CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Adoption of Amendments to the 2014 Active Transportation Program for Metropolitan Planning Organization Competitive Project Selection
May 21, 2014

RESOLUTION G-14-13

1.1 WHEREAS the Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking, and

1.2 WHEREAS Streets and Highways Code Section 2382(k) allows the Commission to adopt separate guidelines for the metropolitan planning organizations charged with allocating funds to projects pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(a)(1) relative to project selection, and

1.3 WHEREAS the Active Transportation Program Guidelines (Resolution G-14-05) requires the Commission to adopt a metropolitan planning organization's use of project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged communities when differing from the statewide guidelines adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, and

1.4 WHEREAS the Active Transportation Program Guidelines (Resolution G-14-05) require metropolitan planning organizations to submit their guidelines to the Commission by May 21, 2014, and

1.5 WHEREAS metropolitan planning organization guidelines were submitted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission adopts the amendments proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, and Southern California Association of Governments for administering the respective metropolitan planning organization's competitive program, as presented by Commission Staff on May 21, 2014, and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these guidelines do not preclude any project nomination or any project selection that is consistent with the implementing legislation.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION** (MTC) proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Definition of Disadvantaged Community**

The MTC region previously adopted a measure to define Disadvantaged Communities known as "Communities of Concern". MTC recently updated the Communities of Concern definition in 2013 as part of the Plan Bay Area Equity Analysis Report.

MTC's Communities of Concern are defined as those census tracts having either 1) significant concentrations of both low-income and minority residents, or 2) significant concentrations of any four or more of the following eight disadvantage factors: minority persons; low-income persons below 200% of the federal poverty level (about $44,000 per year for a family of four); persons with Limited English Proficiency; zero-vehicle households; seniors aged 75 and over; persons with a disability; single-parent families; and housing units occupied by renters paying more than 50% of household income on rent. The concentration thresholds for these factors are described below.

Disadvantage Factor	% of Regional of Population	Concentration Threshold
1. Minority Population	54%	70%
2. Low Income (<200% of Poverty) Population	23%	30%
3. Limited English Proficiency Population	9%	20%
4. Zero-Vehicle Households	9%	10%
5. Seniors Aged 75 and Over	6%	10%
6. Population with a Disability	18%	25%
7. Single-Parent Families	14%	20%
8. Rent-Burdened Households	10%	15%

Based on this definition, roughly 20% of the region's population is located in Communities of Concern. MTC's Communities of Concern definition of Disadvantaged Communities meets the State's legislative intent, and has already been in use in the MTC region for planning and programming purposes.

Additional discussion of the Communities of Concern definition and methodology are included in the Plan Bay Area Equity Analysis Report and associated Appendix, available online at: http://onebayarea.org/pdf/final supplemental reports/FINAL PBA Equity Analysis Report.pdf and http://onebayarea.org/pdf/final supplemental reports/FINAL PBA Equity Analysis Report Appendices.pdf. Further, applicants can find an online map showing precise locations of Communities of Concern online at: http://geocommons.com/maps/118675.

☑ **Supplemental Call for Projects**

MTC elects to conduct an additional solicitation for project applications.

☑ **Project Selection Criteria and Weighting**
Replaces "Scoring Criteria" section (pages 10-11) of the statewide guidelines.

Criteria	Description	Points Possible
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling 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.	30
Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	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.	25
Cost Effectiveness	Project's 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.	10
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities	Refer to MTC's Communities of Concern defined above.	10

Public Participation and Planning	Project demonstrates that a community-based public participation process culminated in the project proposal. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.	15
California Conservation Corps	Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code.	-5 (point deduction)
Performance on Past Grants	Applicant's performance on past grants.	-10 (point deduction)
Consistency with Regional Priorities and Planning Efforts	Applicants shall describe the project's consistency with previously-approved regional priorities, and how the project meets Plan Bay Area's objective to meet SB 375 commitments. Points will be awarded for the degree of the proposed project's consistency with regional priorities, such as: ○ Consistency with Plan Bay Area's Healthy and Safe goals of reduction of particulate matter, collision reduction and encouragement of active transport ○ Consistency with MTC's Safe Routes to School Program ○ Establishment and expansion of regional bike share ○ Bay Trail build-out ○ Regional Bike Network build-out ○ Gap closures in the Regional Bike Network ○ Multi-jurisdictional projects	10
	TOTAL SCORING	**110**

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS** (SACOG) proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Minimum Project Size**

Minimum size for all types of infrastructure projects is $278,675 ($250,000 funding request + $28,675 local match).

