



Land Use & Housing Committee

Item #09-6-4 Action

May 27, 2009

Review of Program and Application Guidelines for Round 4 of Community Design Funding Program

Issue: Should the three recommendations by the staff regarding the fourth round (2009-11) of the Community Design Program be approved?

Recommendation: That the Land Use & Housing Committee forward with a recommendation that the SACOG Board: (1) approve and release of the draft 2009-11 Community Design Program and Application Guidelines; (2) approve a minimum funding amount of \$12 million to the program; and (3) direct staff to initiate de-programming of non-performing projects from Rounds 1 and 2.

Discussion: The SACOG staff is submitting for review and approval the draft program and application guidelines for the fourth round of the Community Design Funding Program. As part of the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the program provides financial incentives to implement the Blueprint Principles. Cities, counties, transit and air quality districts in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties are eligible to apply. Placer and El Dorado counties have their own programs.

The draft guidelines document is attached (minor changes may still be made to the draft before it goes to the Board). It includes a FAQ that summarizes the basics about the program, including the proposed application requirements and selection process. The staff's proposed guidelines remain mostly unchanged from Round 3. Staff interviewed most of the individuals who prepared applications or who thought of submitting applications in Round 3 for input on the application process and requirements. Few revisions were suggested. The main issue that the program has experienced is ensuring that grant recipients utilize the funding in a timely manner. For this reason, the only substantive additional requirement proposed in the Round 4 guidelines is that jurisdictions that received funding during Round 1 (in 2004) or Round 2 (2006) submit an updated scope of work and timeline to complete their projects as part of the process for applying in Round 4. If the recipient jurisdiction cannot complete its Round 1 or 2 project in a timely manner (as determined by SACOG and Caltrans staff), then staff seeks the Board's direction to initiate steps to de-program these non-performing projects.

Staff is recommending that a minimum of \$12 million be dedicated to funding Round 4 projects, as this is the lowest amount that interviewed stakeholders stated would be enough to entice them to apply through such a competitive process. Of the \$12 million, approximately \$9 million will come from already-dedicated federal State Transportation Improvement Program Transportation Enhancements (STIP TE) funds for this program; the remaining \$3 million will come from some combination of federal apportionment and loan repayment funds. A higher minimum is not being proposed because SACOG has not received notice of its projected share of the STIP Fund estimate, which may be lower this year than prior ones. If the two program selection committees strongly believe that total more than \$12 million in projects should be funded, then staff will forward the recommendation for the Board to consider funding a higher amount along with a proposal on the sources of funding for the higher amount. The prior Community Design funding cycle awarded \$18.3 million to recipients. If the Board approves the guidelines at its June 18 meeting, then staff will release the guidelines on June 19, applications will be due on September 3 and the Board will be presented with the recommendations on November 19. Federal programming must be complete by Dec 15.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Executive Director

MM:GC:ef
Attachment

Key Staff: Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs & Member Services, (916) 340-6224

Greg Chew, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6227

S:\SACOG\Land Use & Housing\2009\June\4 - Comm. Design.doc0900501

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

**DRAFT ROUND 4 COMMUNITY DESIGN
FUNDING PROGRAM (2009-2011)**

GUIDELINES

and

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

(Draft May 27, 2009)

RELEASE DATE: Friday, June 19, 2009

APPLICATIONS DUE: 4 p.m., Thursday, September 3, 2009

This document contains information regarding the Sacramento Area Council of Government's Community Design Program for 2009-11. The program provides grants to local government agencies and their partners to implement the SACOG Blueprint Principles or smart growth. Approximately every two years the program releases the program and application guidelines. This document provides background and instructions for submitting an application:

- **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)** provides a summary background of the program, the application requirements and other basic information.
- **Section 1** describes the guidelines for the Community Design Funding Program – the purpose of the program and generally how the program is managed. It also provides practical information that applicants should consider when preparing an application based on the selection process from prior funding rounds.
- **Section 2** serves as the Request for Applications for Round 4 of the Community Design Funding Program (2009-11). It contains instructions for applicants on the submittal requirements, including timelines and optional workshops.

Please note that this program only applies to jurisdictions in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties. Jurisdictions in El Dorado and Placer Counties have separate programs for their funds.

The Frequently Asked Questions portion of this document will be updated as questions come up and posted on the SACOG website at www.sacog.org

Round 4 Community Design Funding Program (2009-11)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Frequently Asked Questions

Section 1: Guidelines for Community Design Funding Program

- Sub-section A: Program Background
- Sub-section B: Blueprint Project
- Sub-section C: Program Funding and Grant Categories
- Sub-section D: Federal Aid Eligibility
- Sub-section E: Funding Sources, Timeline and Extensions
- Sub-section F: General Award Requirements
- Sub-section G: Project Sponsorship
- Sub-section H: Placer and El Dorado Counties
- Sub-section I: Local Matching Fund Requirements
- Sub-section J: Communication to Countywide Transportation Authorities
- Sub-section K: New Requirement for Round 1 and 2 Grant Recipients
- Sub-section L: Review and Selection Process
- Sub-section M: Evaluation Criteria
- Sub-section N: Optional Program Overview/Grantwriting 101 Workshops with Incentive

Section 2: Request for Applications for Community Design Funding Program

- Sub-section O: Program Manager and Updated Information
- Sub-section P: Pre-Submittal Letter (Required)
- Sub-section Q: Application Format and Contents
- Sub-section R: CMAQ Air Emissions Benefit Calculations
- Sub-section S: Post-Submittal Materials
- Sub-section T: Program Schedule
- Sub-section U: Checklist of Application Requirements

Appendix A: Federal Funding Requirements

Appendix B: 2007-09 Awarded Community Design Grant Application Descriptions

Round 4 Community Design Funding Program (2009-11)

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

This section, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ), provides the basic information about the program for potential applicants. However, if applying, the applicant is expected to fully review the guideline information described in Section 1 and 2 of this document. If there are any clarifications or information on the guidelines after June 19, 2009, then this FAQ will be updated on the SACOG website at www.sacog.org

What is the Community Design Funding Program?

The Community Design Program was established in 2003 by the SACOG Board of Directors to provide financial assistance to implement the principles of the Blueprint Project: mixed land uses, transportation options, housing choice, compact development, use existing assets, quality design, and natural resource protection. The program offers funding for projects by local jurisdictions that implement these principles.

How much funding will be awarded in this round?

Staff will recommend that the SACOG Board approve a minimum of \$12 million for Round 4 of the program, which is the 2009-11 funding cycle. Staff will also propose that the Board may be requested to fund more depending on the selection process and the recommendations made by the two review committees.

What kinds of projects are eligible?

Because federal transportation funds are used for this program, awarded projects must be “federal aid eligible”. This means that projects must have a significant element involving transportation – the construction of infrastructure, environmental review, design or right-of-way purchase are general tasks that are eligible for these funds. The most common prototype project is one where the grant funds street improvements along a corridor that has infill development with private capital committed.

Planning activities by themselves are not eligible. The main reason is the source of funds in this round do not allow for pure planning projects in most cases.

Because the issue of eligibility is so critical to the program, each project is reviewed on a case-by-case basis for eligibility. Applicants must submit a pre-submittal letter to SACOG; and, in return, SACOG and Caltrans staff will reply with a letter stating whether the project is eligible and any foreseeable concerns the project is raising. Potential applicants are required to work with their public works staff or equivalent who are trained in managing federal aid requirements, and with SACOG staff throughout the application, selection and funding stages of the program.

Who can apply? What jurisdictions are eligible?

Local jurisdictions in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties that have a master agreement with Caltrans to receive federal transportation funding are eligible to apply for Community Design Program funds. This may include cities, counties, air districts, and transit districts. Potential applicants unaware of their eligibility are advised to check with SACOG or Caltrans staff. Jurisdictions in El Dorado and Placer Counties have a separate Memorandum of Understanding with SACOG and receive their share of federal aid through a different process.

Are applicants required to provide a local match?

Yes. The recipient must provide a minimum of 11.47% match in non-federal funds, as is required in all federal aid funding projects. The selection committee may construe a higher match percentage by the applicant as a stronger application.

What are the critical dates?

The most important date is the applications are due on 4 p.m., Thursday, September 3, 2009. The applications guidelines will be released by SACOG on Friday, June 19, 2009, if the SACOG Board of Directors approves the proposed guideline. A pre-submittal letter is required before an applicant is permitted to submit an application; the last day that SACOG will accept pre-submittal letters is August 19. There will be two, identical, optional Program Overview/Grantwriting 101 Workshop on Wednesday, July 8 and on Tuesday, August 4th (participants who attend the workshop are offered the incentive of SACOG staff reviewing drafts of applications for general-level comments). The SACOG Board of Directors will be asked to approve the recommended projects on November 19, 2009.

Projects receiving grant funding in Round 4 must be completed by September 30, 2013. The exceptions to this deadline are (1) if SACOG does not have available federal aid funds for the programming year requested by the recipient; (2) if SACOG, Caltrans or a federal agency do not process a programming request in a timely manner; or (3) with approval by the SACOG Board of Directors for a timeline extension.

What are the major key elements of the Program that a potential applicant needs to know about?

