



## Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

## Item #15-4-2 Information

March 26, 2015

### Frameworks for Regional Funding Programs in 2015

**Issue:** Should the SACOG Board approve policy frameworks for the 2015 SACOG four-county Flexible Funding Round and six-county Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP), and authorize the release of the guidelines and calls for projects?

**Recommendation:** For information only. The Transportation Committee will take action on this item.

**Discussion:** During the March 2015 SACOG Advisory and Board Committee cycle, staff provided a briefing on the 2015 Regional Funding Programs and the draft Policy Framework for each individual program. The goal in March was to highlight proposed changes to the programs and processes in advance of an April 2015 Board action approving the guidelines and issuance of a call for projects. The draft frameworks reflected previous committee input, including support for two policy opportunity areas: program streamlining and addressing air quality planning efforts. The opportunity for streamlining involves integrating the grant application and review processes for the State ATP, six-county Regional ATP, and 2015 SACOG Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program. The other recommendation was to link air quality and GHG reduction funding through a funding set-aside for yet-to-be-determined air quality improvement projects. These projects would be funded through the Air Quality Funding Program, would reduce vehicle emissions and, where possible, reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Timing would be linked to ongoing planning efforts related to the Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP). Both of these recommendations are folded into the revised frameworks as appropriate.

Additionally, the Board committees in March gave feedback on the goal of the Regional/Local Funding Program to “Focus on Small or Medium-Sized Capital Projects.” The committees expressed general consensus on maintaining flexibility of this goal in the program, but recommended that demonstration of performance be correlated with the size of the funding request. To link performance considerations with total project cost and funding requested, staff will utilize guidance related to the funding sources available within the round, and include additional questions assessing performance relative to the amount of the funding request. Staff will collect and consider this information in the application development and review phase. For policy purposes, the framework language related to this goal will remain unchanged from the prior round but the framework has been revised to include clarification on assessing performance and request size together. The update is included in the Regional/Local Program description (Attachment D) and additional questions targeting performance relative to request size will be included in the application.

The committees also requested additional information related to the Statewide ATP guidelines’ point structure, Disadvantaged Community definition, and approaches used by other Metropolitan

Planning Organizations (MPOs) compared with SACOG's six-county Regional ATP program. Staff examined results from the State ATP Cycle 1 and found that the MPO programming recommendations statewide identified 80 percent of the funds as benefiting disadvantaged communities. SACOG performed similarly, awarding just under 80% of available Regional ATP funds to benefit Disadvantaged Communities, even as some MPOs lessened the weight of the Disadvantaged Communities Criteria (Attachment A1a and A1b). Staff will provide a verbal report to the Committee on these additional background pieces.

### **Overview of the Regional Funding Programs**

The SACOG four-county Flexible Funding Round programs have unique and long-standing identified purposes. The *Bicycle & Pedestrian Program* is intended to support the efforts of local agencies to construct infrastructure with walking, bicycling, and transit use as primary transportation considerations, and to provide facilities for walking and biking within and between the communities of the Sacramento region. The *Community Design Program* seeks to promote the implementation of the regional Blueprint principles through the construction of improvements in the public right-of-way. The emphasis of the *Regional/Local Program* is to promote projects that provide regional benefits and that develop and maintain the regional transportation network. The *Air Quality Program* and *Transportation Demand Management Program* have been non-competitive programs to fulfill TCM commitments related to the Ozone SIP.

The *six-county Regional ATP* is in its second cycle. It is based on the State ATP program, which focuses on safe routes to school projects and ensuring that disadvantaged communities share in the benefits of the program. In addition to these areas of emphasis, the Regional ATP also focuses on increasing active transportation and addressing known safety concerns. The statutory goals of the Regional ATP include:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking;
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users;
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391;
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity; and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

### **Framework Modifications**

As part of the initiation of each funding round, SACOG staff assesses the prior round's program-level policies, outcomes, and processes. Staff conducts this assessment to determine ways to refine, streamline, and provide additional transparency within each of the individual programs. This includes updating policy frameworks and application forms based on feedback from participants, local agencies, and participating staff. For the various 2015 competitive funding programs, SACOG staff has updated the individual policy frameworks, and continues to work to refine the application process in preparation for the anticipated release of the call for projects by the SACOG Board on April 16, 2015.

Besides the changes described above to link performance and request size in the Regional/Local Program, below are the other modifications to the four funding programs, with more information provided in the draft policy frameworks in Attachments A, B, C, and D. Proposed modifications

reflect input received from applicants and working group members in the prior funding round and staff analysis. These frameworks also reflect input received in March through standing and advisory committees.

### ***SACOG Four-County Flexible Funding Round***

*Community Design Program:* The policy framework and selection process remain fundamentally the same as in prior funding rounds. There is an emphasis on streamlining the overall application requirements and increasing the certainty of land use policy elements of project applications.