Minimum size for all types of non-Infrastructure projects is $55,735 ($50,000 funding request + $5,735 local match).

These minimum project sizes do not require Commission approval.

☑ **Match Requirement**

Project includes at least an 11.47% local match; applies to all project types.

☑ **Supplemental Call for Projects**

SACOG elects to conduct an additional solicitation for project applications.

☑ **Project Selection Criteria and Weighting**
Replaces "Scoring Criteria" section (pages 10-11) of the statewide guidelines.

Criteria	Description	Points Possible
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling 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. The regional program includes additional considerations drawn from the policy framework for the SACOG Regional Bicycle &	30

	Pedestrian Funding Program. The focus is on clearly demonstrating how well the project supports the policy framework priorities, including improving access to transit services, increasing access to schools, and eliminating gaps or barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network.	
Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	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. The regional program highlights the same performance outcomes, but emphasizes the importance of data to demonstrate benefits.	25
Cost Effectiveness	Project's 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. The regional program asks that the project proponent demonstrate there is balance between minimizing projected capital and ongoing operating costs while offering strong performance benefits and the leveraging of resources.	10
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities*	Project demonstrates benefits to disadvantaged communities. o Median household income < 80% of the statewide median, or o Among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state, or o At least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP. * After dedicating 25% to projects and programs benefitting disadvantaged communities, projects will be ranked without the 10 points for the Disadvantaged Communities	10
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals in SB 375 and SB 391	Note: This is not a criterion for the State ATP program, but is one of the overall goals of the state program. The stated goal: "Project advances the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and	10

	SB 391 (C585, §2009)". The regional program asks that the project proponent demonstrate utilitarian purposes and placemaking strategies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reduced or shortened vehicle trips.	
Other Considerations	Scoring for other considerations include past performance on projects, demonstrated project delivery readiness in the application, and evidence of strong stakeholder support to implement the project.	10
	TOTAL SCORING	**105**

San Diego Association of Governments

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS** (SANDAG) has proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Match Requirement**

Applicants are not required to provide a local match. A scoring criteria, however, has been established to award more points to projects with matching funds.

☑ **Supplemental Call for Projects**

SANDAG elects to conduct an additional solicitation for project applications.

☑ **Project Selection Criteria and Weighting**
Replaces "Scoring Criteria" section (pages 10-11) of the statewide guidelines.

Non-Infrastructure Scoring Criteria:

Criteria	Description	Points Possible		
ALL GRANTS		P	E/A/E/E	BP
Relationship to Program Objectives	How well does the proposed project address program objectives?	30	20	20
Comprehensive-ness	Planning: How comprehensive is the proposed plan? (geographic area and emphasis on bike/pedestrian/traffic calming, CATS) Education/awareness/encouragement/ enforcement: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?	16	16	12

	Parking/carrying facilities/bike share: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?			
Methodology	Planning: How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals? Education/awareness/encouragement/ enforcement, parking/carrying facilities/bike share: How effective will the proposed effort be in meeting the demonstrated need and project goals?	30	30	10
Community Public Support/ Public Participation	Planning: Does the planning project include an inclusive process? Other: Does the project involve broad segments of the community and does it have broad and meaningful community support?	16	16	10
Matching Funds	Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter approval. 2. Approved match grant. 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.	20	20	20
Cost/Benefit	Subtotal Score (not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount	18	18	18
Public Health	Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?	10	10	10
EDUCATION, AWARENESS, ENCOURAGEMENT, ENFORCEMENT, AND BIKE PARKING GRANTS ONLY				
Evaluation	How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?		20	10
Innovation	Is this project new to the region and does it have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region?		10	30