Some of the key features of the proposed guidelines for Round 4 are:

- the program is intended to fund projects that promote the implementation of the SACOG Blueprint Principles (compact development, mixed of land uses, transportation options, etc.)
- cities, counties, air districts and transit districts in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties are eligible to apply, while jurisdictions in El Dorado and Placer counties have their own programs;
- projects must be federal transportation aid eligible (construction, environmental review, design or right-of-way purchase for transportation infrastructure);
- applicants must provide a pre-submittal letter to SACOG to determine eligibility;

- the applicant's point-of-contact must be trained in managing federal transportation aid and is responsible for all contents submitted in the application;
- interviews will be conducted with applicants who received a funding recommendation from the first of two review committees; and
- applications will be evaluated based on how well they implement the Blueprint principles, the project's realistic ability to be delivered by the program deadline of Sept 30, 2013, and the past performance by the applicant jurisdiction in delivering awarded projects.

What are the major proposed changes since the last round of Community Design Funding?

Generally, the program and application requirements, processes and guidelines remain the mostly the same as the prior cycle, Round 3. The only major proposed addition to the application requirements are that applicants who received funding from the 2003-05 or 2005-07 program cycles (Round 1 or Round 2) will also be required to submit a scope of work, deliverables and timeline for completion of any projects that have not been finished. A jurisdiction's ability to deliver projects will be considered when evaluating Round 4 applications. SACOG must approve the updated scope/timeline/deliverables document for the Round 1 or Round 2 project by August 28. If not approved by then, SACOG will take measures to de-program the project and that jurisdiction will be prohibited from applying in Round 4.

There are three funding categories– what are they, and what do I need to know?

There are three categories of project applications, as defined by the amount of funding requested. First, the most common category, referred to as Category #1 (formerly called "Conventional"), is for federal-aid projects that seek funding between \$100,000 to \$7 million. The types of projects in this category can be varied so long as they are federal-aid eligible. Most projects (except the planning ones, which are not eligible) awarded in past rounds fall into this category.

Category #2 projects are federal-aid eligible "Complete Streets" projects seeking \$2 million to \$7 million. These projects seek improvements within transportation corridors into more pedestrian and transit-friendly environments with associated land use changes.

Category #3 projects seek exactly \$100,000. These projects must be federal-aid eligible, although they may not necessarily be awarded federal funding; this is the only category in which projects may be awarded non-federal funding sources. Only cities and counties may apply for funding in this category, and they are not allowed to submit applications in any other category. The submittal requirements would be less than applications in the other two categories. Applicants may only submit one application. Projects in this category would compete only with others in this category.

What's involved in the application process?

All applicants are expected to review the program and application guidelines. They must submit a pre-application letter before an application may be submitted. Applicants must also submit the application in accordance to the guidelines and with SACOG's letter of reply to the pre-submittal letter.

How will the projects be selected for funding?

There will be two different bodies reviewing the applications. First, the internal SACOG Review Team comprised of staff, Caltrans, and others, will review the pre-submittal letter and provide written comments regarding eligibility and delivery that it would like to see addressed in the application. Then, the Community Design Review Committee, comprised of staff and professionals in related fields from around the region, will review the applications and make funding recommendations based on merit as per the program guidelines. The SACOG Review Team will then interview and negotiate with each recommended recipient on the scope, timeline and deliverables. The team will also factor in an applicant's past performance on delivering Community Design Projects. If the project is considered eligible and deliverable by the team, and the applicant has a solid history of delivering past Community Design Projects, the project will be forwarded to the SACOG Board for funding approval.

What responsibilities do jurisdictions have once SACOG has programmed the awarded funds?

As per prior funding rounds, all recipients must accept the full responsibility of managing federal-aid funds. This is a significant responsibility that can require a lot of reporting and coordination with Caltrans and federal agencies. SACOG will only allow a trained professional in managing federal aid funding for the project.

Also, jurisdictions that receive Community Design Funds are required to deliver their projects according to their applications and subsequent negotiated scopes of work, timelines and deliverables. All projects funding in Round 4 must be completed by September 30, 2013. There are three exceptions described earlier when this deadline may be extended. Applicants who fail to meet the September 30, 2013 deadline and do not receive an extension will lose this funding, plus forfeit the right to apply in the next funding cycle for this program.

If I have questions, who do I contact?

Please contact SACOG Community Design Program Manager, Greg Chew. He can be reached at (916) 340-6227 or at gchew@sacog.org.

Section 1

Round 4 Community Design Funding Program (2009-11)

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

A. COMMUNITY DESIGN PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The overall purpose of the Community Design Program is to provide financial support for federal aid eligible capital development projects that promote implementation of the Blueprint Project Principles.

The Community Design Program provides financial incentives to local governments in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties that have specific development and public improvements that will help foster Blueprint-friendly communities. The financial incentives, which come in the form of grants through a competitive process, must be federal aid eligible and transportation-related projects that have some land use component. Projects must also conform to some of the seven Blueprint Principles (which are discussed in detail on the SACOG website: www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/betterways.pdf):

- transportation choices;
- housing diversity;
- compact development;
- mixed land uses;
- use of existing assets;
- natural resource protection; and
- quality design.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035 authorized the Community Design Program through 2035. The MTP included \$500 million dedicated to directly fund public agencies (possibly in partnership with private developers and community organizations) for projects that support the goals of the Plan. The intent of the Community Design Program is to use regional transportation funding to promote the construction of land use developments (or land use and related projects) that lead to fewer vehicles miles traveled and more walking, biking, and transit usage. The program results from the recognition that land use influences travel behavior and can be a powerful tool to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the regional transportation system. If it is convenient for people to travel to common destinations by walking, biking, or public transit, the Sacramento region can reap air quality and congestion-relief benefits at the local and regional scale.

The Community Design Program is one of SACOG's four Regional Funding Programs. This program and the Air Quality, Transportation Demand Management, and Bicycle/Pedestrian programs all provide financial assistance to promote specific activities that lead to more livable

communities.

Please note that the Community Design Program only applies to jurisdictions within the Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties; funding for El Dorado and Placer County projects will be according to their respective agreements with SACOG..

B. BLUEPRINT PROJECT

The Blueprint Project has given the six-county Sacramento region a long-range vision for land use to better manage the growth pressures of this region. The SACOG Board of Directors adopted a Blueprint Project Preferred Scenario in December, 2004. The Preferred Scenario serves only as a concept-level illustration of the growth principles. It was developed with parcel-level data and analysis to help ensure that the growth concepts were being applied in a realistic manner; however, the Preferred Scenario is not for literal, parcel-level interpretation. Besides the Preferred Scenario, the Blueprint Project also created the seven Blueprint Principles listed above that help guide the region when planning for individual communities. SACOG is working with local jurisdictions to implement the concepts of the Preferred Scenario. The Community Design Funding Program is intended to promote the actual construction of projects that promote the Blueprint Principles. More information about the Blueprint Project may be found at <http://www.sacregionblueprint.org/sacregionblueprint/home.cfm>

C. PROGRAM FUNDING AND GRANT CATEGORIES

In the combined fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, SACOG has reserved a minimum of \$12 million total for this round of the Community Design Funding Program. If, through the end of the selection process, the two selection committees assigned to review and make recommendations on the application believe that more than \$12 million should be funded, their recommendations for the higher amount will also be submitted to the SACOG Board. Staff will then have to offer the Board alternatives to providing enough funding from the various federal and state funding sources. Ultimately, the SACOG Board of Directors will make the determination on the final program amount for Round 4 after it reviews the award recommendations.

There are three grant categories within the Community Design Funding Program for 2007-09.

- **Category #1: Conventional Projects.** This category covers the range of projects that are anticipated to be the most numerous during this round of funding. Typically, these include transportation infrastructure projects. These infrastructure projects must either (1) connect directly to a site, corridor, or neighborhood development or redevelopment project that incorporates Blueprint Principles, or (2) supports a land use plan for development or redevelopment that incorporates the Principles, or (3) support an existing community that conforms to the Principles but lacks transportation infrastructure for alternative modes. Project applicants may seek from \$100,000 to \$7 million per project in this category.

- **Category #2:** Complete Streets Projects: This category is to provide funding for the transformation of transportation corridors to more pedestrian and transit friendly streetscapes with an associated transition in land uses. One to three projects in the region will be selected in this round of funding in this category. Projects funding requests must be between \$2 million to \$7 million.
- **Category #3:** \$100,000 Projects: This category is to provide more opportunities for cities and counties that choose not to compete for larger amounts of funding. Category #3 limits applicants to request one \$100,000 (not more, not less) grant. It was developed to encourage cities and counties that have not applied for program funds in the past, and those that cannot compete in the other two categories. Application submittal requirements for Category #3 are less than the other Categories #1 and #2 (see Sub-section Q). Applications in this category are rated against other projects in this category, not against projects in the other two categories. A very limited amount of non-federal sources of funding may be awarded to projects in this category. Cities or counties that submit an application in this category are prohibited from applying in the other two categories.

D. FEDERAL AID ELIGIBILITY

All projects must be federal aid eligible to apply, meaning the project must meet the requirements to receive federal transportation aid funding. Generally speaking, federal aid eligible projects are those that significantly contain transportation infrastructure. Activities or tasks within the project must be either categorized as “construction”, “environmental”, “design” or “right-of way”. Pure planning activities are generally not considered an eligible use.

