

2nd Draft 2017 Active Transportation Program Guidelines

Summary of Proposed Changes

Section I. Introduction (pgs. 1-2)			
Sub-section (s)	Page(s)	Change	Intent
3	1	Add language describing the funding years for 2017	Clarify per request of workgroup

Section III. Eligibility (pgs. 5-11)			
Sub-section (s)	Page(s)	Change	Intent
9	5	Add language designating how long applicants could be excluded from the program is they misrepresent information on application	Clarify per request of workgroup
11	6	Under non-infrastructure projects, strike pilot projects and add language that a start-up project must demonstrate sustainability	Clarify that ATP funds are not to fund ongoing operations
11. A.	7	Add language that bullet list below refers to components of a project not types of projects	Clear up confusion between eligible projects vs. eligible components of projects
13. A.	8 1 st paragraph	Add language to Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) criteria explaining that any information provided must be verifiable and explaining what is meant by directly benefitting.	Tighten up definition of DACs to ensure points are going to true DACs
13. A.	8 1 st bullet	Revise Median Household Income (MHI) DAC criteria to explain what is qualifies by population	Tighten up definition of DACs to ensure points are going to true DACs
13. A.	8 2 nd bullet	Add qualifying score for the CalEnviroScreen criteria	Tighten up definition of DACs to ensure points are going to true DACs
13. A.	9 1 st bullet	Add language specifying that to use the school lunch program criteria, project must be located within 2 miles of school used to qualify	Tighten up definition of DACs to ensure points are going to true DACs
13. A.	9 Sub- bullets	Language added to modify under what circumstances applicants can qualify as a DAC under the 4 th option	Respond to workgroup request for DAC 4 th option to be less open to interpretation
13. B.	9	Revise funding requirement to say designation	Correction
13. D.	9	Revise Resource Center title	Correction
13. E.	10	Add in a Disadvantaged Community after Active Transportation Plan	Clarify that funding for active transportation plans is only for DAC

Section IV. Project Selection Process (pgs. 11-16)			
Sub-section (s)	Page(s)	Change	Intent
18	13	Remove parenthetical <i>including the potential</i> and add the word risk and sentence allowing applicants to describe qualitative safety barriers	Correct that projects that reduce the risk of collisions to nonmotorized users but do not have historical data are at a disadvantage
18	14	Restore maximum number of points available for Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities from 5 to 10 and add language that points will be scaled in relation to the severity of the DAC	Respond to workgroup request to tighten up the definition for DAC and modify the scoring criteria to a sliding scale rather than reduce points
18	14	Reduce points for Public Participation and Planning from 15 to 10	The information requested for this criteria was repetitive and can be streamlined
18	15	Add parenthetical <i>excluding in-kind contributions</i> to leveraging funds criteria	Clarify what can be used for leveraging
18	15	Add language regarding point reductions for non-use of the Corps and project failures	Clarify what is meant by Applicant's performance on past grants
19	16	Add language under tie-breaker criteria	Clarify that construction readiness means construction ready infrastructure projects