*Regional/Local Program:* The goals/priorities and performance outcomes within the policy framework remain fundamentally the same as in prior funding rounds. Updates are reflective of changes in delivery practices and asset management dialogue, and provide increased transparency. This round continues to place an emphasis on early feedback within the application process regarding available data resources and project scoping; a pre-submittal letter will be required of all proposed projects. In the last funding cycle, an additional performance outcome was included for project evaluation, which allowed applicants to document how their project supports “state of good repair” benefits that improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system. This method of evaluation has been refined to provide a universal method for evaluation across modes. Within the review process, there will be continued emphasis on utilizing a workgroup with expertise in the performance outcomes; this will be further broadened to additional external staff. Additional clarification has been provided on the context of capital projects, funding requests, and demonstration of performance.

### ***Six-County Regional ATP and Four County-Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program Streamlined***

*Six-County Regional ATP:* The policy framework and selection process remain fundamentally the same as in Cycle 1 but now include a process utilizing a single working group to evaluate all applications submitted to both this program and the Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program. Staff is requiring that applicants submit a letter of intent identifying any projects intended to be submitted to the six-county Regional ATP and/or Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program. Six-County applicants are strongly encouraged to apply to the State ATP to take advantage of streamlining opportunities. Based on the outcomes from the first round of the State ATP, SACOG will try to provide more data and analytics to support applicants pursuing the second round of the state program. Technical assistance provided to applicants for the State ATP will also help the applicants increase the quality of information in the any subsequent application to the Regional ATP.

Addressing comments from Cycle 1, a phone call option will be utilized during the working group review process to provide a greater opportunity for dialogue between the working group and project sponsor. Identical to last time, the policy framework includes scoring criteria for a project’s potential for supporting greenhouse gas reduction goals through reducing or shortening vehicle trips. Cycle 2 proposes amending the State ATP-identified scoring criteria for leveraging non-ATP funds (i.e., providing a match of local funds for the project). SACOG’s past practice is to require, not incentivize, matching funds.

Attachment A.1b describes in greater detail the proposed focus areas of each project selection criteria and applicable weighting, and how they differ from the State ATP project selection criteria and weighting. Additionally, SACOG has prepared modifications to the ranking process to include points related to disadvantaged communities, in the event that the 25% dollar threshold is not attained through performance-driven scores. During Cycle 1, points were applied to meet the dollar threshold minimum and discretion was given to the working group to rank the rest of the projects utilizing two lists, one with points for benefit to disadvantaged communities and one without those points. As noted, in analysis of this process, the two lists yielded the same results for the top \$8 million of funding available within the \$9.8 million total. SACOG surpassed the minimum 25% dollar threshold, with 79% of available funds going towards projects benefiting disadvantaged communities. Of the 11 projects funded, six were considered to benefit disadvantaged communities. To simplify the ranking process staff is recommending that one list be used to rank all projects. Should the ranking not yield the minimum dollar threshold, application of points related to disadvantaged communities benefit would be added.

*Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program:* The policy framework remains fundamentally the same as in prior rounds, with only minor modifications to the selection process in order to allow for application streamlining with the six-county Regional ATP. The most notable change is that staff is requiring applicants to submit a brief letter of intent identifying any projects intended to be submitted to the six-county Regional ATP and/or Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program in order to allow staff to better plan for project evaluation. Staff is also clarifying how projects are scored in the framework rather than in the application, and staff is requesting that applicants agree to conduct bicycle and/or pedestrian counts (if feasible) as part of a regional effort to collect data and increase competitiveness for funding opportunities. The process and working group make-up will be consistent with the six-county Regional ATP Cycle 1. Four-County applicants are strongly encouraged to apply to the State ATP and six-county Regional ATP to take advantage of streamlining opportunities.

### **Program Timing Overview**

#### ***SACOG Four-County Flexible Funding Round***

SACOG releases a call for projects on a biennial basis, providing local agencies within the four-county region (Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties) the opportunity to apply for flexible funds that can go towards road, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian projects related to the five regional funding programs: Air Quality, Bicycle & Pedestrian, Community Design, Regional/Local, and Transportation Demand Management. The four-county project selection process runs for multiple months, beginning with the circulation of draft policy frameworks, formal Board approval of the policy frameworks and issuance of a call for projects, and culminating in a final programming recommendation by December 15<sup>th</sup>. A high-level overview of these programs and the schedule is included in Attachment E.

Based upon the discussion and direction provided during the February and March committee cycles, staff has developed a systematic approach for adjusting the timing of these five programs:

- The Air Quality Funding Program and Transportation Demand Management Program will remain non-competitive for 2018 to fulfill the final year of adopted Transportation Control Measure commitments. Future year funding will be addressed off-cycle at the conclusion of

analysis by staff of the need for TCMs as part of the Ozone State Implementation Plan. The results of that analysis will inform the direction that a future Air Quality Funding Program and related Transportation Demand Management Program could take.