The following are examples of projects that are generally considered federal aid eligible:

- Transportation infrastructure directly connected to a land development project, land use plan, or in an existing “Blueprint friendly” community
- Bicycle and pedestrian paths, tunnels, and bridges
- On-street bike lanes
- Pedestrian plazas
- Pedestrian street crossings
- Streetscaping such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and furniture
- Traffic calming (but not interfering with public transit, bicycling or walking)
- Transit buses and services that serve the site (operations limited to 3 years)
- Transit stop amenities such as shelters, restrooms, and benches
- Transit transfer centers

Not all projects can be easily determined for eligibility. In all cases, SACOG and Caltrans District #3 Local Assistance staff will work directly with each applicant on eligibility. For each potential application, an applicant must submit a pre-application letter describing the project and SACOG/Caltrans will provide a written response addressing issues relating to eligibility. In addition, all applicants must have a staffperson who is trained in federal aid funding management. In most cases, the staff is found in the Public Works Departments.

For those sponsoring jurisdictions that do not have internal staff who can manage federal transportation funds, they will be required to team with a local agency or hire a qualified consultant in this area. This is not something that can be learned just for one project. The Caltrans District 3 Local Assistance staff makes the final determination on whether an individual is adequately qualified in federal aid management. If that person is deemed not qualified and a suitable replacement cannot be found, Caltrans may advise SACOG to disqualify the application.

E. FUNDING SOURCES, TIMELINES AND EXTENSIONS

The following are considered the most likely sources of funding for the awarded Community Design Funding Program for Category 1 and 2 projects:

- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
- Transportation Enhancements (TE)
- CMAQ (Congestion Management and Air Quality Program)

Category 3 projects that are awarded funding may receive funds from the above sources, or “SACOG-managed” funds, which have only the restrictions that SACOG imposes on the use of these funds. Category 3 recipients in most cases will receive SACOG-managed funds and will need to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with SACOG.

Category 1 and 2 funding sources, there are two federal fiscal years that projects will be obligated, 2010-11 and/or 2011-12. All grant recipients must complete the part of the project that utilizes Community Design Program funds by September 30, 2013.

There are three exceptions by which an applicant can appeal to extend this deadline:

- (1) if SACOG does not have available federal aid funds for the programming year requested by the recipient as evaluated and administered by the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team (described later);
- (2) if SACOG, Caltrans or a federal agency do not process a programming request in a timely manner, as evaluated and administered by the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team; or
- (3) with direct approval by the SACOG Board of Directors.

F. GENERAL AWARD REQUIREMENTS

Recipients receiving funding in any of the four funding programs will be asked to follow or be aware of these requirements.

- Follow all federal funding requirements listed in Appendix A.

- Follow all federal environmental justice directives.
- Assure SACOG that the projects meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- Follow SACOG’s “Use It or Lose It” policy for obligating and spending the grant funds. The policy requires project sponsors to schedule fund obligation and project implementation in the *Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program* and to honor that schedule. The “Use It or Lose It” policy may be downloaded at <http://www.sacog.org/projectdelivery/useit.pdf>
- A local non-federal match of at least 11.47% of the total cost of a project is required for projects receiving federal funding in the Sacramento region, with a few exceptions that are detailed under the individual program guidelines. This does not include “in kind” match, but must be funding that is dedicated to eligible features within the project and included in its overall cost.
- For capital projects, federal funds may be used for Preliminary Engineering (which includes environmental work and design) as well as for right-of-way and construction. When a project is ready for implementation, the project sponsor requests an authorization from Caltrans. When the project is authorized, the sponsor can incur expenses that will then be reimbursed from the grant. A project sponsor submits invoices for the entire cost incurred, and will be reimbursed at 88.53% (the total cost minus local match).
- SACOG encourages project sponsors to seek other non-federal sources of matching funding that may be available.

G. PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

Eligible public agencies that may apply for Community Design funding are those organizations qualified to enter into a Cooperative Agreement with the California Department of Transportation to receive and use Federal transportation funds. This applies only to jurisdictions in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties. These jurisdictions may choose to create a partnership with private or non-profit parties. However, the eligible sponsoring agency thereby agrees to assume all the responsibility in management of federal transportation funds, ensuring that eligible match funds are dedicated to this project, and all of the other responsibilities that accompany submittal of the application and receipt of funding.

Public/private collaborations are encouraged, but the sponsoring eligible jurisdiction applying for the funds bears the responsibility of managing federal aid requirements. Community groups and developers who wish to apply for these funds with a public agency are required to receive the consent of the applicable eligible public agency. It is recommended that the coordination of such a request occur as early as possible.

Non-city/county qualified public agencies that choose to serve as the lead sponsor will be

evaluated on whether they received support from the local government in which the project site is located, preferably with coordination early in the application process. Lack of documented support or coordination will leave the impression that the project is not endorsed by the SACOG member agency and would considerably weaken the project's chances for program funding.

Also please note that if the awarded government agency intends to hire private consulting or construction services with the grant funds, public bidding laws will take affect regarding the selection of contractors.

H. PLACER AND EL DORADO COUNTIES

For Placer and El Dorado Counties, a different situation applies, due to Memoranda of Understanding between the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and SACOG and the El Dorado Transportation Commission and SACOG that govern the use of federal funds in those counties. Please refer to Appendix C for a detailed explanation of how federally-funded projects are approved in those counties.

In summary, the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) for Placer and El Dorado Counties each hold a written agreement with SACOG that allows them to select projects with a fair share of federal funds. Local governments in these two counties will submit their grant applications to their RTPA. The RTPA will forward its selected projects to SACOG for funding. SACOG staff will review these projects and make a determination if they are qualified for the Community Design Funding Program, and, if so, they will be designated as receiving funding through this program and will be recognized as such.

I. LOCAL MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT

A local non-federal match of at least 11.47% of the total cost of a project is required for projects receiving federal funding in the Sacramento region. This does not include “in kind” match, but must be funding that is dedicated to eligible features within the project and included in its overall cost.

Federal funds may be used for Preliminary Engineering (which includes environmental work and design) as well as for right-of-way and construction. If awarded, when a project is ready for implementation, the project sponsor requests an authorization from Caltrans. When the project is authorized, the sponsor can incur expenses that will then be reimbursed from the grant. A project sponsor submits invoices for the entire cost incurred, and will be reimbursed at 88.53% (the total cost minus local match).

Jurisdictions are encouraged to provide a local match higher than 11.47% if they are able to. The two review committees have generally viewed a higher match percentage as a better indication by the jurisdiction that it is committed to the project.

The match works through the reimbursement process. For instance, if a grant recipient has a 20% match and sends an invoice with incurred costs of \$100,000, then the Community Design Program will send, via Caltrans, a reimbursement check for \$80,000. The remaining \$20,000 will be paid for by the recipient. (This does not necessarily apply to Category 3 projects, which will likely be directly reimbursed by SACOG).

J. COMMUNICATION TO COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITIES

Depending on the county in which the primary applicant jurisdiction resides, specific requirements are in effect:

Sacramento/Yolo Counties: Applicants for Community Design Funding Program in Sacramento and Yolo Counties must communicate (email acceptable) to the board of the transportation agency in those counties that they intend to apply for these funds before the September 3, 2009 application due date. The CTA does not need to take action on the application.

Sutter and Yuba Counties: These two counties do not have countywide transportation agencies in place, so the above action is not necessary.

K. NEW REQUIREMENT FOR ROUND 1 AND 2 GRANT RECIPIENTS

The only significant change in the program and application guidelines from Round 3 is a new requirement for applicants who have received funding in Rounds 1 or 2 and whose grants are not completed. For those unfinished projects, the recipient is required to provide SACOG an updated scope, schedule and deliverables document, with a clear completion date. SACOG and

the Round 1 or 2 recipient will agree upon on a scope/timeline/deliverables. If one is not agreed upon by August 28, 2009 per project, SACOG will assume the project is no longer active and take measures to de-program any unused Round 1 or Round 2 funds. Those funds will revert back to the SACOG Board for its discretion regarding use. If there is agreement on how to complete the project between the two parties, then the timeline will be enforced as written until the Round 1 or Round 2 project is completed or the deadline is reached and unspent monies will be de-programmed. In addition, jurisdictions that have their Round 1 or Round 2 projects de-programmed will be prohibited from applying in Round 4.

L. REVIEW COMMITTEES AND SELECTION PROCESS

Two committees will be involved in the review and selection process. The first committee is the Community Design Working Group. Its main function is to review the applications and recommend funding based on the stated criteria (see sub-section _). The committee is comprised of staff and appointed officials from geographically diverse areas of the region. Different technical disciplines will also be represented on the committee (see below for composition).

The second committee is the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team, comprised of SACOG and Caltrans staff, and possibly staff from other agencies who are familiar with federal transportation funding requirements. This team will review each applicant's pre-application letter to provide guidance on federal aid eligibility.

Here are the application selection process involving the two review committees:

Step 1a: Pre-submittal Letter Applicants submit a pre-submittal letter regarding their project to SACOG. The SACOG/Caltrans Review Team reviews the letter for federal aid eligibility and any other issues that raise concerns. A letter is submitted back to the applicant indicating the Team's findings. The applicant may proceed if the Team's review indicates the project is federal aid eligible and/or could be modified to be eligible.

