be submitted to Caltrans for consideration in the statewide competition. The Commission will consider approval of a competitive grant only when it finds that the grant request meets the requirements of statute and that the project has a commitment of any supplementary funding needed for a full funding plan.

Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition must be considered in the large MPO run competitions or the state run Small Urban and Rural competitions.

A large urban MPO may elect to have a supplemental MPO specific call for projects. The projects received in this call must be considered along with those not selected through the statewide competition.

16. MPO Competitive Project Selection

As stated above, projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition must be considered by the MPOs in administering a competitive selection process.

An MPO choosing to use the same project selection criteria and weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, and definition of disadvantaged communities as used by the Commission for the statewide competition may delegate its project selection to the Commission. An MPO delegating its project selection to the Commission may not conduct a supplemental call for projects.

An MPO, with Commission approval, may use a different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, and/or definition of disadvantaged communities for its competitive selection process. Use of a minimum project size of $500,000 or less, or of a different match requirement than in the statewide competitive program does not require prior Commission approval. An MPO may also elect to have a supplemental MPO specific call for projects. The projects received in this call must be considered along with those not selected through the statewide competition.

In administering a competitive selection process, an MPO must use a multidisciplinary advisory group to assist in evaluating project applications. Following its competitive selection process, an MPO must submit its programming recommendations to the Commission along with the following:

- Project applications that were not submitted through the statewide program
- List of the members of its multidisciplinary advisory group
- Description of unbiased project selection methodology
- Program spreadsheet with the following elements
    - All projects evaluated

  - Projects recommended with total project cost, request amount, fiscal years, phases, state only funding requests, **amount benefiting disadvantaged communities**
  - **Project type designations such as Non-infrastructure, Safe Routes to School, etc.**
- Board resolution approving program of projects
- Updated Project Programming Requests (PPRs)

17. Screening Criteria

Before evaluation, project applications will be screened for the following:

- **Consistency with a regional transportation plan**
- **Supplanting Funds: A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. ATP funds cannot be used to supplant other committed funds.**
- **Eligibility of project: Project must be one of the four types of projects listed in Section 11 of these guidelines.**

~~Demonstrated needs of the applicant: Supplanting Funds: A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. ATP funds cannot be used to supplant other committed funds.~~

~~Consistency with a regional transportation plan: All projects submitted must be consistent with the relevant adopted regional transportation plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080. Applicants must provide the supporting language cited from the adopted regional transportation plan that shows that the submitted project is consistent with the plan.~~

18. Scoring Criteria

Proposed projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the below criteria. Project programming recommendations may not be based strictly on the rating criteria given the various components of the Active Transportation Program and requirements of the various fund sources.

- Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of non-motorized users. (0 to 30 points)
- Potential for reducing the number and/or rate **(including the potential)** of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists. (0 to 25 points)
- Public participation and Planning. (0 to 15 points)

Identification of the community-based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal, which may include noticed meetings and consultation with local stakeholders. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process (including the participation of disadvantaged community stakeholders) resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.

For projects costing $1 million or more, an emphasis will be placed on projects that are prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pursuant to Section 891.2, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, or circulation element of a general plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation plan. In future funding cycles, the Commission expects to make consistency with an approved active transportation plan a requirement for large projects.

- Improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues, with a description of the intended health benefits of the proposed project. (0 to 10 points)
- Benefit to disadvantaged communities. (0 to **5** points)

  Applicants must:

  - Demonstrate how the project connects the disadvantaged community(ies) to commonly identified resources or amenities such as medical facilities, employers, parks, community centers and grocery stores.
  - Provide a map that delineates the specific disadvantaged census tract(s) or school(s) that will benefit from the project in relationship to the project site.
- Cost-effectiveness and **Construction Readiness.** (0 to 10 points)

  For cost-effectiveness, applicants must:

  - Discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered.
  - Quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided.

  To be considered construction ready, a project applicant must show that the project has already achieved environmental clearance (both CEQA and NEPA) and final design.
  The Cal-B/C benefit-cost model is being updated to incorporate active transportation projects. When this update is complete, applicants must use this model to quantify the cost-effectiveness of their project.
  ~~Caltrans has developed a first generation benefit/cost model for infrastructure and non-infrastructure active transportation projects in order to improve information available to decision makers at the state and MPO level. Applicants must use the benefit/cost model for active transportation projects developed by Caltrans when responding to this criterion (a link to the model is posted on the Commission's website under Programs/ATP). Applicants are encouraged to provide feedback on instructions, ease of use, inputs, etc. This input will be useful in determining future revisions of the model.~~

- Leveraging of non-ATP funds on the ATP project scope proposed. (0 to 5 points)
- Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code, as partners to undertake or construct applicable projects in accordance with Section 1524 of Public Law 112-141.

Points will be deducted if an applicant does not seek corps participation or if an applicant intends not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate. (0 **or** ~~to~~ -5 points)

The California Conservation Corps can be contacted **atp@ccc.ca.gov.**

Qualified community conservation corps can be contacted at inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org.

Direct contracting with the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps without bidding is permissible provided that the implementing agency demonstrates cost effectiveness per 23 CFR 635.204 and obtains approval from Caltrans. A copy of the agreement between the implementing agency and the proposed conservation corps must be provided to the Department.

- ~~Applicant's performance on past grants. This may include project delivery, project benefits (anticipated v. actual), and use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps (planned v. actual). Applications from agencies with documented poor performance records on past grants may be excluded from competing or may be penalized in scoring. (0 **or** to -10 points)~~

19. Project Selection between Project Applications with the Same Score

If two or more projects applications receive the same score that is the funding cut-off score, the following criteria will be used to determine which project(s) will be funded:

- **Construction readiness**
- **Highest score on Question 1**
- **Highest score on Question 2**

20. Project Evaluation Committee

Commission staff will form a multidisciplinary Project Evaluation Committee to assist in evaluating project applications. In forming the Project Evaluation Committee, staff will seek participants with expertise in bicycling and pedestrian transportation, including Safe Routes to Schools type projects, and in projects benefiting disadvantaged communities, and will seek geographically balanced representation from state agencies, large MPOs, regional transportation planning agencies, local jurisdictions in small urban and rural areas, and non-governmental organizations. Priority for participation in the evaluation committee will be given to those who do not represent a project applicant, or will not benefit from projects submitted by others.

In reviewing and selecting projects to be funded with federal Recreational Trails program funds, the Commission and/or Caltrans staff will collaborate with the Department of Parks and Recreation to evaluate proposed projects.

MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, must use a multidisciplinary advisory group, similar to the aforementioned Project Evaluation Committee, to assist in evaluating project applications.

V. Programming

Following at least one public hearing, the Commission will adopt a program of projects for the Active Transportation Program, by April 1 of each odd numbered year. ~~However, for the 2015 program, the deadline for programming is December 31, 2015.~~ The Active Transportation Program must be developed consistent with the fund estimate and the amount programmed in each fiscal year must not exceed the amount identified in the fund estimate.