- The Community Design and the Regional/Local Programs will begin with a formal approval of the policy frameworks/issuance of the call for projects in April, and conclude with a draft recommendation in October and a final programming recommendation in December.
- The Bicycle & Pedestrian Program will be linked with the timing of the Active Transportation Program for purposes of streamlining. The timing is outlined below.

### ***Active Transportation Programs***

New this year is the concurrent timing of the State and six-county Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) competitive processes during the four-county Flexible Funding biennial cycle. The timing and policy of the ATP program is determined and constrained by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The statewide competition will commence in March with statewide guideline adoption and the issuance of a call for projects. The commencement of the program influences the start date of the six-county Regional ATP process.

The six-county Regional ATP policy framework must first be acted upon by the SACOG Board and then be approved by the CTC. For this reason, the SACOG Board will take action on the policy framework in April and the CTC will take action on the policy frameworks in May. It will be necessary for the Board to delegate to SACOG's CEO the authority to respond to any CTC changes and to release the six-county Regional ATP call for projects to allow for timely application development.

The State ATP's selection of projects to be funded will inform the selection and recommendations of the six-county Regional ATP. Results of the statewide ATP competition will be announced on September 15<sup>th</sup>. The six-county Regional ATP must consider all projects not selected through the Statewide ATP competition, and any regional-only applications, and provide a Board-approved recommendation to the CTC by November 15<sup>th</sup>. To meet this deadline, staff will provide the preliminary ranked draft recommendation for all submitted projects during the September 2015 committee cycle, followed by a final recommendation for approval in the October 2015 committee cycle.

### **Funding Estimates**

#### ***Four-County Funding Programs***

The flexible funds for programming are derived from state and federal sources and leveraged by available local resources to both pair and focus federal dollars. The funding round is one of SACOG's means for funding and advancing projects that contribute to the implementation the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) through a well-developed program funding structure and targeted investments in the region's transportation system.

Using the latest information, staff has identified an estimated \$145 million in this cycle to fund various projects as well as other funding commitments. These funding commitments include transportation control measures as identified above. Also included in the funding commitments is the Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange for rural counties, and planning,

programming, and monitoring costs. Staff must balance the funding program amounts against eligibility requirements for the funding sources. The \$145 million estimate is comprised of the following sources:

- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds: Funds are available in state fiscal years 2016/17 through 2020/21, with most of this capacity anticipated in the last two years of the STIP (State Fiscal Years 2019/20 and 2020/21). At the release of the SACOG call for projects, there will be uncertainty concerning the amount of STIP funds available for programming, as the STIP fund estimate is anticipated to be released in June 2015 and final action is not taken by the CTC until August. Staff assumes a flat estimate based upon prior apportionment shares. Noting the advancement of projects from the STIP during the 2014 delivery year using other funding sources, STIP funds available within this call for projects will make up the majority of funding available for programming. STIP funds can be used for a wide variety of capital projects; statewide policy on the dispersal of these funds is currently under development by the CTC. Final programming authority for these funds resides with the CTC.
- Federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds are available in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017/18 through 2018/19 for a wide variety of capital projects, programs, and road rehabilitation on federal aid-eligible corridors. Staff assumes a flat estimate based upon prior apportionment shares developed by Caltrans. Estimates are not finalized until the actual year of programming and are influenced by the federal transportation act.
- Federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds are available in FFY 2017/18 through 2018/19 for capital projects, programs, and transit operating assistance that can demonstrate air quality improvement benefits. Staff assumes a flat estimate based upon prior apportionment shares developed by Caltrans. Estimates are not finalized until the actual year of programming and are influenced by the federal transportation act.
- The funding target includes an additional \$1 million in SACOG Managed Funds for projects to be programmed in FFY 2017/18 through 2018/19. As in past funding rounds, staff is recommending that the SACOG Managed Fund be used to fund small projects that are not eligible for or would face extreme difficulty in using federal funds through the Community Design and Bicycle & Pedestrian programs.

***Active Transportation Programs***

The 2015 ATP Fund Estimate is derived from state and federal sources. Program capacities are based on Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101, and guidance from the Federal Highway Administration, CTC, and California State Transportation Agency. Funds are available in FY 2016/17 through 2018/19. The ATP combines many federal and state funding streams previously used for bicycle, pedestrian, safety, and other related purposes into one funding stream with broad eligibilities. A draft fund estimate was released by the CTC on January 22, 2015; an estimate incorporating necessary revisions was adopted March 26, 2015.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:AM:ds  
Attachments

Key Staff: Kacey Lizon, Planning Manager, (916) 340-6265  
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235  
Renée DeVere-Oki, Team Manager of Programming & Project Delivery,  
(916) 340-6219

## 2015 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES: EL DORADO, PLACER, SACRAMENTO, SUTTER, YOLO, AND YUBA COUNTIES

The purpose of this funding program is to increase and attract active transportation users and provide facilities for walking and biking in urban, suburban, and rural portions of the region and to provide connections between them. Projects and programs funded through this program are consistent with the vision of the Blueprint and support the implementation of the long-range transportation plans for the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).