Step 1b: Round 1 and Round 2 Updated Scope of Work: Applicants that have received grants from the Community Design Program in Rounds 1 or 2 (2003-05, or 2005-07) and whose projects have not be completed must submit an updated scope of work and timeline. The SACOG/Caltrans Review Team will review the proposed updated scope/timeline and work directly with the recipient until agreement is reached. If the agreement is reached, those projects must be completed by the stated timeline. If an agreement cannot be reached by August 28, 2009, SACOG staff will institute the Board's direction to de-program funds for those unfinished projects in Round 1 or Round 2.

Step 2: Round 4 Application Review: Round 4 applications will be reviewed by the first committee, the Community Design Working Group. The Group will select projects based on implementation of the Blueprint Principles, ability to be delivered in a timely manner, and past performance of the applicant with prior Community Design projects. The Group's recommendations will be forwarded to Step 3.

Step 3: Interviews for Recommended Projects: The SACOG/Caltrans Review Team will review the projects recommended for funding for their ability to be delivered, and to ensure that they remain federal aid eligible. For each recommended project in Categories #1 or #2, an interview will take place between the Team and the applicant. Projects in Category #3 will have a phone interview. Prior to the interview, the applicant will submit a document providing more detail on the scope of work, timeline and deliverables. The Team and the applicant will discuss the scope work/timeline/deliverables. If the Team concludes the project is deliverable and federal aid eligible, the project will be submitted for recommended funding to the Board.

Step 4: Final Program Funding Decision: The SACOG Board of Directors will be presented with the list of recommended projects for funding. The recommendation will have a minimum of \$12 million of projects. However, if the two review committees recommend more than \$12 million of projects, then the Board will be presented with two lists: one showing how \$12 million will be awarded, and another showing a higher amount coupled with SACOG staff's recommendations on the sources of funding for the higher amount. The Board will be asked to take action of one of the two lists.

Members of the first committee, the Community Design Working Group, will be appointed from the following groups as shown below:

Community Design Working Group Composition

Expertise	Appointment By:	Working Group Positions
Planners	Planners Committee	3-5
Project Engineers	Regional Planning Partnership	1-2
Urban Designer	Regional Planning Partnership	1
Bike/Ped	Bike/Ped Advisory Committee	1
Air Quality	Air Districts	1
TDM	TDM Task Force	1
Transit	Transit Coordinating Committee	1
Community Groups	Regional Planning Partnership	1
TOTAL		10-13

M. EVALUATION CRITERIA

There are three evaluation criteria used by the two review committees to determine whether a project will be recommended for funding. These three criteria will serve as the evaluation framework for the group's selection process; applicants are not necessarily encouraged to address each subset of questions, but to create an overall impression based on what each criterion is asking applicants to address. The two committees do not use a formal document of agreed upon questions; however, there are some questions noted below that have been universally asked in prior funding rounds. .

Criterion #1: How well does the proposed project promote the Blueprint Project Principles?

Practical considerations: This is the most fundamental question each project will be judged against by the Working Group. Based on the prior funding rounds, the Working Group selected projects that best exemplified the Blueprint Principles. Reviewers look for projects that will promote pedestrian/transit friendly, compact mixed-use communities. Oftentimes, projects that have private investment associated with property adjacent or near the application project area are favorably viewed.

Reviewers also look for the “relative context” and “relative value”, meaning relative to the jurisdiction and community that the project is in, will the project implement Blueprint principles better than other projects. For instance, a small project in a more rural area that promotes walking and more compact development may provide more relative value per dollar in the review group’s view than a bigger, more costly project in a more urban area. In other words, the small jurisdiction gives more “Blueprint value” given its locational conditions per dollar than bigger jurisdiction.

Applicants seeking to understand how competitive their projects might be, may wish to compare their idea against the projects funded in prior rounds. Some of the past funded projects show the concept of relative context and relative value. These applications may also give prospective applicants an idea of what application contents were successfully used. However, please be sure to note that many of the pure planning projects that were funded in these two rounds are no longer eligible for funding in this current round. The .PDF files of grant applications of each of those projects may be found at <http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/communitydesign.cfm>

The single most common concern the Working Group had in reviewing applications was the lack of clarity, information or documentation. Some applications lacked why their project was Blueprint-supportive, while others tried unsuccessfully to rationalize why a project followed the Blueprint principles. Some applicants also lacked a clear explanation of why the project was needed to support Blueprint. Other applicants failed to clearly describe how they would use the grant funding in a way that would lead to Blueprint-friendly development. The following are questions that have been raised in the past by the Working Group:

- Does this project serve as a good example of the Blueprint Principles for the region?
- There are several projects in the region that need funding; what makes this project particularly outstanding that regional funds should be used to get it built?
- Has the governing body with the most legal standing endorsed or approved this project? How else has this governing body shown support for this project?
- Are there letters or other documentation from property owners and other stakeholders who have something to lose stating support for the project? Do the property owners state what they are intending to do with their property that is Blueprint-friendly and how committed they are completing their project(s)?
- Has the surrounding neighborhood been involved in the project’s development and has the affected neighborhood or the appropriate neighborhood association endorsed the grant project?
- What are the number of units of housing, commercial space, jobs and other important indicators within a quarter mile of this site? Within one mile? How do residential densities compare with other comparable subject areas?

- If the project is implemented, what additional Blueprint-style development will occur as a result from both the public and private sectors?

Criterion #2: Will this project be delivered? What is the likelihood that the project will be implemented as the application implies?

Of the applications that showed a strong tie with the Blueprint Principles, the Working Group spent a considerable amount of time deliberating about how realistic, or “deliverable”, are these proposals. As stated above, both the Review Team and the Working Group will review a project’s deliverability. The Working Group will base its review on the information in the application, and the Review Team may ask for additional information beyond the application if the project is recommended for funding by the Working Group.

Successful applicants will be able to provide evidence that the project has been well-thought through and that the project was likely be implemented immediately. The following are a brainstorm of questions that past Working Groups have used to help evaluate this criterion. Please note that applicants are not expected to answer each of the following questions, but use some of them as a framework for creating a clear understanding of the deliverability of the project. The following are common questions that the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team has used in evaluating project applications:

- What evidence is there to suggest the applicant can meet the program’s September 30, 2013 deadline?
- Where is the applicant in terms of securing right-of-way, CEQA/NEPA, and other pertinent matters?
- Where is this project in the development review and entitlement process?
- What documentation is there on how much funding has been invested in the project area?
- What source of money is being used for the matching funds? Have those funds been dedicated for this project?
- What is the likelihood that this project will be built as it is described in the application? And how soon will it get built or implemented?
- Are there major outstanding issues that are not resolved? Does this project need to be awarded in this funding cycle, or can it wait until future cycles after the applicant has addressed all critical issues?

Practical Considerations: Applications that adequately addressed the issues raised in these questions were more likely to have been successful in the prior two funding rounds. Some of the tools that successful applicants included in their applications included:

- A context map of the site: where is the subject area in relation to the commonly known landmarks within the region.
- An aerial map showing the project or subject area. The maps showed what exist currently, what projects are in place, and how and where grant funds were going to be used.

- A list of major capital improvements within, adjacent to, or near the subject site. This list could show infrastructure improvements, private development investment made or committed, and long-term public works projects likely to be built according to an adopted plan.
- Photographs of the site or subject area as they currently exist.
- Renderings or drawings of what the subject site or area will look like as a result of grant funding.
- Renderings, graphics or photographs of projects that have recently been built or are going through development review for construction in or near the project subject area.
- Letters of support from key organizations (neighborhood association, adjacent property owners, private developers directly affected by the subject project). These stakeholders should have “something to lose” but support the project anyway. Letters from parties who have little at risk generally have not influenced past Working Groups.
- Written information that addresses as some (but not all) of the questions mentioned above. The level of detail that is provided should be enough to provide the Working Group a clear, overall picture of what activities, investments, etc. are taking place without providing extraneous information.

Criterion #3: Past Performance of Community Design Funded Projects

As stated above, jurisdictions that received funding in Rounds 1 or 2 and who have not completed their projects will be required to submit an updated scope of work, timeline and deliverables document. The project will have to be agreed upon by the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team by August 28, 2009, or the jurisdiction will not be allowed to apply in Round 4 of the Community Design Program. The Team will also review why projects were not completed in Rounds 1 or 2.

N. OPTIONAL PROGRAM OVERVIEW/GRANTWRITING 101 WORKSHOPS WITH INCENTIVE

There will be two identical optional workshops that potential applicants may attend. These workshops will review the program, the application requirements and lessons from prior funding rounds as they apply to this funding cycle, including how to prepare a grant application. The focus on the workshops are to insight into the thought process of the two review committees.

The workshops, which will contain the same contents, will be held on:

Wed, July 8
and
Tuesday, August 4
1:00 to 2:30
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento
(No RSVP necessary; open to all parties)

Incentive for Attending Either Workshop: Anyone may attend either or both workshops. Any individuals who attend the workshop will be allowed to submit drafts of their application to SACOG staff to a general overview of their progress. Staff will provide verbal comments on the draft and specific suggestions for improvement. This service is not available to individuals or jurisdictions that do not have individuals attend one of these workshops.

Section 2

Round 4 Community Design Funding Program (2009-11)

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

This section directly addresses the requirements for applying for a Community Design Grant. Please read the instructions in this section with the background information from the Guidelines in Section 2 when considering and preparing a grant application.