PLANNING AND BIKE PARKING GRANTS ONLY				
Demand (GIS Analysis)	Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.	20		20
	TOTAL SCORING	**160**		

P: Planning
E/A/E/E: Education, Awareness, Encouragement, Enforcement
BP: Bike Parking

Infrastructure Project Scoring:

Criteria	Description	Points Possible
Completion of Major Milestones	Points are eligible for points following the completion of each phase: • Community active transportation strategy/neighborhood-level plan/corridor study • Environmental Clearance • Right-of-Way • Final Design	20
Connection to Regional Bicycle Network	Project directly connects or is a part of the Regional Bikeway Network.	8
Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network	Closes a gap between existing bicycle facilities (guidance will definition of gap and will include situations where there exists an undesirable change in facility type).	8
Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network	Closes a gap in the existing network.	12
Connection to Transit	Bike and/or pedestrian improvements proximity to regional transit stations and local transit stops.	12
Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers	Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or accident history and/or creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclist and pedestrians.	15

Effectiveness and Comprehensiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures	How well will the proposed traffic calming, pedestrian improvements, and bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?	18
Relationship to Program Objectives	How well does the project meet the program objectives?	8
Innovation	Is the project an FHWA or state experimentation? Does the project propose solutions that are new to the region, and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region? Does the project utilize innovative solutions such as those listed in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Guide?	8
Complimentary Programs	Is the project accompanied by programs that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and increased enforcement?	3
Supportive Policies and Plans	Demonstrated policy language in approved plan, or a completed community active transportation strategy/plan.	3
Demand (GIS Analysis)	Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.	15
Matching Funds	Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter approval. 2. Approved match grant. 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.	10
Cost/Benefit	Subtotal Score (not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount	10

Public Health	Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?	10
California Conservation Corps	Has the applicant sought California Conservation Corps or a qualified Community Conservation Corps participation on the project?	-5 (point deduction)
	TOTAL SCORING	**160**

Southern California Association of Governments

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS** (SCAG) has proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Project Selection Criteria and Weighting**
Replaces "Scoring Criteria" section (pages 10-11) of the statewide guidelines.

Criteria	Description	Points Possible
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling 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.	30
Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	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.	25
Cost Effectiveness	Project's 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.	10
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities	Project demonstrates benefits to disadvantaged communities. ○ Median household income < 80% of the statewide median, or ○ Among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state, or ○ At least 75% of the public school students are	10

	eligible for the NSLP.	
Public Participation and Planning	Project demonstrates that a community-based public participation process culminated in the project proposal. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.	15
California Conservation Corps	Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code.	-5 (point deduction)
Performance on Past Grants	Applicant's performance on past grants.	-10 (point deduction)
Consistency with Plans Adopted by Local and Regional Governments	The county transportation commissions will review the infrastructure projects and determine which projects "are consistent with plans adopted by local and regional governments within the county" per the requirements of SB 99. If a project is consistent, the county will assign up to 10 points to each project. "Plan" shall be defined by each county transportation commission. Note that non-infrastructure projects will be scored solely the use of State criteria and scores.	10
	TOTAL SCORING	**110**

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Adoption of Amendments to the 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organization Competitive Project Selection
June 25, 2014

RESOLUTION G-14-15

1.1 WHEREAS the Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking, and

1.2 WHEREAS Streets and Highways Code Section 2382(k) allows the Commission to adopt separate guidelines for the metropolitan planning organizations charged with allocating funds to projects pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(a)(1) relative to project selection, and

1.3 WHEREAS the Active Transportation Program Guidelines (Resolution G-14-05) requires the Commission to adopt a metropolitan planning organization's use of project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged communities when differing from the statewide guidelines adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, and

1.4 WHEREAS the Active Transportation Program Guidelines (Resolution G-14-05) require metropolitan planning organizations to submit their guidelines to the Commission by May 21, 2014, and

1.5 WHEREAS the Commission adopted the amendments proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, and Southern California Association of Governments for administering the respective metropolitan planning organization's competitive program on May 21, 2014 (Resolution G-14-13), and

1.6 WHEREAS additional metropolitan planning organization guidelines were submitted by the Fresno Council of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission adopts the amendments proposed by the Fresno Council of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments for administering the respective metropolitan planning organization's competitive program, as presented by Commission Staff on May 21, 2014, and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these guidelines do not preclude any project nomination or any project selection that is consistent with the implementing legislation.