EDCTC, PCTPA, and SACOG invest regional funds regularly for infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects benefitting active transportation in the region. ATP funds from the State of California provide an important new funding source for active transportation projects.

### PROGRAM GOALS

California Senate Bill (SB) 99 establishes California's ATP program with six program goals that provide a foundation for the state and regional ATP programs:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking;
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users;
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and SB 391 (C585, §2009);
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity, through the use of programs including but not limited to projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding;
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program; and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

### ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

The infrastructure projects eligible for this funding program are largely derived from the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan) that is amended every odd year. The Master Plan provides a set of policies and projects for regional bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts across the six-county SACOG region, and was developed through a working group and approved by the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and SACOG Board of Directors. Additionally, bicycle and pedestrian projects included in the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for EDCTC or PCTPA are also eligible. Federal funds may be used for construction, preliminary engineering, environmental work and design, and/or right-of-way. Projects must support the performance outcomes identified in the sections below.

Non-infrastructure projects eligible for funding must meet at least one of two criteria: (1) Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, training, and awareness; and/or (2) Perform studies and develop plans that support one or more of the project performance outcomes identified in the section below. Projects include bike/ped planning, education, information, and marketing efforts.

The ATP is a State of California identified program implemented by the California Transportation Commission and comprised of a compilation of state and federal funding. The majority of projects will need to meet the requirements of the federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). Projects must also meet eligibility requirements specific to the ATP funding source provided.

### INELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

Projects in new developments that are considered "good practices" according to FHWA guidelines, long-term staff positions, transit operations, law enforcement, and bicycle racks for carpools, vanpools, or private vehicles are ineligible for ATP funds.

## PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The application process will be specific to the Regional ATP and the Bicycle & Pedestrian program. Generally, project sponsors are encouraged to discuss potential Regional ATP projects with regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) staff. The applicant must submit an intent letter identifying any projects for which they will apply for funding through the Regional ATP and/or Bicycle & Pedestrian program. This statement of intent to apply permits the project sponsor to submit a full application for the identified project(s), and supplements RTPA staff/project sponsor discussion about potential projects.

A Regional ATP Team comprised of representatives from the three RTPAs in the region (EDCTC, PCTPA, and SACOG) will screen applications for eligibility. Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible based on these guidelines. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide ATP competition, but deemed eligible for the state program will be considered; to compete in the regional program, applicants will be required to submit a supplemental application. The Regional ATP Team will forward the eligible applications to the Active Transportation Working Group, comprised of experts from the following areas:

### Active Transportation Working Group Composition

Expertise	Number
Land Use Planners	1
Project Engineers	2
Bicycle/ Pedestrian Planning	4 (2 advocates, 2 planners/ engineers)
Air Quality	1
Public Health	1
Transit	1
Community Groups	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

The Working Group will be recruited from standing advisory committees, multidisciplinary, and represent a diverse geography across the region. The Working Group

is required to review, evaluate, and score the applications according to its own process, and will not discard any applications submitted to the Regional ATP and/or Bicycle & Pedestrian Program. Working Group members will not vote or comment on applications from their own organizations. The Working Group prioritizes and ranks the projects, according to an iterative process that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. The Working Group and/or SACOG staff reserves the right to contact applicants during this project selection process for additional information. The applicant will be provided the opportunity to address the Working Group either by phone or during a meeting to address questions related to the scope of work, budget, timeline, and performance considerations. After collectively evaluating the projects, the Working Group members will submit re-evaluated application scores to the Regional ATP Team at the conclusion of the Working Group review period.

Following the announcement of the statewide ATP awards, the Regional ATP Team will remove any projects successful in securing funds through the statewide competition from further consideration for the Regional ATP. The Regional ATP Team will then use the re-evaluated application scores to finalize the funding recommendation, and will confirm that a minimum 25% of available ATP funds are dedicated to projects and programs benefiting Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) as identified in the State Guidelines. In the event ~~the a~~ **minimum DAC threshold is not obtained, the DAC points (0-10) will be applied to the entire project list 0-10 points for DAC will be applied and the projects re-ranked to the ranked projects until the minimum funding level is reached.** Discretion will be placed on the Working Group and Regional ATP Team to select a comprehensive package of projects.

## PROJECT SCREENING

To be selected for funding, a project or program must meet the following screening criteria:

- Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Master Plan or the Regional Transportation Plan of EDCTC or PCTPA.** Only under special circumstances will an application be considered for a project that is not listed in one of these sources.

2. **Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility criteria identified in the preceding section.**

3. **Project is identified in the project sponsor's intent to apply letter.**

4. **Project must be ready for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.** The project application may include the cost of preparing environmental documents. When project design, right-of-way, or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the project's cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project's ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to the appropriate RTPA (EDCTC, PCTPA, or SACOG) for re-evaluation following completion of the environmental process.

5. **Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources** (i.e., TAP, HSIP, State Highway Account funds, State SRTS).