O. PROGRAM MANAGER AND UPDATED INFORMATION

Please direct any questions regarding the Community Design Funding Program or the application process to the SACOG Program Manager:

Gregory Chew
Community Design Funding Program Manager
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
phone (916) 340-6227
fax (916) 321-9551
email gchew@sacog.org.

The Program Manager will provide assistance to all potential applicants regarding eligibility, deliverability and the application and selection process. The Program Manager will also provide preliminary draft application review to individuals who attend one of two optional workshops (see sub-section N).

Updated information will be posted by the Program Manager on the SACOG website (www.sacog.org) to provide answers to frequently asked questions. The FAQs will not be sent directly to potential applicants, so please periodically check the website for updates, particularly as the application deadline draws near.

P. PRE-SUBMITTAL LETTER (REQUIRED)

All applicants are required to submit to the SACOG Project Manager a letter describing their potential project. Category 1 and 2 letters must be received by SACOG by August 19, 2009; Category 3 pre-submittal letters must be received by SACOG by September 1, 2009. The SACOG Review Team will prepare a written response to Category 1 and 2 pre-submittal letters within 7 working days of receipt of the pre-submittal addressing issues regarding eligibility or

delivery that should be addressed in the application; Category 3 responses will be sent with 7 working days or by September 2, whichever is first.

The response letter will state if the project is evaluated as eligible, and if so, the applicant will be given permission to submit an application. If the project is not eligible, the letter will explain why and the project will not be allowed to submit. If the project's eligibility is unclear, the response letter will state what some of the issues are; in some cases, the applicant will be asked to submit a revised letter, and in other cases, the applicant will be asked to make the necessary adjustments and address the issues raised in the application.

The letter is expected to be about two pages; however, more pages are allowed and encouraged if it provides the Review Team more information in which to make an assessment on the project's eligibility and deliverability. The letter may be written in any format using any narrative style. Letters may be converted to a .pdf and sent via email, so long as the signature is provided. The pre-submittal letter may only come from the staff person at each jurisdiction who is trained in managing federal aid projects. Here are the key questions that the Review Team will be addressing:

- 1) Name of the Sponsoring Jurisdiction
- 2) Name of the Project
- 3) Category of the Project (Category 1, 2 or 3)
- 4) Staff Member Trained in Managing Federal Aid Project
- 5) Federal Aid Project Manager's phone and email
- 6) If awarded, how will the federal transportation funding be spent (what is the project, what are the major outcomes, deliverables, etc)
- 7) When is the starting date (assume that federal clearance of the project will take place no earlier than fall, 2010)
- 8) When is the finish date when all awarded federal funding will be exhausted (may not extend beyond September 30, 2013)?
- 9) Why does this project help promote the Blueprint Project?
- 10) How much in matching funds will be committed? What source do they come from?
- 11) Is there associated private and public development with this project? At what stage is the development?
- 12) Please let the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team know anything else it may need to know to make a preliminary assessment of the eligibility and deliveryability of the project, including any questions that the applicant would like addressed by the Team.
- 13) Statement declaring review ("I am trained in managing federal aid eligible projects and have reviewed and approved the contents in this pre-submittal letter").
- 14) Signed by the staff member trained in managing federal aid funding

SACOG must receive the Category 1 and Category 2 pre-submittal letters by no later than August 19, 2009. SACOG will issue a written response within 7 working days of receiving it. Category 3 pre-submittal letters may be submitted no later than September 1.

Q. APPLICATION FORMAT AND CONTENTS

Upon receiving permission to submit an application in the pre-submittal response letter, applicants may prepare the application based on the following instructions. Applications are required to stay within the prescribed format so that there is uniformity for the Working Group to review.

Format

The format requirements for all application categories are:

- All narrative text shall have at least 1 inch margins on all sides, and use no less than 11 point font size. Footers and headers are exempt from margin and font size requirements.
- Narrative pages may only be written on 8.5” x 11” paper. Graphics, photos and maps may be printed only on 8.5”x11” or 11”x17” paper; either size counts only as one page.
- Divider pages are allowed if they are on colored paper that can be recycled. These do not count toward the page limits. Please do not insert plastic pages or non-recyclable tabs on the divider page. The divider page may show section titles; no other narrative or graphic content is allowed.
- Please do not include a separate cover, comb-binding or any plastic materials; stapling or clipping the document will suffice. The signed letter from the primary applicant on letterhead described below shall serve as the cover for the application. One blank white sheet of paper may serve as the back page.
- Submit 1 original signed application and 19 copies of each application.
- Submit one electronic .pdf file of the application, including support materials. Scanned images are acceptable in the .pdf file. The file should be submitted on a compact disc to SACOG Program Manager within 24 hours of submitting the application.

Application Contents For Category #1 or Category #2 Applications

Grant proposals in the Category #1 (“**Conventional**”) and Category #2 (“**Complete Streets**”) must contain the following elements with page limits as listed:

Max Pages	Content Element	Content Description
2	Cover memo	Signed cover memo on letterhead of lead applicant jurisdiction by the chief elected official of governing body, chief executive officer or designated official who has managerial authority above than the federal aid project manager for this application (see below). Memo acknowledges that

		the application is officially authorized by the jurisdiction, provides an official name of the project, and identifies the jurisdiction's Federal Aid Project Manager, who will serve as the contact person for the project. Any other contents are optional. Please address cover letter to the SACOG Program Manager listed above. If a jurisdiction submits more than one application, only the delegated official may sign all cover letters.
1	Signed statement understanding terms of award	By same signatory above, signed statement of "Understanding of Conditions of Acceptance by Community Design Funding Recipient" (shown later in this sub-section). This may be combined with the cover letter above, or serve as a separate document.
1	Letter from Applicant's Federal Aid Project Manager	Signed letter from staff member who will manage the federal aid funds for the project. Letter must contain a clear statement that this person believes he/she is qualified to manage federal aid funds, has reviewed all of the contents in the application, states that to his/her best knowledge this project is federal aid eligible and understands that the project must be completed by September 30, 2013. This person also states that he/she will serve as the lead contact for managing federal aid funding for this project.
1-2	Project Summary Table #1	Summary description of grant application using similar format to Table #1 shown in this sub-section.
16 total pages combined with maps/graphics/photos (see below)	Narrative Project Description	Written description of project – applicant may choose format, structure and any content. This is where the applicant may wish to describe what the project is, how it fits in with the Community Design Program and Blueprint Principles, how the grant funds will be spent, the commitments in place for the project and/or adjacent projects or any information proposer believes will best describe why this project should be awarded a grant. See description in Evaluation Criteria sub-section M. Page total is combined limit with maps/graphics/photos described below.
16 total pages combined with	Project Maps/Graphics/Photos	Maps or graphics illustrating the proposal. Proposer may choose any graphic medium but page sizes are restricted to either 8.5"x11" or 11"x17". See description in Evaluation Criteria in

narrative project description		sub-section M for suggested ideas. These pages may be interspersed with the pages from the narrative project description above.
1	Project timeline	Provide a one page chart showing when the project will start and when the project will be delivered. Assume that if awarded, the project will not receive its federal authorization to start work until Fall, 2010. All awarded projects will be given until September 30, 2013, then the project will be de-programmed. The applicant may provide more detail on the timeline, major work tasks, etc. outside of this table as part of the 16 page limit above.
1	Project Budget - Table #2	Fill out Table #2 shown later in this sub-section describing the project budget according to federal aid categories and fiscal years. The applicant may provide more detail on the costs and budget, etc, outside of this table as part of the 16 page limit above.
As applicable	Copy of pre-submittal letter and response letter	Copy of pre-submittal letter sent to SACOG; and SACOG's written response letter
15 pages total	Related Materials	Any additional information that will provide support for the application. This information should be pre-existing from other reports, plans, etc. and should not be created for this application. Examples may be key pages from an adopted plan that includes the grant project or subject area, information regarding adjacent private or public projects or list of investments made in subject area that are Blueprint-friendly.
No limit	Letters of support or commitment	Letters of endorsement or commitment from key stakeholders (e.g., private developers who have financially committed to building a project adjacent to or near the project site, recognized neighborhood groups in support of the project, etc.). The review committees look for support letters from those who have the most at stake by the project. Do <u>not</u> have letters sent directly to SACOG; instead, they must be part of the application package.