The program of projects for each fiscal year will include, for each project, the amount to be funded from the Active Transportation Program, and the estimated total cost of the project. In the case of a large project delivered in segments, include the total cost of the segment for which ATP funds are requested. Project costs in the Active Transportation Program will include costs for each of the following components: (1) permits and environmental studies; (2) plans, specifications, and estimates; (3) right-of-way; and (4) construction. The cost of each project component will be listed in the Active Transportation Program no earlier than in the fiscal year in which the particular project component can be implemented.

When proposing to fund only preconstruction components for a project, the applicant must demonstrate the means by which it intends to fund the construction of a useable segment, consistent with the regional transportation plan.

~~When project design, right-of-way or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the project's cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project's ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to the Commission following completion of the environmental process. If this updated information indicates that a project is expected to accomplish fewer benefits or is less cost effective as compared with the initial project application, future ATP funding for the project may be deleted from the program. For the MPO selected competitions, this information must be submitted to the MPO. It is the responsibility of the MPO to recommend that the project be deleted from the program if warranted.~~

The Commission will program and allocate funding to projects in whole thousands of dollars and will include a project only if it is fully funded from a combination of Active Transportation Program and other committed funding. The Commission will regard funds as committed when they are programmed by the Commission or when the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution. For federal formula funds, including Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, and federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by Federal approval of the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. For federal discretionary funds, the commitment may be by federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval.

If the program of projects adopted by the Commission does not program the full capacity identified in the fund estimate for a given fiscal year, the balance will remain available to advance programmed projects. Subject to the availability of federal funds, a balance not programmed in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.

The intent of the Commission is to consolidate the allocation of federal funds to as few projects as practicable. Therefore, the smallest projects may be designated, at the time of programming, for state-only funding.

VI. Allocations

The Commission will consider the allocation of funds for a project when it receives an allocation request and recommendation from Caltrans in the same manner as for the STIP (see section 64 of the STIP guidelines). The recommendation will include a determination of project readiness, the availability of appropriated funding, and the availability of all identified and committed supplementary funding.

Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, the allocation request must include a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency.

The Commission will approve the allocation if the funds are available and the allocation is necessary to implement the project as included in the adopted Active Transportation Program.

In order to ensure the timely use of all program funds, the Commission will, in the last quarter of the fiscal year, allocate funds to projects programmed in a future fiscal year on a first-come, first served basis. If there are insufficient funds, the Commission may delay the allocation of funds to a project until the next fiscal year without requiring an extension. Should requests for allocations exceed available capacity, the Commission will give priority to projects programmed in the current-year.

Allocation requests for a project in the MPO selected portion of the program must include a recommendation by the MPO.

In compliance with Section 21150 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission will not allocate funds for a non-infrastructure project or plan, or for design, right-of-way, or construction of an infrastructure project, prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a matter of policy, the Commission will not allocate funds, other than for the environmental phase, for a federally funded project prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Exceptions to this policy may be made in instances where federal law allows for the acquisition of right-of-way prior to completion of National Environmental Policy Act review.

If an implementing agency requests an allocation of funds in an amount that is less than the amount programmed, the balance of the programmed amount may be allocated to a programmed project advanced from a future fiscal year. ~~An MPO, in administering its competitive portion of the Active Transportation Program, must determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the Commission. Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.~~

Any amount allocated for environmental may also be expended for design. In addition, a local agency may expend an amount allocated for environmental, design, right of way, or construction for another allocated project component, provided that the total expenditure shifted to a component in this way is not more than 20 percent of the amount actually allocated for either component. This means that the amount transferred by a local agency from one component to another may be no more than 20 percent of whichever of the components has received the smaller allocation from the Commission.

Any scope changes must be presented to Caltrans for consideration prior to allocation. Caltrans will make a recommendation of approval to the Commission for final approval.

Scope changes that result in a decrease of active transportation benefits may result in removal from the program.

VII. Project Delivery

Active Transportation Program allocations must be requested in the fiscal year of project programming, and construction allocations are valid for award for six months from the date of allocation unless the Commission approves an extension. Applicants may submit and the Commission will evaluate extension requests in the same manner as for STIP projects (see section 66 of the STIP guidelines) except that extension to the period for project allocation and for project award will be limited to twelve months. Extension requests for a project in the MPO selected portion of the program must include a recommendation by the MPO, consistent with the preceding requirements.

If there are insufficient funds, the Commission may delay the allocation of funds to a project until the next fiscal year without requiring an extension.

Whenever programmed funds are not allocated within the fiscal year they are programmed or within the time allowed by an approved extension, the project will be deleted from the Active Transportation Program. Funds available following the deletion of a project may be allocated to a programmed project advanced from a future fiscal year. An MPO, in administering its competitive portion of the Active Transportation Program, must determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the Commission. ~~Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.~~

The implementing agency must enter into a cooperative agreement with Caltrans and, if the project is federally funded, obligate the federal funds within six months.

Funds allocated for project development or right of way costs must be expended by the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated. After the award of a contract, the implementing agency has up to 36 months to complete (accept) the contract. At the time of fund allocation, the Commission may extend the deadline for completion of work and the liquidation of funds if necessary to accommodate the proposed expenditure plan for the project. The implementing agency has six months after contract acceptance to make the final payment to the contractor or vendor, prepare the Final Report of Expenditures and submit the final invoice to Caltrans for reimbursement.

It is incumbent upon the implementing agency to develop accurate project cost estimates. If the amount of a contract award is less than the amount allocated, or if the final cost of a component is less than the amount allocated, the savings generated will not be available for future programming.

Caltrans will track the delivery of Active Transportation Program projects and submit to the Commission a semiannual report showing the delivery of each project phase.

21. Federal Requirements

Unless programmed for state-only funding, project applicants must comply with the provisions of Title 23 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations and with the processes and procedures contained in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual and the Master Agreement with

Caltrans. Below are examples of federal requirements that must be met when administering Active Transportation Program projects.

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance and documentation is required on all projects. Refer to Chapter 6, Environmental Procedures, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on complying with NEPA and other federal environmentally related laws.
- Project applicants may not proceed with the final design of a project or request "Authorization to proceed with Right-of-Way" or "Authorization to proceed with Construction" until Caltrans has signed a Categorical Exclusion, a Finding of No Significant Impact, or a Record of Decision. Failure to follow this requirement will make the project ineligible for federal reimbursement.
- If the project requires the purchase of right of way (the acquisition of real property), the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 apply. For more information, refer to Chapter 13, Right of Way, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual.
- If the project applicant requires the consultation services of architects, landscape architects, land surveyors, or engineers, the procedures in the Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual must be followed.
- Contract documents are required to incorporate applicable federal requirements such as Davis Bacon wage rates, competitive bidding, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises/Equal Employment Opportunity provisions, etc. For more information, refer to Chapter 9, Civil Rights and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, and Chapter 12, Plans, Specifications & Estimate, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual
- Failure to comply with federal requirements may result in the repayment to the State of Active Transportation Program funds.