6. **Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure project and includes at least an 11.47% local match; application is to all project categories.**

a. Infrastructure project minimum is \$282,390 (\$250,000 funding request + \$32,390 local match).

b. Non-Infrastructure project minimum is \$56,478 (\$50,000 funding request + \$6,478 local match).

c. Public agencies applying for funding for smaller projects may want to consider combining projects to meet the project minimum thresholds, or consider a larger, multi-year program or project.

7. **Public Participation & Planning.** The project applicant must demonstrate how a

community-based public participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project, and include relevant notices and materials.

8. **Partnering with Community Conservation Corps.** The project applicant must demonstrate that the California Conservation Corps, or a qualified community conservation corps, was sought out to participate as a partner to undertake the project; or provide demonstration of the cost-effectiveness clause 23 CFR 635.204 and provide the relevant documentation.

9. **Project is not part of developer-funded basic good practices.** The project applicant must demonstrate the project complies with the policy statement and design guidance adopted by FHWA to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel.

In addition to how projects address the program goals discussed above, the following are scoring criteria considerations that will be used by the Active Transportation Working Group to make funding recommendations to the Regional ATP Team. .

## PROJECT SCORING

Projects will be scored based on the criteria described in the State ATP guidelines with minor modifications as described below.

### Project Performance Outcomes (0-95 points)

1. Project has potential to increase walking and bicycling through targeted strategies: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities. **0-30 points**
2. Project has the potential to reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries. **0-25 points**
3. Project improves public health through the targeting of populations with high risk

factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues. **0-10 points**

4. Project demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits. **0-10 points**
5. Project provides benefit for a disadvantaged community. **0-10 points will be applied in the event the 25 percent minimum is not met.** (Please reference the project selection process section.)
6. Project advances active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reducing or shortening vehicle trips today and over time, as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391, and demonstrates potential for placemaking. **0-10 points**

#### **Other Considerations (0-10 points)**

7. Project sponsor demonstrates good performance on past grants and/or federal aid projects or programs.
8. Project sponsor demonstrates readiness to move forward with the project on a timely schedule (i.e., application includes clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project).
9. Project applicant demonstrates evidence of strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located.

#### **FUNDING RECIPIENT REQUIREMENTS**

Recipients must submit a quarterly update on all projects receiving funding during the 2015 SACOG Programming Cycle. Failure to do so could result in negative impacts for future funding rounds.

**MPO Amendments to ATP Cycle 1 Guidelines**

	Fresno Council of Governments	Kern Council of Governments	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	SACOG	San Diego Association of Governments	San Joaquin Council of Governments	Southern California Association of Governments	Stanislaus Council of Governments	Tulare County Association of Governments
Amended Definition of Disadvantaged Communities			X*						
Amended Project Selection Criteria and Weighting			X	X	X		X		
Total Points Available in Application	100	100	110	105	160	100	110	100	100
Percent of Score Derived from Disadvantaged Community Criteria	10.00%	10.00%	9.09%	9.52%	0.00%	10.00%	9.09%	10.00%	10.00%

\*MTC added a regional definition for "Communities of Concern".

Source: [http://www.catc.ca.gov/meetings/agenda/2014Agenda/2014\\_05/Tab\\_19\\_4.7.pdf](http://www.catc.ca.gov/meetings/agenda/2014Agenda/2014_05/Tab_19_4.7.pdf)

Program Criteria	State Criteria Description	Regional (MPO) Criteria & Scoring Emphasis	State Scoring Range	MPO Scoring Range
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of non-motorized users.	The regional program includes additional considerations drawn from the policy framework for the SACOG Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program. The focus is on clearly demonstrating how well the project supports the policy framework priorities, including improving access to transit services, increasing access to schools, and eliminating gaps or barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network.	0-30	0-30
Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	Potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists.	The regional program highlights the same performance outcomes, but emphasizes the importance of data to demonstrate benefits.	0-25	0-25
Cost Effectiveness	Project's relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered. Quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided using the Caltrans benefit/cost model.	The regional program asks that the project proponent demonstrate there is balance between minimizing projected capital and ongoing operating costs while offering strong performance benefits and the leveraging of resources.	0-5	0-10
Leveraging of non-ATP funds	Leveraging of non-ATP funds for ATP eligible expenses on the project or project segment proposed.	The state program criterion is considered a screening consideration in the regional program, which requires the leveraging of non-ATP funds (i.e. matching funds) to compete for funding.	0-5	0
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	The regional program emphasizes the same performance outcomes and asks the same questions on the application.	0-10	0-10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities*	Project demonstrates benefits to disadvantaged communities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• median household income &lt; 80% of the statewide median</li> <li>• among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state</li> <li>• at least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP</li> </ul>	The regional program emphasizes the same performance outcomes and asks the same questions on the application.	0-10	0-10*
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals in SB 375 and SB 391	Note: This is not a criterion for the State ATP program, but is one of the overall goals of the state program. The stated goal: "Project advances the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and SB 391 (C585, §2009)."	The regional program asks that the project proponent demonstrate utilitarian purposes and placemaking strategies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reduced or shortened vehicle trips.	0	0-10
Public participation and planning	Project demonstrates that a community-based public participation process culminated in the project proposal. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.	The state program criterion is considered a screening consideration in the regional program. Scoring for Other Considerations for funding include past performance on projects, demonstrated project delivery readiness in the application, and evidence of strong stakeholder support to implement the project.	0-15	0-10 (other considerations)
California Conservation Corps (CCC)	Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code.	The state program criterion is considered a screening consideration in the regional program. Scoring for Other Considerations for funding include past performance on projects, demonstrated project delivery readiness in the application, and evidence of strong stakeholder support to implement the project.	-5 or 0 (point deduction)	
Performance on past grants	Applicant's performance on past grants.	The state program criterion is considered a screening consideration in the regional program. Scoring for Other Considerations for funding include past performance on projects, demonstrated project delivery readiness in the application, and evidence of strong stakeholder support to implement the project.	-10 or 0 (point deduction)	
<b>Total Scoring</b>			<b>100</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>*Total Scoring if Disadvantaged Communities Points are Applied to Ensure Benefit in the Regional ATP</b>				<b>105</b>