Fresno Council of Governments

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **FRESNO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS** (FCOG) proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Minimum Project Size**

A minimum project size is not established for project submittals.

This request does not require Commission approval.

☑ **Match Requirement**

Project includes at least an 11.47% local match; applies to all project types. However, projects predominantly benefiting a disadvantaged community only need to meet one of the three following options: either provide a local match of at least 11.47%, provide proof that the project is shovel ready, or provide proof that the implementing agency has and will continue to partner with an outside agency to implement the project, such as a school district.

☑ **Supplemental Call for Projects**

FCOG elects to conduct an additional solicitation for project applications.

☑ **Project Selection Criteria and Weighting**
Replaces "Scoring Criteria" section (pages 10-11) of the statewide guidelines.

Criteria	Description	Points Possible
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling 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.	30

Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	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.	25
Public Participation and Planning	Project demonstrates that a community-based public participation process culminated in the project proposal. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.	15
Cost Effectiveness	Project's 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.	10
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities	Project demonstrates benefits to disadvantaged communities. o Median household income < 80% of the statewide median, or o Among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state, or o At least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the National School Lunch Program.	10
California Conservation Corps	Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code.	-5 (point deduction)
Performance on Past Grants	Applicant’s performance on past grants.	-10 (point deduction)
Shovel Readiness	Executed NEPA document and Right of Way Certification are provided.	10
	TOTAL SCORING	**110**

San Joaquin Council of Governments

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS** (SJCOG) proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Supplemental Call for Projects**

SJCOG elects to conduct an additional solicitation for project applications.

2014 Active Transportation Program – MPO Competitive Project Selection Proposal

Tulare County Association of Governments

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(k), the Commission may approve separate guidelines for MPOs relative to project selection. The 2014 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on March 20, 2014, allow MPOs administering competitive selection processes to differ, with Commission approval, from the statewide guidelines in the following areas: project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities. The guidelines further state that the 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.

The **TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS** (TCAG) proposed to differ from the adopted statewide guidelines in the following areas:

☑ **Definition of Disadvantaged Community**

The criterion for qualifying based on median household income has been modified (shown underlined) to:

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. Five (5) additional points will be awarded for projects benefitting severely disadvantaged communities (less than 60% of the statewide median income).

Data is available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml. Other data such as income surveys may also be used.

☑ **Project Selection Criteria and Weighting**
Replaces "Scoring Criteria" section (pages 10-11) of the statewide guidelines.

Criteria	Description	Points Possible
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling 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.	30
Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	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.	25

Public Participation and Planning	Project demonstrates that a community-based public participation process culminated in the project proposal. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project. TCAG will emphasize projects which are part of an adopted plan (general plan, specific plan, community plan, bike plan, etc.) and the project's relationship to system planning. A map showing how the project fits within the system will be required and can be submitted to TCAG after the project's initial submittal to the statewide selection competition.	15
Cost Effectiveness	Project's 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.	10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities	Project demonstrates benefits to disadvantaged communities. o Median household income < 80% of the statewide median, or o Among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state, or o At least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the National School Lunch Program. Projects that benefit severely disadvantaged communities (less than 60% of the statewide median household income) will be awarded maximum 15 points.	15
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	10
California Conservation Corps	Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code.	-5 (point deduction)
Performance on Past Grants	The regional program will consider the applicant's past performance on delivering CMAQ projects. For future ATP cycles, performance on ATP project delivery will also be considered.	-10 (point deduction)

Matching Funds	Points will be awarded to projects providing additional matching funds exceeding 15% of the project cost. For match waiver eligible projects, points will awarded to projects providing matching funds exceeding 5% of the project cost.	5
	TOTAL SCORING	**110**