22. Design Standards

Streets and Highways Code Section 891 requires that all city, county, regional, and other local agencies responsible for the development or operation of bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted utilize all minimum safety design criteria established by Caltrans, except that an agency may utilize other minimum safety design criteria if specific conditions are met, as described in Streets and Highways Code Section 891(b). *Chapter 11, Design Standards, of the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual describes statewide design standards, specifications, procedures, guides, and references that are acceptable in the geometric, drainage, and structural design of Local Assistance projects.*

For capital projects off the state highway system, the project applicant will be responsible for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

All facilities constructed using Active Transportation Program funds cannot revert to a non-Active Transportation Program use for a minimum of 20 years or its actual useful life as documented in the project application, whichever is less, without approval of the Commission.

23. Project Inactivity

Once funds for a project are encumbered, project applicants are expected to invoice on a regular basis (for federal funds, see 23 CFR 630.106 and the Caltrans' Inactive Obligation Policy). Failure to do so will result in the project being deemed "inactive" and subject to de-obligation if proper justification is not provided.

24. Project Reporting

As a condition of the project allocation, the Commission requires the implementing agency to submit semi-annual reports on the activities and progress made toward implementation of the project and a final delivery report. An agency implementing a project in the MPO selected portion of the program must also submit copies of its semi-annual reports and of its final delivery report to the MPO. The purpose of the reports is to ensure that the project is executed in a timely fashion and is within the scope and budget identified when the decision was made to fund the project.

Within one year of the project becoming operable, the implementing agency must provide a final delivery report to the Commission which includes:

- The scope of the completed project as compared to the programmed project.
- Before and after photos documenting the project.
- The final costs as compared to the approved project budget.
- Its duration as compared to the project schedule in the project application.
- Performance outcomes derived from the project as compared to those described in the project application. This should include before and after pedestrian and/or bicycle counts, and an explanation of the methodology for conducting counts.
- Actual use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps as compared to the use described in the project application.

Please note that the final delivery report required by this section is in addition to the aforementioned Final Report of Expenditures.

For the purpose of this section, a project becomes operable when the construction contract is accepted or acquired equipment is received, or in the case of non-infrastructure activities, when the activities are complete.

Caltrans must audit a selection of Active Transportation Program projects to evaluate the performance of the project, determine whether project costs incurred and reimbursed are in compliance with the executed project agreement or approved amendments thereof; state and federal laws and regulations; contract provisions; and Commission guidelines, and whether project deliverables (outputs) and outcomes are consistent with the project scope, schedule and benefits described in the executed project agreement or approved amendments thereof. A report on the projects audited must be submitted to the Commission annually.

VIII. Roles And Responsibilities

25. California Transportation Commission (Commission)

The Commission responsibilities include:

- Adopt guidelines, ~~and~~ policies, **and application** for the Active Transportation Program.
- Adopt Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate.
- Evaluate, score and rank projects, including forming and facilitating the Project Evaluation Committee.
- In consultation with Regional Agencies and Caltrans, recommend and adopt a program of projects, including:
    - The statewide component of the Active Transportation Program,
    - The small urban & rural component of the Active Transportation Program, and
    - The MPO selected component of the program based on the recommendations of the MPOs.
    - Ensure that at least 25% of the funds benefit disadvantaged communities.
- Post recommendations and final adopted list of approved projects on the Commission's website.
- Allocate funds to projects.
- Evaluate and report to the legislature.

26. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Caltrans has the primary responsibility for the administration of the adopted Active Transportation Program. Responsibilities include:

- Provide statewide program and procedural guidance (i.e. provide project evaluation of materials and instructions), conduct outreach through various networks such as, but not limited to, the Active Transportation Program website, and at conferences, meetings, or workgroups.
- Provide program training.
- Solicit project applications for the program.
- ~~Facilitate the **Technical** Advisory Committee.~~
- ~~Assist in facilitating the Project Evaluation Committee.~~
- Perform eligibility and deliverability reviews of Active Transportation Program projects and inform the Commission of any identified issues as they arise **this includes but is not limited to reviewing all Non-infrastructure projects to identify if a project is requesting funds for ongoing program operations.**
- **Assist as needed in functions such as facilitating project evaluation teams and evaluating applications.**
- Notify successful applicants of their next steps after each call for projects.
- Recommend project allocations (including funding type) to the Commission.

- Track and report on project implementation, including project completion.
- ~~Audit a selection of projects~~ **Perform audits of projects in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.**
- Serve as the main point of contact in project implementation, including administering the contract(s) for the technical assistance resource center.

27. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) With Large Urbanized Areas

MPOs with large urbanized areas are responsible for overseeing a competitive project selection process in accordance with these guidelines. The responsibilities include:

- Ensure that at least 25% of the funds in each MPO benefit disadvantaged communities.
- If using different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size greater than $500,000, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged communities for its competitive selection process, the MPO must obtain Commission approval prior to the MPO's call for projects.
- If electing to have a supplemental MPO specific call for projects, the projects within the MPO boundaries that were not selected through the statewide competition must be considered along with those received in the supplemental call for projects. An MPO must notify the Commission of their intent to have a supplemental call no later than the application deadline.
- In administering a competitive selection process, an MPO must use a multidisciplinary advisory group to assist in evaluating project applications.
- In administering a competitive selection process, an MPO must explain how the projects recommended for programming by the MPO include a broad spectrum of projects to benefit pedestrians and bicyclists. The explanation must include a discussion of how the recommended projects benefit students walking and cycling to school.
- An MPO choosing to use the same project selection criteria and weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, and definition of disadvantaged communities as used by the Commission for the statewide competition may delegate its project selection to the Commission. An MPO delegating its project selection to the Commission must notify the Commission by the application deadline, and may not conduct a supplemental call for projects.
- If electing to have a contingency list of projects to be amended into the program in the event a programmed project is delivered for less or fails, approve and recommend such amendments for Commission approval. This contingency list will be provided to the Commission and will be in effect only until the adoption of the next statewide program.
- Recommend allocation requests for a project in the MPO selected portion of the program.
- Determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the Commission.
- Submit an annual assessment of its portion of the program in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the goals of the Active Transportation Program.

In addition, the following statutory requirements apply specifically to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG):

- SCAG must consult with county transportation commissions, the Commission, and Caltrans in the development of competitive project selection criteria. The criteria should include consideration of geographic equity, consistent with program objectives.
- SCAG must place priority on projects that are consistent with plans adopted by local and regional governments within the county where the project is located.
- SCAG must obtain concurrence from the county transportation commissions.

28. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) Outside an MPO with Large Urbanized Areas and MPOs without Large Urbanized Areas

These Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and MPOs (outside the nine large MPOs) may make recommendations or provide input to the Commission regarding the projects within their boundaries that are applying for Active Transportation Program funding.

29. Project Applicant

Project applicants nominate Active Transportation Program projects for funding consideration. If awarded Active Transportation Program funding for a submitted project, the project applicant (or partnering implementing agency if applicable) has contractual responsibility for carrying out the project to completion and complying with reporting requirements in accordance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and these guidelines.

For infrastructure projects off the state highway system, the project applicant will be responsible for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

IX. Program Evaluation

The Active Transportation Program will be evaluated for its effectiveness in increasing the use of active modes of transportation in California. Applicants that receive funding for a project must collect and submit data to Caltrans as described in the "Project Reporting" section.