## 2015 BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN FUNDING PROGRAM: SACRAMENTO, SUTTER, YOLO, YUBA COUNTIES

The purpose of this funding program is to provide facilities for walking and biking within the cities and towns of the Sacramento region, and to provide connections between communities. Having more people bike and walk for transportation is critical to successfully meeting state air quality conformity and greenhouse gas reduction goals. Further, the efficiency of a truly multimodal transportation system is a key component of achieving the goals set forth by the regional Blueprint and MTP/SCS.

In order to help implement the MTP/SCS, SACOG invests in bicycle and pedestrian facilities through the biannual Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program, adopted by the SACOG Board of Directors in September 2003. The Funding Program encourages locally-determined developments consistent with Blueprint principles, MTP/SCS policies and strategies, and local circulation plans that prioritize walking, bicycling and transit use as primary transportation considerations.

### GOALS AND PRIORITIES

#### Capital Project Priorities

1. Increase access to transit services;
2. Increase access to schools;
3. Eliminate gaps in the existing bicycle/pedestrian network;
4. Remove physical barriers in the bicycle and pedestrian network;
5. Facility completion; and
6. Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

#### Non-capital Projects and Programs Goals

1. Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, and awareness;

2. Where needed, perform studies and develop plans for capital facilities that support the goals stated above; and
3. Increase the level of public agency staff expertise on bicycling and walking.

### ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

The projects eligible for this funding program are derived from the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan) which has been amended every two years since its initial adoption in 2004. The Master Plan provides an expansive set of policies and projects for regional bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts, and was developed through a working group and approved by the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Projects in the Master Plan that meet the adopted funding priorities (Capital Project Priorities) are encouraged to apply for this Funding Program.

Financial support for this program will come primarily from federal funding sources expected to be available to the region. Federal funding requirements from the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) are applicable. Examples of eligible projects include multi-use paths, bicycle lanes and routes, sidewalks, shoulders, signals, crossings, and other infrastructure projects. For capital projects, federal funds may be used for construction, preliminary engineering, environmental work and design, and/or right-of-way. Non-infrastructure projects may include bike/pedestrian planning, education, information, and marketing efforts.

### INELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

Projects and programs that are not eligible include facilities that serve only a recreational rather than a transportation function; projects in new developments that are considered "good practices" according to FHWA guidelines; bicycle and pedestrian facility maintenance; long-term staff positions; transit operations (except for bus services for bicyclists); law enforcement; and bicycle racks for carpools, vanpools, or private vehicles.

## PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The application process will be specific to the Bicycle & Pedestrian program and the Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP). Generally, project sponsors are encouraged to discuss potential Bicycle & Pedestrian Program projects with SACOG staff.

The applicant must submit a letter to SACOG staff identifying any projects for which the agency intends to apply for funding through the Regional ATP and/or Bicycle and Pedestrian program. Informing SACOG staff supports effective planning and coordination of project evaluation. This statement of intent is required for the project sponsor to submit a full application for the identified project(s).

SACOG staff will screen applications for eligibility. Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible for federal funds or the project does not meet other requirements identified under "Project Screening." SACOG staff will forward eligible applications to the Active Transportation Working Group.

The Working Group will be recruited from standing advisory committees, multidisciplinary, and represent a diverse geography across the region. The Working Group is required to review, evaluate, and score the applications according to its defined process. Working Group members will not vote or comment on applications from their own organizations.