Category #3 Submittal Requirements

For applications in the **Category #3 (“\$100,000 grant”)** only, the following are the submittal requirements:

Max Pages	Content Element	Content Description
2	Cover memo	Signed cover memo on letterhead of lead applicant jurisdiction by the chief elected official of governing body, chief executive officer or designated official who has managerial authority above than the federal aid project manager for this application (see below). Memo acknowledges that the application is officially authorized by the jurisdiction, provides an official name of the project, and identifies the contact person and contact information on behalf of the applicant. Any other contents are optional. Please address cover letter to the SACOG Program Manager listed above. If a jurisdiction submits more than one application, only the delegated official may sign all cover letters.
1	Signed statement “Understanding Terms of Award”	By same signatory above, signed statement of “Understanding of Conditions of Acceptance by Community Design Funding Recipient” (shown later in this sub-section)
1	Staff member letter responsible for federal aid eligibility	Signed letter from staff member who will manage the federal aid funds for the project. Letter must contain a clear statement that this person believes he/she is qualified to manage federal aid funds, and has reviewed all of the contents in the application and states that to his/her best knowledge this project is federal aid eligible. This person also states that he/she will serve as the lead contact for managing federal aid funding for this project.
1-2	Project Summary Table #1	Summary description of grant application using similar format to Table #1 shown later in this sub-section.
6 total pages combined with maps/ graphics/ photos (see	Narrative Project Description	Written description of project – applicant may choose format, structure and any content. This is where the applicant may wish to describe what the project is, how it fits in with the Community Design Program and Blueprint Principles, how the grant funds will be spent, the commitments in place for the project and/or adjacent projects or

below)		any information proposer believes will best describe why this project should be awarded a grant. See description in Evaluation Criteria sub-section M. Page total is combined limit with maps/graphics/photos described below.
6 total pages combined with narrative project description	Project Maps/Graphics/Photos	Maps or graphics illustrating the proposal. Proposer may choose any graphic medium but page sizes are restricted to either 8.5"x11" or 11"x17". See description in Evaluation Criteria in sub-section M for suggested ideas based. These pages may be interspersed with the pages from the narrative project description above.
1	Project timeline	Provide a one page chart showing when the project will start and when the project will be delivered. Assume that if awarded, the project will not receive its federal authorization to start work until Fall, 2008. In most cases, the project should take 3 federal fiscal years or less to complete. Applicant may provide more detail on the timeline, major work tasks, etc. outside of this table as part of the 16 page limit above.
1	Project Budget - Table #2	Fill out Table #2 in this subsection below describing the project budget according to federal aid categories and fiscal years. Applicant may provide more detail on the costs and budget, etc, outside of this table as part of the 16 page limit above.
As applicable	Copy of pre-submittal letter and response letter	Copy of pre-submittal letter sent to SACOG; and SACOG's written response letter
10 pages total	Related Materials/Letters of support	Any additional information that will provide support for the application. Examples may be key pages from an adopted plan that includes the grant project or subject area, information regarding adjacent private or public projects, letters of support by affected stakeholders or list of investments made in subject area that are Blueprint-friendly.

Project Summary Table #1 (1 to 2 pages – all grant categories - required)

Please fill out the contents of this table for an application in any of the three grant categories. This is the one or two page summary description as explained in the table above; please insert it after the cover letter. The applicant does not need to replicate this exact format, but the table must fit on to no more than two pages.

Project Title	(official name of project)
Sponsoring Agency	(lead organization of grant application; entity that assumes all responsibility regarding management of federal aid funding, the match and project delivery)
Lead Person and contact information (phone, email, mailing address)	(name of lead person who will manage the federal aid funding for the project. This person will be the main contact person for all grant-related communications. Please be sure this contains: the person’s name, title, organization, mailing address, phone number, fax number and email address.
Partner Organizations	(names of other organizations officially affiliated with project)
Grant Category	Category #1, 2 or 3.
Community Design Funds Requested	(amount of money requested from Community Design Grant Program; SACOG administrative fees will not be taken from this amount)
Overall Committed Total Project Costs	(total estimated <u>committed</u> amount for project from all funding sources; please round figure to nearest \$1,000)
Local Match and other funds	(local match must be at least 11.47% of requested amount above; also list other funding amounts from other sources if full grant amount is awarded)
Minimum Amount to Conduct Project	(if not awarded the full requested amount above, what is the minimum amount needed to do the project – this may mean a reduced scope of work, which would be negotiated between applicant and SACOG Review Team before the award is granted. Please note that if the selection process recommends this project may receive funds for less than the stated minimum amount, no award will be given to this project. Please round amount stated to nearest \$1,000.)
Project Description	(summary description of project that may include what is the project, its need, its location, and how the grant funds will be utilized. This summary will be used repeatedly when summarizing all the application descriptions to the SACOG Board of Directors. Not to exceed 125 words)

Understanding Terms of Award Statement (Required – all grant categories)

The following is a summary of the terms that all recipients must acknowledge as their applications are submitted. The applicant may photocopy this page, and then have the authorized official who signs the application cover letter sign this as well and include it as part of the application. This is a required element of the application.

Upon receiving funding through the SACOG Community Design Program for the application in this packet, I, as the authorized signatory for _____ (name of sponsoring jurisdiction) understand the following:

- The funding for the awarded project is for federal aid projects and the jurisdiction that I represent accepts the responsibility of undertaking federal aid funding.
- The staff person who is knowledgeable of federal aid requirements has reviewed the contents in this application and will be assigned as the lead person overseeing federal aid requirements throughout the delivery of this project. The jurisdiction acknowledges that if it does not have a qualified staff person or consultant to manage federal transportation funds, SACOG maintains the right to retract committed funding for this project.
- Delivery of the project as conveyed in the application in terms of scope, timeline and deliverables will be used to evaluate the success of this project. If the project is not delivered or completed by September 30, 2013, this jurisdiction acknowledges that it may be penalized in future funding cycles of SACOG’s four regional funding programs, and in particular the Community Design Program. This will likely mean this project will be de-programmed of any of its unused grant funding, plus this jurisdiction will be prohibited from applying in the next round of funding in this program.
- All awarded projects, regardless of funding source, are required to submit to the SACOG Community Design Program Manager a quarterly update on the status of the project. The responsibility of submitting the 1 or 2 paragraph email to SACOG lies solely with the award recipient. Failure to do so may result in penalties to this jurisdiction in future funding cycles of SACOG’s four regional funding programs, and in particular the Community Design Program. If the awarded jurisdiction’s project manager changes during the course of the project, it is the responsibility of the jurisdiction to convey this Terms of Award Statement to the new project manager.

Signature

Title, Jurisdiction

Print Name

Date

Project Budget Summary – Table #2 (for all grant categories)

Fill out this table below for the Full Requested Funding Amount

Project title		
Requested Federal Fiscal Year Allocation:	2010-11 Federal fiscal year (Oct-Spt)	2011-12 Federal Fiscal year (Oct- Spt)
- Environmental Review	\$	\$
- Design	\$	\$
-Construction	\$	\$
- Right-of-way	\$	\$
Sub-totals	\$	\$
Total (must match total requested amount)		
Local match funds		
State the preferred source of funding (STIP, RSTP, TE, or CMAQ – or “SACOG-managed” if Category #3 project)		

Fill out this table below for the Minimum Request Amount (only if different that the Full Request Amount).

Requested Federal Fiscal Year Allocation:	2010-11 Federal fiscal year (Oct-Spt)	2011-12 Federal Fiscal year (Oct- Spt)
- Environmental Review	\$	\$
- Design	\$	\$
-Construction	\$	\$
- Right-of-way	\$	\$
Sub-totals	\$	\$
Total (must match minimum request amount)		
Local match funds		
State the preferred source of funding (STIP, RSTP, TE, or CMAQ – or “SACOG-managed” if Category #3 project)		

R. CMAQ AIR EMISSIONS BENEFIT CALCULATIONS

Some applicants may be required to perform a Congestion Management and Air Quality Emissions (CMAQ) Benefit Calculation. Generally, if the project is eligible for CMAQ funding, then the calculation is a requirement as part of the application. SACOG will notify the applicant if this is a requirement. Directions on how to perform this calculation will be provided in the SACOG pre-submittal response letter.

S. POST-SUBMITTAL CLARIFICATIONS FOR WORKING GROUP

SACOG reserves the right to contact applicants during the project selection process and request up to one written email page to clarify questions the Community Design Working Group or the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team may have. Applicants are not required to respond to these questions. Applicants will be given five calendar days to submit their responses via email from the time they are contacted by the Program Manager. If no response is provided, the selection committees will make their own assumptions regarding the questions.

T. PROGRAM SCHEDULE

June 18, 2009 (Thursday)	SACOG Board of Directors Reviews and Approves release of Program and Application Guidelines
June 19, 2009 (Friday)	SACOG staff distributes final version of Program and Application Guidelines and posts on SACOG Website
July 8, 1:00-2:30 p.m. (Wednesday)	Optional Workshop #1: Program Guidelines and Grantwriting 101
August 4, 1:00-2:30 p.m. (Tuesday)	Optional Workshop #2: repeat of Workshop #1
August 19; 4:00 p.m. (Wednesday)	Last day SACOG will accept pre-submittal letters for Category #1 and #2
August 28, 4:00 p.m. (Friday)	Last day SACOG will approve updated scopes/timelines/deliverables for completion of Round 1 and Round 2 projects (from 2003-05 and 2005-07); projects without approved scopes will be de-programmed and recipient jurisdiction prohibited from applying in Round 4.
Tuesday, September 1	Last day SACOG will accept pre-submittal letters for Category #3

September 3, 4:00 p.m. (Thursday)	ROUND 4 APPLICATIONS DUE - One signed original, 19 copies of application to Greg Chew, SACOG Community Design Program Manager 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814. 4:00 p.m. submittal time strictly enforced.
September 4, 4:00 p.m. (Friday)	Pdf file of application on CD due
Week of Sept 28	First Review Committee completes recommendations on selected projects; applicants notified immediately after recommendations are made; applicants scheduled for interviews and asked to submit more detailed information on scope of work, timeline and deliverables.
October 6 (Tuesday)	Selected project applicants submit detailed descriptions of scope, timeline and deliverables for Second Review Committee evaluation
October 8 and 9 (Thursday and Friday)	One-on-one interviews on selected projects with Second Review Committee; following interview, selected project applicant revises scope/schedule/deliverables and re-submits to SACOG
October 19 (Monday)	Deadline for Second Review Committee to approve revised description of scope, timeline and deliverables; SACOG staff submits staff report to Land Use and Housing Committee with recommendations
November 9, 10:00 a.m. (Monday)	Staff presents recommended projects to SACOG Land Use and Housing Committee
November 19, 9:00 a.m. (Thursday)	SACOG Board takes action on recommended projects and determines final program funding amount
November 20, 2009 (Friday)	Initiate programming and federal authorization request process
Fall, 2010	Earliest likely time a federal authorize request will be approved. Timeline highly subject to the recipient's ability to prepare request and nature of the project.