The Commission will include in its annual report to the Legislature a discussion on the effectiveness of the program in terms of planned and achieved improvement in mobility and safety and timely use of funds, and will include a summary of its activities relative to the administration of the Active Transportation Program including:

- Projects programmed,
- Projects allocated,
- Projects completed to date by project type,
- Projects completed to date by geographic distribution,
- Projects completed to date by benefit to disadvantaged communities, and
- Projects completed to date with the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

PROJECT APPLICATION – CYCLE 3

Part B: Narrative Questions

(Application Screening/Scoring)

Project unique application No.: _____

Implementing Agency's Name: _____

Important:

- *Applicants must ensure all data in Part B of the application is fully consistent with Part A and C.*
- *Applicants must follow all instructions and guidance to have a chance at receiving full points for the narrative question and to avoid flaws in the application which could result in disqualification.*
- *Applicants must ensure that all information provided is an accurate representation of the project. Misinformation that could affect the project's score may result in the application being excluded from the selection process.*

Table of Contents

Screening Criteria **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #1 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #2 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #3 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #4 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #5 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #6 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #7 **Page: ___**

Narrative Question #8 **Page: ___**

~~**Narrative Question #9** **Page: ___**~~

Part B: Narrative Questions
Screening Criteria

The following Screening Criteria are requirements for applications to be considered for ATP funding. Failure to demonstrate a project meets these criteria will result is the disqualification of the application.

~~1. Demonstrated fiscal needs of the applicant:~~

~~2. Consistency with Regional Plan.~~

1. Consistency with a regional transportation plan
2. Supplanting Funds: A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. ATP funds cannot be used to supplant other committed funds.
3. Eligibility of project: Project must be one of the four types of projects listed in Section 11 of these guidelines.

- Infrastructure Projects: Capital improvements that will further the goals of this program. This typically includes the environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction phases of a capital (facilities) project. A new infrastructure project will not be programmed without a complete project study report (PSR) or PSR equivalent. The application will be considered a PSR equivalent if it defines and justifies the project scope, cost and schedule. Though the PSR or equivalent may focus on the project components proposed for programming, it must provide at least a preliminary estimate of costs for all components. PSR guidelines are posted on the Commission's website: http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP.htm. A capital improvement that is required as a condition for private development approval or permits is not eligible for funding from the Active Transportation Program.
- Plans: The development of a community wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.
- Non-infrastructure Projects: Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of this program. The Commission intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure projects on pilot and start-up projects that can demonstrate funding for ongoing efforts. The Active Transportation Program funds are not intended to fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students.
- Infrastructure projects with non-infrastructure components.

Part B: Narrative Question #1
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #1~~

QUESTION #1

POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING AND BICYCLING, ESPECIALLY AMONG STUDENTS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF WALKING AND BICYCLING ROUTES TO AND FROM SCHOOLS, TRANSIT FACILITIES, COMMUNITY CENTERS, EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, AND OTHER DESTINATIONS; AND INCLUDING INCREASING AND IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY OF NON-MOTORIZED USERS. ***(0-30 POINTS)***

A. Describe the following:

-Current and projected types and numbers/rates of users. (12 points max.)

B. Describe how the project links or connects, or encourages use of existing routes (for non-infrastructure applications) to transportation-related and community identified destinations where an increase in active transportation modes can be realized, including but not limited to: schools, school facilities, transit facilities, community, social service or medical centers, employment centers, high density or affordable housing, regional, State or national trail system, recreational and visitor destinations or other community identified destinations via: (12 points max.)

a. creation of new routes
b. removal of barrier to mobility
c. closure of gaps
d. other improvements to routes
e. educates or encourages use of existing routes

C. Referencing the answers to A and B above, describe how the proposed project represents one of the Implementing Agencies (and/or project Partnering Agency's) highest unfunded non-motorized active transportation priorities. (6 points max.)

Part B: Narrative Questions #2
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #2~~

QUESTION #2

POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLIST FATALITIES AND INJURIES, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF SAFETY HAZARDS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS. ***(0-25 POINTS)***

A. **Describe the plan/program influence area or project location's history of collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users and the source(s) of data used (e.g. collision reports, community observation, surveys, audits). (10 points max.)**

B. **Describe how the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities; including but not limited to the following possible areas: (15 points max.)**

- **Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users.**
- **Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users.**
- **Eliminates potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including creating physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users.**
- **Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users.**
- **Addresses inadequate traffic control devices.**
- **Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users.**
- **Addresses inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks.**

Note: Applicant should consider the reduction of potential fatalities or injuries where current information is not available.

Part B: Narrative Question #3
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #3~~

QUESTION #3

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION and PLANNING *(0-15 POINTS)*

Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project/program proposal or will be utilized as part of the development of a plan.

- **Who: Describe who was engaged in the identification and development of this project/program/plan (for plans: who will be engaged). (5 points max)**

- **How: Describe how stakeholders were engaged (or will be for a plan). (4 points max)**

- **What: Describe the feedback received during the stakeholder engagement process and describe how the public participation and planning process has improved the project's overall effectiveness at meeting the purpose and goals of the ATP. (5 points max)**

- **Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan. (1 points max)**

Part B: Narrative Question #4
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #4~~

QUESTION #4

IMPROVED PUBLIC HEALTH *(0-10 points)*

A. **NOTE: Applicants applying for the disadvantaged community set aside must respond to the below questions with health data specific to the disadvantaged communities. Failure to do so will result in lost points.**

- ☐ **Describe the health status of the targeted users of the project/program/plan. (3 points max)**

- ☐ **Describe how you expect your project/proposal/plan to enhance public health. (7 points max.)**

Part B: Narrative Question #5
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #5~~

QUESTION #5

BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES *(~~0-10~~ 0-5points)*

To count as providing a benefit, a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

- **Identification of disadvantaged communities: (0 points – SCREENING ONLY)**
  To receive disadvantaged communities points, projects/programs/plans must be located within a disadvantaged community (as defined by one of the four options below) AND/OR provide a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to individuals from a disadvantaged community.
  - The median household income of the census tract(s) is 80% of the statewide median household income
  - Census tract(s) is in the top 25% of overall scores from CalEnviroScreen 2.0
  - At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible for the Free or Reduced Priced Meals Program under the National School Lunch Program
  - Alternative criteria for identifying disadvantage communities (see below)

  Provide a map showing the boundaries of the proposed project/program/plan and the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community that the project/program/plan is located within and/or benefiting.

Option 1: Median household income, by census tract for the community(ies) benefited by the project: $_____

- Provide all census tract numbers
- Provide the median income for each census track listed
- Provide the population for each census track listed

Option 2: California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 2.0 (CalEnviroScreen) score for the community benefited by the project: _____

i. Provide all census tract numbers
ii. Provide the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score for each census track listed
iii. Provide the population for each census track listed

Option 3: Percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Programs: _____ %

i. Provide percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Meals Program for each and all schools included in the proposal

Option 4: Alternative criteria for identifying disadvantaged communities:

i. Provide median household income (option 1), the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score (option 2), and if applicable, the percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced Meal Programs (option 3)
   - Provide ADDITIONAL data that demonstrates that the community benefiting from the project/program/plan is disadvantaged

- Provide an explanation for why this additional data demonstrates that the community is disadvantaged

- **For proposals located within disadvantage community: (5 2 points max)**
  What percent of the funds requested will be expended in the disadvantaged community? ____%
  Explain how this percent was calculated.

- **Describe how the project/program/plan ~~provides~~ (for plans: will provide)** fulfills an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community. **(~~5~~ 3 points max)**
  Define what direct, meaningful, and assured benefit means for your proposed project/program/plan, how this benefit will be achieved, and who will receive this benefit.

Part B: Narrative Question #6
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #6~~

QUESTION #6

COST EFFECTIVENESS AND CONSTRUCTION READINESS *(~~0-5~~ 0-10 POINTS)*

A. Cost Effectiveness: **Describe the alternatives that were considered and how the ATP-related benefits vs. project-costs varied between them. Explain why the final proposed alternative is considered to have the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose of "increased use of active modes of transportation".**
(~~3~~ 5 points max.)

B. Construction Readiness: (0 or 5 points)
   a. Date of CEQA Clearance:
   b. Date of NEPA Clearance:
   c. *(Date of Final Design Completion:)*

~~C. Use the ATP Benefit/Cost Tool, provided by Caltrans Planning Division, to calculate the ratio of the benefits of the project relative to both the total project cost and ATP funds requested. The Tool is located on the CTC's website at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/eab/atp.html. After calculating the B/C ratios for the project, provide constructive feedback on the tool (2 points max.)~~

~~($\frac{Benefit}{Total\ Project\ Cost}$ and $\frac{Benefit}{Funds\ Requested}$).~~

Part B: Narrative Question #7
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #7~~

QUESTION #7

LEVERAGING OF NON-ATP FUNDS *(0-5 points)*

A. **The application funding plan will show all federal, state and local funding for the project: (5 points max.)**

Part B: Narrative Question #8
~~Detailed Instructions for: Question #8~~

QUESTION #8

USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (CCC) OR A CERTIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS *(0 or -5 points)*

Step 1: Is this an application requesting funds for a Plan (Bike, Pedestrian, SRTS, or ATP Plan)?

- Yes (If this application is for a Plan, there is no need to submit information to the corps and there will be no penalty to applicant: 0 points)
- No (If this application is NOT for a Plan, proceed to Step #2)

Step 2: The applicant must submit the following information via email concurrently to **both** the CCC **AND** certified community conservation corps prior to application submittal to Caltrans. The CCC and certified community conservation corps will respond within five (5) business days from receipt of the information.

- Project Title
- Project Description
- Detailed Estimate
- Project Schedule
- Project Map
- Preliminary Plan

California Conservation Corps representative:
Name: Wei Hsieh
Email: atp@ccc.ca.gov
Phone: (916) 341-3154

Community Conservation Corps representative:
Name: Danielle Lynch
Email: inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org
Phone: (916) 426-9170

Step 3: The applicant has coordinated with Wei Hsieh with the CCC **AND** Danielle Lynch with the certified community conservation corps and determined the following (check appropriate box):

4. Neither corps can participate in the project (0 points)
5. Applicant intends to utilize the CCC or a certified community conservation corps on the following items listed below (0 points).

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Applicant has contacted the corps but intends not to use the corps on a project in which either corps has indicated it can participate (-5 points)
   - Applicant has not coordinated with both corps (-5 points)

The CCC and certified community conservation corps will provide a list to Caltrans of all projects submitted to them and indicating which projects they are available to participate on. The applicant must also attach any email correspondence from the CCC and certified community conservation corps to the application verifying communication/participation.

Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #9

QUESTION #9
APPLICANT'S PERFORMANCE ON PAST GRANTS AND DELIVERABILITY OF PROJECTS
(0 to 10 points OR disqualification)

- ***Applicant:*** **Provide short explanation of the Implementing Agency's project delivery history for all projects that include project funding through Caltrans Local Assistance administered programs (ATP, Safe Routes to School, BTA, HSIP, etc.) for the last five (5) years.**

B. ***Caltrans response only:***
Caltrans to recommend score for deliverability of scope, cost, and schedule based on the overall application.

Part C: Application Attachments

Applicants must ensure all data in this part of the application is fully consistent with the other parts of the application. See the Application Instructions and Guidance document for more information and requirements related to Part C.

List of Application Attachments

The following attachment names and order must be maintained for all applications. Depending on the Project Type (I, NI or Plans) some attachments will be intentionally left blank. All non-blank attachments must be identified in hard-copy applications using "tabs" with appropriate letter designations

Application Signature Page — **Attachment A**
Required for all applications

ATP - PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST (ATP-PPR) — **Attachment B**
Required for all applications

Engineer's Checklist — **Attachment C**
Required for Infrastructure Projects

Project Location Map — **Attachment D**
Required for all applications

Project Map/Plans showing existing and proposed conditions — **Attachment E**
Required for Infrastructure Projects (optional for 'Non-Infrastructure' and 'Plan' Projects)

Photos of Existing Conditions — **Attachment F**
Required for all applications

Project Estimate — **Attachment G**
Required for Infrastructure Projects

Non-Infrastructure Work Plan (Form 22-R) — **Attachment H**
Required for all projects with Non-Infrastructure Elements

Narrative Questions backup information — **Attachment I**
Required for all applications
Label attachments separately with "H-#" based on the # of the Narrative Question

Letters of Support — **Attachment J**
Required or Recommended for all projects (as designated in the instructions)

Additional Attachments — **Attachment K**
Additional attachments may be included. They should be organized in a way that allows application reviews easy identification and review of the information.

From: Eric Bruins
To: Waters, Laurie@DOT
Subject: ATP Cycle 3 guidelines
Date: Thursday, January 14, 2016 5:47:07 PM

Laurie,

Thank you for our conversation yesterday. As chair of the ATP-TAC Planning Subcommittee, I look forward to reviewing the draft guidelines with our subcommittee.

Our subcommittee has identified the following focus areas. We have not arrived at any recommendations, but anticipate generating comments on the following topics:

- Refining the definition of an Active Transportation and/or SRTS Plan
- Increasing the funding mark for planning applications
- Streamlining the application process for planning applications
- Improving scoring consistency for planning applications
- Providing greater regional flexibility in guidelines

We look forward to working with you and the Commission to continue strengthening the Active Transportation Program.

Thank you for your consideration,
-Eric

--
Eric Bruins
Planning & Policy Director
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition

634 South Spring Street, Suite 821, Los Angeles, CA 90014
eric@la-bike.org | (213) 629-2142 ext. 127
www.la-bike.org | Facebook | Twitter | Instagram

Help make L.A. County a healthy, safe, and fun place to ride a bike:
Become an LACBC member today!

Central Coast Coalition
Moving California's Economy

January 14, 2016

Mr. Will Kempton
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Room 2233 (MS-52)
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Kempton:

The Central Coast Coalition would like thank the California Transportation Commission for the opportunity to provide input on Cycle 3 of the Active Transportation Program. The Coalition consists of the regional transportation planning agencies in San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara counties and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. Our coalition members compete for ATP funding from the small urban\rural program in addition to the Statewide program.