U. CHECKLIST OF APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Program Updates: check for any program updates under the Community Design link at the SACOG website at www.sacog.org .
2. Optional Workshops: Attend an optional workshop on July 8 or August 4. Attendees offered opportunity for feedback on draft application by SACOG staff. See sub-section **N**.
3. Partnership/Sponsorship: for non-city/county public agencies that are considering applying as the lead applicant, please coordinate early with the city or county in which the project area lies.
4. Notification to County Transportation Authority: Check sub-section **J** for pre-submittal review requirements based on the county of the applicant's jurisdiction.
5. Updated Scope of Work/Timeline/Deliverables for Round 1 and 2 Projects: Ensure that any of the applicant jurisdiction's non-completed projects that received Community Design funding in Round 1 or 2 have updated scopes/schedules/deliverables approved by SACOG by August 28; see Sub-section **K**.
6. Pre-submittal letter: All applicants are required to provide a pre-submittal letter to SACOG before an application is permitted. A SACOG Review Team will provide a response to the letter. Review sub-section **P**.
7. Proposal contents: Review sub-section **Q** for all application contents, including cover letter, federal aid management qualifications, one page summary (showing local match), narrative project description, graphics, related materials, and support letters. Review sub-section **M** for practical information regarding evaluation criteria and application materials.
8. Program Schedule: Review the program schedule in sub-section **T** for all timeline matters.
9. **Submittal Deadline: Please submit one signed original and 19 copies of the grant application by no later than 4:00 p.m. (strictly enforced) on Thursday, September 3, 2009, to Greg Chew, SACOG Community Design Program Manager, 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814.**
10. PDF File Submittal: Also, please submit one compact disc with one .pdf file of all the application contents. Scanned materials into the pdf file are acceptable, such as maps, graphics, related materials and letters of endorsement. Check sub-section **Q** for details.

Appendices

Appendix A: Federal Funding Requirements

Appendix B: 2007-09 Awarded Community Design Grant Application Descriptions

APPENDIX A

FEDERAL FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

The following federal funding requirements are derived from the State's Transportation Enhancement Activities (STE) funding program guidelines. Items "a" and "b" apply only to STE funds, but "c" through "l" apply to all federal funds, including STE. The SACOG Community Design Program can be funded from any of the types of federal funds that SACOG receives.

- a. Direct relationship to the transportation system: STE projects must be directly related to the surface transportation system. This relationship may be one of function, proximity or impact. For example, a bikeway or historic rail station still in service is a functional component of the transportation system; landscaping or restoration of a historic site alongside the highway can be related by proximity (the proximity relationship will not be eligible if tenuous or contrived); and archaeology planning or water pollution control alongside an existing highway affect the impact of the transportation system or the environment.
- b. Over and above normal work: Enhancement funds must build projects that would be over and above normal transportation work. STE projects cannot be used for mitigation specified in environmental documents, permit requirements from federal, state or local agencies for other transportation work, maintenance activities such as repaving bike lanes or repainting historic buildings on a normal life cycle schedule, and other requirements such as retrofit of drainage facilities to meet current clean water standards or retrofit of existing sidewalks for compliance with requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- c. Public benefit and access: STE projects use public funds, must provide benefit to the general public, and generally must provide for public access, except in certain cases where access might be inappropriate, such as wildlife corridors or water pollution control facilities. Improvements to private property and commercial tenant facilities are not eligible.
- d. Right of way acquisition: Any property needed for right of way for STE projects must be acquired from willing sellers, since a finding of public necessity for eminent domain cannot be made for work "over and above normal work." Whenever federal funds are used in any phase of a project, acquisition of real property for the project becomes subject to the provisions of the uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended, no matter if carried out by federal, state or local agencies or by private parties. Properties to be acquired must be appraised, and an offer made to purchase at full-appraised value, although the sale may be completed for an option value or another value different from appraised value by mutual agreement. Any tenants displaced because of the project are entitled to relocation assistance benefits under the Act (funded within the project), but willing sellers are not. Improvements for tenant or commercial activities such as snack bars or retain businesses are not eligible.

- e. Historic restoration: Projects funded with federal transportation funds must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, pertaining to evaluation and preservation of historic and archaeological resources. For historic property projects, all restoration work must be done in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, or the State Historic Building Code. Work must be managed under the direction of professionals meeting the standards published in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR, Part 61, which define minimum education and experience required to perform eligible historic preservation activities; in some cases, additional areas or levels of expertise may be needed depending on the complexity of the task and the nature of the historic properties involved. Rehabilitation work to return a property to a state that allows contemporary use while preserving the significant historic features of that property will usually be eligible. Preservation work to repair deferred maintenance that should have been done, as a condition of a prior historic preservation agreement is not eligible. Construction of replicas of historic structures or buildings is not eligible. Work related to Native American archaeological sites typically requires extra consultation with interested tribes, may require that Native Americans control the disposition of certain artifacts, and may require artifact displays to show alternative interpretations.

- f. Environmental studies and review: All STE projects are subject to the requirements of both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970. For NEPA, the project sponsor must make a good faith effort to study, assess and disclose environmental impacts that could be expected from the project and consult with interested federal agencies; and for CEQA, the project must mitigate any significant adverse impacts to the extent feasible. Experienced agencies can meet both the federal and state environmental requirements using a single joint process. The level of effort varies by the type of project, the amount of impacts and the degree of public controversy. While some projects may be able to use a Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion, and most others will require no more than a Finding of No Significant Impact/Negative Declaration (which may include mitigation of impacts), a few STE projects will require a full Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, particularly those where significant public controversy arises, with all of the required agency consultation and public reviews.

- g. Parks: Since STE projects must have a direct relationship to transportation, park improvements such as park benches, park landscaping and recreational trails are not eligible, although the same scope of project might be eligible in a streetscape setting. STE projects that may provide an ancillary recreational experience or may be located on parkland can be eligible as bicycle or pedestrian facilities if the projects also provide through access from one point to another. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 applies to projects funded with federal enhancement funds, even though it is an odd fit with the enhancements program; it prohibits building a project on land in a publicly owned park, recreation area, wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or significant historic site unless

the applicant can demonstrate that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to the use of park property, and can minimize damage to the park property from the transportation use. The state expects Section 4(f) should be waived for most enhancements projects, but does not have the power to ensure this.

- h. Permits: Depending on the nature of the project, STE projects may require permits or clearance from a wide range of federal and state agencies with environmental responsibilities, covering at least water quality, floodplain encroachment, wetlands protection, endangered species (both federal and state listed) and habitat protection, and historic or archaeological resources. In particular, wetlands protection and floodplain encroachment require a no-practicable-alternative finding. The list of interested agencies usually includes, but is not limited to, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (or National Marine Fisheries Service), California Department of Fish & Game, California Coastal Commission, State Historic Preservation Office, and Advisory Council on Historic preservation. The most common applicable federal legal requirements can be found in:

- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977,
 - Executive order 11990, "protection of Wetlands," May 24, 1977,
 - Executive Order 11991, "Floodplain Management," May 24, 1977,
 - Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and
 - Section 106 of the National Historic Act of 1966.

Many STE projects will end up involving no permits, but that must be determined project-by-project through studies and consultation.

- i. Transportation project requirements: STE projects are transportation projects and, thus, must meet any applicable federal or state standards for transportation projects. For example, bicycle facilities generally must meet federal and state standards for width, grade and signing; state highway landscaping must comply with state landscaping policies on Nation Highway System routes; and removal of nonconforming billboards must follow federal and state procedures, including local ordinances to control subsequent outdoor advertising in the area. Projects sharing or crossing railroad rights of way must have railroad agreements, which can be time-consuming to negotiate and get approved. Walkways and buildings must include handicapped access (Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)). Agencies unfamiliar with the requirements and costs of constructing to the design standards required for federal-aid projects should consult in advance with their Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer.
- j. Other federal contract requirements: STE projects use federal funds and so must comply with various federal contracting requirements, which apply if consultants are to be used for environmental or design studies, to right of way activities (including utility work) done under contract, and for the project construction contract. The most ubiquitous of these requirements include competitive bidding, pre-award audits, minority business participation (DBE/WBE), and prevailing wage rates (Davis-Bacon Act).
- k. Regional Transportation Plan, Federal TIP and air quality conformity. All projects using

federal transportation funds must be consistent with the regional transportation plan covering that area; if the plan is not specific enough to list every small project, the project must be consistent with the general policy direction and priorities of the plan and not inconsistent with any of its provisions. All projects using federal transportation funds must also be added to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), a document describing the slate of projects approved for federal funding by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). In urban areas, the designated metropolitan planning organization is responsible for drawing up the regional transportation plan and Federal TIP, and amending it when necessary; in rural counties, Caltrans has that responsibility. The agency responsible for the Federal TIP must also assess the air quality implications of the whole slate of projects and make a finding that total pollutant emissions from all projects collectively do not exceed federal clean air standards; that finding must be reassessed each time a Federal TIP is amended, which can be an arduous process in areas far out of compliance with the clean air standards. While STE projects by themselves rarely would have any significant effect on air quality, Federal TIP amendments often contain a package of projects, including some highway projects that will force a time-consuming re-evaluation of clean air impacts. In the end, FHWA must approve the Federal TIP (and any amendments), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must approve the findings of air quality conformity before funds can be released for the project. Some regions reserve enhancement funds in a lump sum and, thus, can avoid the need to amend their Federal TIP each time projects are selected; others have not done this.