We applaud the expeditious work by the CTC and Caltrans to program projects during Cycles 1 and 2 of the Active Transportation Program; however, we do have several suggestions that we believe will improve the effectiveness of the program. Below are our recommendations for Cycle 3 for consideration by the Commission.

1. Maintain the statutory schedule for Cycle 3 which requires that funds be awarded to projects by April 2017.

   There is a significant backlog of bicycle and pedestrian projects and it is important to deliver a message to the legislature that more transportation funding of all kinds is sorely needed now. This message is best delivered by maintaining the ATP schedule set in statute, especially as the Governor and legislature develop the 2016-2017 budget. Delaying Cycle 3 of the ATP would require legislation and carries a significant risk of conveying the wrong message to the legislature that there is no urgency in providing funding for projects that support active transportation.

   The Active Transportation Program is also a critical funding source for the small urban and rural counties we represent. The phase out of the STIP's Transportation Enhancement program eliminated a reliable, formula funding source for active transportation projects that were prioritized and selected by our boards following a community-based public outreach process and delivered by our local agencies. Instead, we must now compete via the Statewide and Small Urban/Rural components of the ATP to secure funding for critical projects in our regions as we do not receive a direct share funding like large MPOs. Being entirely reliant on statewide competitions to secure funding makes it challenging to plan for and deliver projects that are needed to meet the safety, environmental, and active-lifestyle goals of our communities. However, the rapid pace of the first two cycles coupled with the sheer magnitude of funding available has helped mitigate our loss of discretionary control over project selection and the loss of formula funding. So we encourage the Commission to stay the course and move forward with Cycle 3.

While many of projects have been funded through Cycles 1 and 2, there continues to be very high demand for ATP funding in our regions, and across the state. The CTC received nearly 1,400 applications requesting over $2 billion in the first two cycles, while only $720 million has been available for programming. Many of our Coalition's priority projects remain unfunded through Cycles 1 and 2; we have applications ready to be submitted for Cycle 3. It is critical that with this level of demand, the CTC move forward with conducting a call for projects in 2016.

2. <u>If additional time is necessary to incorporate revisions, delay adoption of the guidelines by no more than two months.</u>

An additional three months to adopt the Cycle 3 guidelines compared to prior cycles provides the Commission with the latitude to streamline the application and incorporate minor changes to the guidelines and project evaluation process, such as those we suggest below. However, if necessary, the CTC could consider adoption of the guidelines in May 2016 rather than March 2016 to accommodate minor changes. This schedule would still allow the CTC to adopt projects by the statutory deadline of April 1, 2017.

3. <u>Ensure all of the goals of the Program are being advanced by making adjustments to the Project Scoring Criteria for Disadvantaged Communities and Non-Motorized Traveler Safety in Cycle 3</u>

Reduce the Weight Given to Projects in Disadvantaged Communities:
We acknowledge that a goal of the ATP is to ensure that disadvantaged communities share in the benefits of the program. We believe that the first two ATP cycles have been successful in this regard. The CTC has programmed over 80% of ATP funds to projects that benefit Disadvantaged Communities over the first two cycles which far exceeds the 25% statutory requirement for the program. We believe it is reasonable in Cycle 3 to reduce the weight given to Disadvantaged Communities to provide more geographic equity, and ensure that other goals of the program are met.

As part of the scoring criteria for the program, ten points have been available to applicants that can demonstrate their project serves a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). These ten points, in such a highly competitive program, can be a barrier to projects that may not necessarily serve a DAC but still meet the goals of the Active Transportation Program by increasing the proportion of biking/walking trips, increasing safety and mobility for non-motorized users and advancing the efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals. **We recommend that the points for the Disadvantaged Communities section of the scoring be reduced from ten points to five points and that the criteria for increasing walking and bicycling/Section 1 be increased by five points.** With this approach, points will still be available to projects that serve Disadvantaged Communities and more points will be made available to the highest priority of the program which is to increase walking and bicycling among users.

Prioritize Projects that Reduce <u>the Risk</u> of Fatalities and Injuries to Non-Motorized Users:
Finally, we also recommend that the CTC revise the scoring criteria for Safety/Section 2 to award points to projects whose purpose is to reduce <u>the risk</u> of collisions resulting in

fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users. It seems unreasonable to us to award points only after a record of fatalities and injuries have occurred. Critical safety projects that could prevent a loss of life or injury are at a disadvantage in the evaluation process with the present wording. Bicyclists and pedestrians are significantly more vulnerable to conflicts with cars and trains and perceived safety risks are a significant deterrent for active transportation. Relying solely on historical accident rates does not account for the potential increased usage of bike and pedestrian facilities when perceived safety risks are reduced.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and suggestions. If you have any further questions, please contact Sarkes Khachek at the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments at 805-961-8913.

Sincerely,

Jim Kemp, Executive Director
Santa Barbara Association of Governments

Ron DeCarli, Executive Director
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

George Dondero, Executive Director
Santa Cruz Co. Regional Transportation Commission

Mary Gilbert, Interim Executive Director
San Benito Council of Governments

Maura Twomey, Executive Director
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

cc: The Honorable Katcho Achadjian, Assembly Member, 35th District
The Honorable Luis Alejo, Assembly Member, 30th District
The Honorable Anthony Canella, Senator, 12th District
The Honorable Hannah-Beth Jackson, Senator, 19th District
The Honorable Bill Monning, Senator, 17th District
The Honorable Mark Stone, Assembly Member, 29th District
The Honorable Das Williams, Assembly Member, 37th District
Mr. Bill Higgins, CalCOG
Mr. Jerry Barton, Chair, Rural Counties Task Force
Ms. Laurel Janssen, California Transportation Commission
Ms. Laurie Waters, California Transportation Commission
Ms. April Nitsos, Caltrans, Chief, Active Transportation Program and Special Programs

Metro Comments on Active Transportation Program

in Preparation for Cycle 3

GENERAL/PROCESS

1) Delay Call for Projects 2-4 Months: There is not sufficient time for the ATP TAC to have a meaningful role in updating the guidelines, and especially the application. It is recommended that the Call for Projects be delayed 2-4 months – this level of delay, which could be incorporated within statutory deadlines, would allow a thorough streamlining of the application.

2) Further align guidelines regarding project delivery deadlines with STIP: the guidelines should resemble STIP for time extensions and ability to reprogram. Many ATP projects are large and complex, and/or tied to large, complex projects. More time is warranted for successful delivery. Projects with 3 or 4 phases can accumulate delays that could impact later phases such as construction, possibly causing them to lapse. This is not in anyone's interest. It wastes state funding on early phases for a project that is never delivered, and keeps the city from obtaining a needed project. If a sponsor knows before a fiscal year that there is a problem, it should be able to reprogram. Active Transportation projects are not easier to deliver than other projects. Many have roadway safety, drainage, irrigation, utilities, etc. issues. They should not be held to a tighter standard than other projects, such as STIP projects, that have these same issues.

3) More evaluators: Scoring discrepancies between similar projects and same projects applied for in different cycles indicate that consistent scoring is a significant issue. The evaluation team should have more reviewers – 3 instead of 2 per application.

SCORING CRITERIA

1) DAC points should not be decreased. Active Transportation improvements are largely used by members of disadvantaged communities. Targeting funding to disadvantaged communities is appropriate and the right thing to do. Some regions are frustrated with successful outcomes for disadvantaged communities and would like to see 5 points removed from the disadvantaged community question. It is recommended instead that 5 of the points in Question 1 be given for absence or poor condition of existing facilities. The purpose of these points is to address the disadvantaged community concern, and also reflect the fact that it is very hard to forecast usage in locations where there is a complete lack of infrastructure currently in place.

APPLICATION/SCORING

2) Project description: The application should start with a ¼ to ½ page project description, including a description of the problem to be solved. This will aid the evaluators in understanding the project and make scoring faster and easier.

3) Streamlining the application and instructions: these documents are unnecessarily long, cumbersome, confusing, and difficult. Streamlining them is a top priority. It would be helpful to create an online application so that where data sources are known by the state, they can be incorporated as drop down menus and standard forecast and cost benefit models can be included as well. There should be no more than one application file and one set of instructions. Instructions should be minimal and should in no way add to or conflict with the application – they should only explain it.

4) Make the scoring for Questions 1, 2, and 4 less subjective: the subjectivity of the current application reduces the State's ability to direct funds toward projects that are meritorious or needy in these areas consistent with State law. For Question 1 regarding walking and cycling increase, the application should include a new user forecast/model. For Questions 2 and 4, the Safety and Health Questions, there should be a few simple questions with statewide scaled criteria, data available by drop-down menu, and a statewide scaled scoring rubric. No more than ¼ or 1/3 of points should be score on a subjective/narrative basis.

5) Ensuring Funding for Plans: Plans are required for full points for projects over $1 million. There is still demand and need for plans. In the Cycle 2 statewide competition less than 1% of available funds were awarded to planning projects, though almost $18 million or 10% of the statewide funding availability was applied for. Limiting planning funds puts disadvantaged communities in an even more disadvantaged position, by perpetuating an obstacle to their receiving up to 15 points on the planning and community outreach question. This more than outweighs the up to 10 points for Disadvantaged Community status. To address this issue the following is recommended:

    a) That 3% be a floor rather than a cap.

    b) Additionally the application for plans should be revised to gear questions to the objective of <u>positioning project sponsors to obtain funds for projects to increase walking and cycling</u>, rather than <u>increasing walking and cycling,</u> which is more appropriate for infrastructure or educational projects.

    c) The proportion of funding for planning projects should <u>not</u> be lowered from 3% to 2% for Cycle 3, since unfair scoring resulted in less than 1% of statewide funds going to planning projects in Cycle 2.

6) Non-Infrastructure projects – these are the most cost-effective ways to alter peoples' behavior to increase active transportation usage and safety behavior. They have not been scoring as well as they should be, given this fact. Either questions and rubriks need to be updated to optimize scoring outcomes for these projects, or a floor needs to be set for a minimum percentage of funds to be awarded for non-infrastructure projects.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS/ELEMENTS

1) Bus stop seating: bus benches are often used by non-transit pedestrians who need to stop to rest, orient themselves, etc. Bus stop improvement funding is inadequate. Bus patrons are "half pedestrians", as well as being "half transit patrons". Bus stop benches should be eligible for at least 50% ATP funding.

METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
EMAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Dave Cortese, Chair
Santa Clara County

Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair
Sonoma County and Cities

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Jason Baker
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Mark Luce
Napa County and Cities

Julie Pierce
Association of Bay Area Governments

Bijan Sartipi
California State Transportation Agency

Libby Schaaf
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Amy Rein Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Alix Bockelman
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

December 22, 2015

RECD BY CTC
DEC 28 2015

Will Kempton
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Room 2221 – MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 Comments

Dear Mr. Kempton:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the upcoming Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 Guidelines and Process. Current law mandates that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopt the next cycle of ATP projects by April 1, 2017. MTC would like to offer a few comments and suggestions from our experience in administering the region's large-MPO share of ATP.

- **Delay Guidelines adoption of 2017 ATP to June 2016**
  Recognizing the statutory requirement to adopt the next program by April 1, 2017, MTC believes additional time is required to discuss and amend the Guidelines based on lessons learned from Cycles 1 and 2. The current schedule to adopt Cycle 3 Guidelines in March 2016 does not leave sufficient time to consider changes or comments. MTC encourages the CTC to delay the adoption of the Cycle 3 Guidelines to June 2016 in order to have a robust discussion about improving the Guidelines. This should still leave sufficient time for sponsors to complete the application (especially if the application is simplified), evaluators to review and score each application, and the CTC to meet the statutory April 1, 2017 adoption deadline.

- **Revisit disadvantaged communities in guidelines/application**
  The region applauds ATP's goal of highlighting the active transportation needs of disadvantaged communities (DACs). With nearly 90% of ATP funds benefiting DACs over the first two ATP cycles, the CTC is clearly demonstrating support of these important areas. For Cycle 3, CTC should clearly indicate its emphasis on ATP funds benefiting DACs in order to be more transparent towards non-DAC sponsors. Non-DAC sponsors could then decide whether to devote substantial staff resources on the application if only 10% of ATP funds are awarded to non-DAC areas.

Alternatively, the CTC could consider another approach, such as reducing the points assigned to DACs, or instituting a target minimum that is above the 25% statutory minimum.

- **Revise and simplify application process**
  A common comment from project sponsors was that the application was too onerous. For all sponsors trying to do more work with less staff and resources, completing the ATP application often required 40 to 80 hours of staff time. This resource strain is especially burdensome for smaller sponsors with limited staff, and may unfairly give an advantage to jurisdictions with resources to hire consultants to prepare the application. The region suggests simplifying the application and putting as much of it online as possible.

- **Create a two-tier program based on funding request size**
  The complexity of the application manifested itself in the increased average per project ATP request in Cycle 2. Increased funding requests with funding remaining static means that fewer projects will be funded. MTC recommends that CTC consider creating a two-tier program based on funding request size, in order to encourage smaller projects to apply, which may translate to more projects being funded. For instance, two-thirds of the program could be dedicated for project requests over $2 million, and those projects must complete the federal process and receive federal funds. The remaining one-third of the program could fund project requests under $2 million, and could utilize state-only funding.