1. Maintenance Agreement: The project applicant must guarantee that the STE project will be maintained for the normal project life cycle, by the sponsoring agency or via contract with a third party, as a condition of receiving federal enhancement funds. The Caltrans' master agreement typically will hold the applicant liable up to the amount of federal funding if maintenance is not kept up. The project applicant should understand that the use of federal enhancement funds for a project brings all of these federal and state requirements that may apply to bear on the entire project, not necessarily just the part funded by enhancement funds (unless the project consists of distinct and separable phases done as separate projects by separate contracts). The project applicant should build into the project application enough funding to deal with these many requirements and build into the project schedule enough time to carry out the work, most of which must be completed before project construction can be started.

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIONS OF AWARDED PROJECTS

FROM 2007-09 COMMUNITY DESIGN FUNDING PROGRAM

City of Elk Grove

Elk Grove Bus Shelters Project

(Requested and awarded \$430,000)

The Elk Grove Citywide Bus Shelter Project will construct thirty-eight (38) new e-tran Bus Shelters throughout the city. The purpose of these shelters is to create a comfortable environment that enhances and encourages transit ridership within Elk Grove and to the Sacramento Area. The bus shelter locations will be designated throughout the city to accommodate numerous users from commuters, recreationalists, residents, seniors, and students.

City of Marysville

City of Marysville East 10th Street and Ramirez Street Intersection Improvement Project

(Requested and awarded \$100,000)

The East 10th Street and Ramirez Intersection Improvement Project is an existing City of Marysville project in which a new traffic signal will be installed to help alleviate commute time traffic congestion at this intersection. The existing project involves the installation of a new signal and a pavement overlay in the intersection to fix damaged asphalt. The award of these grant funds would allow the City to expand the project to include the installation of sidewalks and landscaping to further promote more pedestrian activity in the area and provide a direct pedestrian connection between the downtown business district and the residential East Marysville areas.

City of Rancho Cordova

Folsom Blvd Complete Streets Project

(Requested and awarded \$3 million)

The next phase of the ongoing Folsom Boulevard & Mather Field Road Streetscape Enhancement Master Plan is to construct pedestrian improvements along Folsom Boulevard at the eastern edge of the City of Rancho Cordova. The specific improvements have been outlined in the Master Plan for the "Gateway" design segment, with priority given to completing gaps in the existing sidewalk and connecting Kinney High School to Light Rail Stations. The improvements will create more uniform bicycle facilities with traffic calming measures including landscape medians and driveway consolidation. The Plan saw its first implementation with the construction of landscaped medians in 2007.

City of Sacramento

R Street Phase I Improvements, 10th to 13th Streets

(Requested and awarded \$4.665 million)

The R Street Phase I Improvements project will reconstruct three blocks of R Street Corridor right-of-way to provide adequate pedestrian walkways, vehicular lanes, parking, lighting, and roadway drainage. The pedestrian and accessibility improvements will aid the City of Sacramento's and CADA's R Street Corridor redevelopment efforts according to the R Street Corridor Master Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. The proposed project will complete the first

of four street reconstruction projects planned within the CADA R Street Corridor area. The improvements will support pedestrian access from the 13th Street Light Rail Station to the Capitol Lofts project, which includes 122 condominium units and 4,000 square feet of retail.

**Sacramento County Department of Transportation
Complete Streets for Freedom Park Drive and North Watt Avenue
(Requested and awarded \$2 million)**

The project will construct various transportation improvements along Freedom Park Drive and North Watt Avenue in North Highlands to implement the community's vision for a walkable, mixed-use town center adjacent to McClellan Park. Proposed transportation improvements include the installation of new sidewalks and bike lanes along Freedom Park Drive, streetscape and landscape improvements such as street lighting, public pedestrian plazas and monumentation at the Watt Avenue/Freedom Park Drive intersection, intersection enhancements, bus shelters and other transit stop amenities.

**City of West Sacramento
West Capitol Avenue Streetscape Project – Phase 1
(Requested and awarded \$7 million)**

This project will reconstruct the historic 4- and 6-lane divided thoroughfare. Phase I of the project is from Riske Road to Jefferson Boulevard, the centerpiece of the "Downtown Core" section of West Capitol Avenue. Key project features will include: vehicle travel lanes will be reconfigured, and the road cross section flattened; sidewalks will be widened; and planters, decorative paving; historical markers and additional lighting will be installed. This project has been designed to attract additional private investment in the corridor, consistent with corridor plans that integrate land use with transportation.

**City of Wheatland
City of Wheatland Bus Shelter Project
(Requested and awarded \$100,000)**

The City of Wheatland will install a minimum of three (3) bus shelters and ancillary trash receptacles, benches, and signs to serve transit stops in the city.

**City of Winters
City of Winters, Downtown Streetscape Improvements Phases 1 & 2
(Requested and awarded \$495,000)**

Downtown Streetscape Improvements Phases 1 & 2: improvements in the Downtown Core including pedestrian and aesthetic (bulb-out) improvements at the intersection of Railroad Avenue and Main Street, Railroad Avenue and Abbey Street and Main and First streets; improvements to both sides of Railroad Avenue between Abbey and Main streets; a mid-block paseo on Main Street. Improvements include full sidewalk bulb-outs, enhanced crosswalks, seatwalls or aesthetic barriers, landscaping and irrigation, street furniture, signage and lighting enhancements for safety and storm drainage improvements. Implementation of this project will serve as a catalyst for future revitalization of the Downtown Core.

City of Woodland

Lemen, North, East Intersection Realignment (Requested and awarded \$100,000)

This project includes the realignment of Lemen Avenue to be opposite of North Street, installation of a traffic signal and left turn pockets, installation of colored stamped concrete pedestrian crossings at the intersection, and installation of a signal interconnect between Main Street and North Street. This project also includes the construction of a median on East Street at Court Street to prevent left turns to and from Court Street, rehabilitation of city owned utilities, landscaping frontage along the east side of East Street, and landscaping the section of existing Lemen Avenue roadway that will be demolished due to the realignment.

County of Yolo

Town of Esparto Main Street Revitalization Implementation Plan (Requested and awarded \$100,000)

This project will provide engineering services to implement a portion of the Town of Esparto Main Street Revitalization Plan conceptually approved by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors. Engineering items may include transportation features such as corner curb extensions and/or bulbouts, diagonal parking, crosswalks, refuge islands, directional curb ramps and/or street lighting. If awarded, the county will combine this grant with funds already obtained for implementing the overall Esparto Plan.

Yolo County Transportation District

West Sacramento/Sacramento Streetcar Right-of-Way, Construction, Equipment, & Rolling Stock

(Minimum request \$1.443 million; awarded \$275,000 if combined with the \$7.0 million award for the West Sacramento West Capital Avenue Project)

This project seeks funding for right-of-way, construction, equipment, and rolling stock associated with a planned streetcar system between West Sacramento and downtown Sacramento. It will originate near West Sacramento Civic Center (at the incoming transit center) and terminate at 15th/K Streets in Sacramento.

Yuba County

Olivehurst Avenue / Powerline Road Intersection Project (requested and awarded \$100,000)

This project will examine alternative designs (traffic signal/round-about) and will provide the design plans, specifications and estimate to improve the intersection and provide illumination for the intersection and overpass. The improved geometries and functionality of the intersection will make the area around the intersection much more attractive for private development.

**AWARDED COMMUNITY DESIGN PROJECTS
IN SUPPLEMENT FUDING ROUND
(March, 2008)**

The following projects were awarded funding in a supplementary funding round. The funds used for these projects came from de-programmed projects in Rounds 1 and 2. The SACOG Board directed staff on the process for selecting projects in this supplementary funding round. The Board approved the re-programming of these funds in March, 2008.

City of Sacramento

Del Paso Boulevard Streetscape Improvements – Acoma Street to Arden Way

(Requested \$5.009 million; awarded \$1.4 million)

The Project proposes to make intersection and light rail improvements including bulb-outs; new sidewalks; improved drainage; aesthetic enhancements of crosswalks, curb ramps, and the light rail platform in the center of Del Paso Road; application of slurry seal and striping on the roadway in the vicinity of the Globe Light Rail Station; and installation of new signage. The project will also include a lane reduction from two westbound lanes to a single westbound lane between Barstow and Acoma Streets.

County of Sacramento Department of Transportation

Complete Streets for Old Florin Town

(Requested \$2.5 million; awarded \$1.4 million)

Funding for this project will be used for the design and preliminary engineering costs associated with preparing construction plans for a larger overall "lynchpin" project in the Old Florin Town main street corridor between Pritchard Road to just east of McComber Road. Accordingly, Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS and E) documents, with the corresponding environmental clearances and identification of right-of -way impacts, will be delivered by 2010 for this larger overall project.