Thank you for your consideration of the region's comments. If you have any questions about our comments or any other ATP-related issues, please contact me at (510) 817-5722, arichman@mtc.ca.gov, or Kenneth Kao, ATP Program Manager, at (510) 817-5768, kkao@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Anne Richman

Anne Richman
Director, Programming & Allocations

AR: KK

cc: April Nitsos, Caltrans ATP Program Manger
Sylvia Fung, Caltrans District 4 Local Assistance Engineer
Joel Goldberg, San Francisco MTA – ATP Technical Advisory Committee Member
Sarkes Khachek, Santa Barbara CAG – RTPA Moderator

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T4-MAP21\MAP21 - TAP and ATP\ATP\Regional ATP\2017 rATP (Cycle 3)\Correspondence\Ltr- ATP3 Comments 2015-12-19.docx

LEADERSHIP COUNSEL FOR JUSTICE & ACCOUNTABILITY

PolicyLink

November 17, 2015

Laurie Waters, Assistant Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS-52
Sacramento, CA 95814
laurie.waters@dot.ca.gov

VIA E-MAIL

Re: Feedback on Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 2 Process and 2015 ATP - Statewide Component Staff Recommendations

Dear Laurie:

Thank you for the multiple opportunities to provide feedback on the Active Transportation Program (The Program, ATP) Cycle 2 Process and 2015 ATP - Statewide Component Staff Recommendations. We submit the following comments based on our participation and experiences in preparing and supporting the application process for Cycle 2 projects. We collaborated with residents from disadvantaged communities to provide education on the benefits of active transportation as well as identify potential proposals for the Active Transportation Program. We conducted extensive community based meetings to facilitate resident identified project priorities for improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety and mode-shift, collaborated with applicants to prepare projects and continued engagement with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans to improve the ATP.

However, we remain concerned with the barriers faced by applicants from small urban and rural disadvantaged communities and welcome the opportunity to provide comments that would assist CTC staff in addressing challenges that prevent many disadvantaged communities from equitably competing for and receiving the benefits of the Program.

Transparency in Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities

We commend the CTC for prioritizing equity in the program and support that a large percentage of recommended project awards benefit disadvantaged communities. However, we recommend that the CTC establish a process to carefully scrutinize all projects to ensure that the projects credited for DAC funding provide direct, meaningful, and assured benefits. To meet the statutory goals of SB

The above barriers have limited smaller cities and unincorporated communities from applying to the ATP program and accessing the infrastructure investments that are most needed in these communities. Even more so, these barriers have exacerbated inequitable distribution of funds perpetuating historic disinvestment that continue to plague California's small rural disadvantaged communities and exclude them from sustainable and equitable growth. By addressing the aforementioned barriers, the CTC could ensure investment reach communities that need them the most.

Improve Targeted and Robust Technical Assistance to Small Urban and Rural Disadvantaged Communities

While in theory the Technical Assistance Resource Center (TARC) is helpful to under-resourced jurisdictions, in practice and reality it has yet to fulfill its objectives. In order for the CTC to address barriers faced by under-resourced jurisdictions, we strongly recommend that the CTC prioritize targeted outreach to small urban and rural jurisdictions serving disadvantaged communities. More so, the CTC should clearly instruct TARC to prioritize small urban and rural disadvantaged communities for these limited technical assistance resources first.

Access to technical assistance resources during the application process, including grant writing, and data collection (i.e. walk and bike counts) will improve the ability to overcome barriers and increase the number of objectively competitive, successful awards that meaningfully benefit low-income, underserved, disadvantaged communities. Without such technical assistance, these communities will continue to fall even further behind in developing equitable and healthy transportation infrastructure and programs.

Demonstrated Need to Invest Planning Resources in Disadvantaged communities

We are concerned with the lack of investment allocated to developing active transportation plans in small urban and rural disadvantaged communities. Seven of the 114 recommended projects are for planning, totalling $2,043,000 (0.95 of total recommended, including statewide component and small urban and rural component). Many small urban and rural disadvantaged communities lack neighborhood level mobility plans, and this absence of plans means project identification and proposal development is arbitrary. Without active transportation plans, under resourced staff from disadvantaged jurisdictions have to identify projects on a project per project basis, stifling the ability of these jurisdictions to create sustainable long term active transportation plans and infrastructure. Thus, projects are implemented on a piecemeal basis, without planned active transportation infrastructure, and neighborhood level connectivity is haphazard and non-conducive to sustainable mode shift. In order to incentivize mode shift, active transportation needs to provide residents with safe, reliable walkable and bikeable connectivity on a neighborhood level. Thus, planning is fundamental to ensuring all active transportation projects produce the highest level of connectivity for residents to access key destinations by foot or bike.

Furthermore, without plans, contributions to greenhouse gas reduction strategies and strategies for reducing vehicle miles travels through comprehensive mode-shift strategies, which are paramount

evaluated. However the scoring rubric used can better reflect the ATP Guidelines particularly for the disadvantaged community, public health, and public participation sections. The suggestions below will not only better ensure that evaluators reach a similar objective conclusion for each question, but this will also provide greater insight regarding what constitutes a significant benefit to a DAC informed by a strong public participation process. Many evaluators may lack experience working with severely under-resourced communities and residents who face large barriers to civic engagement (low-income, working multiple jobs, without child care, limited English proficiency, low education attainment, etc.), yet these are the communities most reliant on and in need of high quality active transportation infrastructure and programming. With greater guidance, evaluators will have a better idea of what to look for and assess in the application.

Below are additional areas that should be made more explicit in the scoring rubric:

Public Participation

- The involvement of specifically community-based organizations and residents in the public participation *and* project implementation process, including the submission of support letters by community based organizations and/or community leaders
- Location of meetings
- The following guidance on strategies for outreach to disadvantaged communities should be provided to applicants; and reviewers should refer to this when assessing disadvantaged community applications.

Strategies for organizing well-attended meetings and encouraging resident participation:

- *Providing food, child care, and other incentives to attend is a proven technique that agencies have used to increase turnout. Make the incentives clear in the invitations.*
- *Schedule multiple meetings to accommodate residents with different employment and family schedules. Weekend or evening hours are ideal.*
- *Use meeting locations preferably within walking distance for residents. Neighborhood/community based organizations and schools etc. may let you use their meeting space.*
- *Partner with community leaders and community based organizations who can assist with outreach.*
- *Post flyers in high foot traffic areas (if needed, use different languages and explain that an interpreter will be available at the meetings).*
- *Door-to-door in-person invitations.*
- *Mail invitations (same language idea noted above).*
- *Distribute notices at local schools, and community events, such as community festivals, cook-outs, and other events that attract residents.*
- *Add to the meeting agendas of neighborhood/community based organizations, school site meetings, etc. to facilitate a meeting where residents will be gathering.*

Public Health

CITY OF FULLERTON

October 13, 2015

Ms. Laurie Waters
Active Transportation Program Contact
1120 N Street, MS-52
Sacramento, CA 95814

SENT VIA EMAIL
Laurie.Waters@dot.ca.gov

Subject: Active Transportation Program, Cycle 3

Dear Ms. Waters:

On behalf of the City of Fullerton, we are writing to respectfully request that program requirements be addressed for bike boulevards in the Cycle 3 solicitation for the Active Transportation Program. We are currently evaluating the implementation of a bicycle boulevard in the City and we would like to pre-position our project to be eligible for ATP funding in Cycle 3.

Our specific request is in regards to traffic signal warrants. Currently, in order to apply for a traffic signal under the ATP program, we must demonstrate that the traffic signal meets Warrant 4, 5, or 7 (CA MUTCD). It is possible that a traffic signal is necessary for the bike boulevard to function properly while not necessarily meeting Warrant 4, 5, or 7.

Thank you for your consideration of our request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at KarenH@cityoffullerton.com and dhoppe@cityoffullerton.com.

Sincerely,

Karen Haluza, AICP
Director of Community Development

Donald K. Hoppe
Director of Public Works