### Active Transportation Working Group Composition

Expertise	Number
Land Use Planners	1
Project Engineers	2
Bicycle/ Pedestrian Planning	4 (2 advocates, 2 planners/ engineers)
Air Quality	1
Public Health	1
Transit	1
Community Groups	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

The Working Group prioritizes and ranks the projects, according to an iterative process that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. The Working Group and/or SACOG staff reserves the right to contact applicants during this project selection process for additional information. The applicant will be provided the opportunity to address the Working Group either by phone or during a meeting to address questions related to the scope of work, budget, timeline, and performance considerations. After collectively evaluating the projects, the Working Group members will submit re-evaluated application recommendations to SACOG staff at the conclusion of the Working Group review period.

SACOG staff will use the re-evaluated applications to finalize the funding recommendation for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Program, and will present a unified recommendation incorporating all Regional Funding Program recommendations to the SACOG Board of Directors. Following the announcement of the statewide ATP awards and the development of the Regional ATP funding recommendation, SACOG staff will remove any projects recommended for funds through the State or Regional ATP from further consideration for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Program, and move up additional projects for funding using the Working Group's prioritized list.

## PROJECT SCREENING

To be selected for funding from the Bicycle & Pedestrian Program, a project or program must meet the following screening criteria:

1. It is included in the Master Plan as a planned project. Only under very special circumstances will an application be considered for a project that is not listed in the Master Plan.
2. Project is identified in the project sponsor's letter of intent to apply.
3. It must be ready for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost. The project application may include the cost of preparing environmental documents. However, for projects that will necessitate a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),

the EIS can be funded separately from the design and construction of the project (which should seek funding in a later round of funding).

4. Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources (i.e., CMAQ, RSTP, STIP).
5. Project meets the minimum project size of \$282,390 (\$250,000 funding award + \$32,390 local match). Public agencies applying for funding for smaller projects may want to consider combining projects to meet the \$282,390 threshold, or consider a larger, multi-year program or project. The exceptions to this rule are funding for non-capital projects such as Bikeway Master Plans or other projects that would qualify for Federal Transit Agency Enhancement funds; and for pre-construction-only projects, which have a minimum project size of \$169,434 (\$150,000 funding award + \$19,434 local match).
6. The project is committed to increasing information available about quantifiable benefits of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and planning efforts (i.e., conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts both pre- and post-project implementation);

## **PROJECT EVALUATION**

Projects will be evaluated based on the criteria described in the Funding Program Project Priorities, the community benefits, and other considerations (described below) that will be used by the Working Group and SACOG staff to make funding recommendations to the Board.

### **Project Performance Outcomes (0-66 points, 11 points each)**

1. Increase access to transit services;
2. Increase access to schools;
3. Eliminate gaps in the existing bicycle/pedestrian network;

4. Remove physical barriers in the bicycle and pedestrian network;
5. Facility completion; and
6. Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

### **Linking to MTP/SCS (0-10 points 5 points each)**

1. Project supports land use and economic development efforts in alignment with the MTP/SCS land use vision for the area, as described in the SCS and the local general and/or specific plan;
2. Project demonstrates the potential for placemaking and VMT reduction by supporting bicycle/pedestrian travel as a means to achieve the MTP/SCS performance goals for the area, as described in the SCS and the local general and/or specific plan;

### **Community Benefits (0-12 points, 4 points each)**

1. Project demonstrates the community need and community benefits qualitatively and/or quantitatively;
2. Project improves safety/security for bicyclists and pedestrians, and includes documentation of safety issues (if applicable);
3. Project design is context-sensitive and appropriate for surrounding environment.

### **Other Considerations (0-12 points)**

1. Project sponsor's demonstrated readiness to move forward on a timely schedule (e.g., application includes a clear schedule, cost, risk to project, etc.);
2. Sponsor agency's commitment to implement the project, as evident by non-SACOG source funding commitments and/or inclusion in local policy documents;
3. Projects improving access to and around schools and/or transit provide demonstrated evidence of strong support

by affected schools and/or transit agencies (e.g., a letter of partnership from the affected agency);

4. Inter-community projects offer evidence of strong support by all local jurisdictions where the project is located, and include commitment to land use planning consistent with regional Blueprint principles;
5. Project demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits;
6. Sponsor agency's historical performance in delivering federal aid projects (e.g., following federal rules, STIP guidelines, delivery timeliness, etc.);
7. Application follows content requirements.

#### **FUNDING RECIPIENT REQUIREMENTS**

Projects awarded funding through the 2015 Regional Funding Programs must provide quarterly project status updates to appropriate SACOG staff in order to ensure successful project delivery.

## 2015 COMMUNITY DESIGN FUNDING PROGRAM: SACRAMENTO, SUTTER, YOLO, YUBA COUNTIES

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 transportation projects by local jurisdictions that implement these principles, but only in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties.

### GOALS AND PRIORITIES

Projects must conform to some of the seven regional Blueprint Principles (more detail on SACOG's website at [www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/betterways.pdf](http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/betterways.pdf)):

1. transportation choices;
2. housing diversity;
3. compact development;
4. mixed land uses;
5. use of existing assets;
6. natural resource protection; and
7. quality design.

### ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

All projects must be federal aid eligible and primarily lead to or include construction. Projects must be eligible for CMAQ, RSTP or STIP funds (unless the project is submitted in the non-competitive category, which would receive SACOG-managed funds).

Generally speaking, federal aid eligible projects are those that significantly contain transportation infrastructure in public right-of-ways. Activities or tasks within the project must be categorized as "construction", "environmental", "design" or "right-of way." Pure planning activities are generally not considered an eligible use for the Community Design Program (exception: planning is allowed in the non-competitive funding category). The

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

- Transportation infrastructure – e.g., roadway improvements that promote, bike/pedestrian/transit usage and are directly connected to a land development project, land use plan, or in an existing "Blueprint friendly" community;
- Street corridor revitalization towards more pedestrian-oriented activities;
- Bicycle and pedestrian paths, tunnels, and bridges or on-street bike lanes;
- Pedestrian improvements in public right-of-ways;
- Streetscaping such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and furniture;
- Traffic calming (but not interfering with public transit, bicycling or walking);
- Transit stop amenities such as shelters, restrooms, and benches.

One critical distinction is that federal aid projects must be for project elements that are considered "over and above" those that are standard requirements if there is a development associated with the project. For instance, if a private development is going in, and the project seeks Community Design funds for street improvements, the improvements must go beyond the jurisdiction's "standard" requirements for that associated development. The private developer may be required to put in sidewalks and crosswalks, but federal aid could pay for textured crosswalks, landscaped medians and other elements that enhance the pedestrian experience but are not standard conditions of approval.

## Project Selection Process

The application process remains the same as in prior rounds. Two committees will be involved in the review and selection process: the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team and the Community Design Working Group (Working Group). The SACOG/Caltrans Review Team is composed of SACOG and Caltrans staff, and possibly staff from other agencies who are familiar with federal transportation funding requirements. The Working Group is comprised of staff and appointed representatives from geographically diverse areas of the region recruited through SACOG’s staff-level regional advisory committees (e.g., Planners Committee, etc.).

### Community Design Working Group Composition

Expertise	Number
Land Use Planners	3-5
Project Engineers	1-2
Bicycle/ Pedestrian Planning	1
Air Quality	1
Urban Design	1
Transit	1
Community Groups	1
Transportation Demand Management	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10-13</b>

SACOG staff encourages potential applicants to discuss possible projects. Applicants must submit a pre-submittal letter to SACOG describing the project, and the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team will reply with a letter stating whether the project is eligible and any foreseeable concerns the project is raising. If the project is determined to be eligible, a full application can then be submitted. The Working Group then reviews eligible applications and recommends a prioritized project list to SACOG staff based on the criteria stated in these guidelines. Applicants may be contacted during the

project selection process and requested to provide up to one written email page to clarify questions of the Working Group or the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team.

The Working Group prioritizes and ranks the applications, according to an iterative process that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. For projects recommended by the Working Group to be on the prioritized list, applicants will meet with the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team to ensure the project’s scope of work, budget and timeline meet program requirements. The Working Group and SACOG/Caltrans Review Team recommendations are then provided to the SACOG executive team.

## PROJECT SCREENING

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 the SACOG/Caltrans Review Team will provide a written response addressing issues relating to eligibility.

### Capacity to manage a federal-aid project

In addition, all applicants must have a staff person who is trained in federal aid funding management. In most cases, the staff is found in the Public Works Departments. Public agencies (cities, counties, and other public agencies, such as transit agencies and air quality management districts with master funding agreements with Caltrans to manage state or federal transportation funds) in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties are the eligible applicants.

For those sponsoring jurisdictions that do not have internal staff who can manage federal transportation funds, they will be required to team up with a local agency or hire a qualified consultant in this area.

Requested project amounts fall into the following ranges: \$300,000 to \$4 million for conventional construction projects; \$150,000 to \$500,000 for conventional pre-construction (design, engineering, environmental or right-of-way activities) projects; \$1.5 million to \$4.0 million for construction of Complete Streets projects; and

\$100,000 or less for non-competitive projects. Applying for a non-competitive project precludes the applicant from applying competitively within the Community Design Program and is limited to SACOG member agencies.

### **Required local match**

Projects in the competitive categories of the program (above \$100,000 in funding request) must provide a minimum of 11.47% match in non-federal funds, i.e., for every \$100,000 of total project cost (grant and match combined), the program will pay up to \$88,530 for every \$11,470 of match provided by the project sponsor. Projects in the non-competitive category (funding requests of \$100,000 or less) have a 10% local match requirement.

### **EVALUATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE**

The Working Group prioritizes and ranks the projects, according to an iterative process that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. There are two general evaluation criteria used by the Working Group and SACOG/Caltrans Review Team to determine whether a project will be recommended for funding. The two review committees will consider the projects based on the two criteria stated below. Additionally, this funding cycle, a renewed emphasis will be placed on the applicant's ability to demonstrate that the land use changes claimed by the project will be reliable.

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

- transportation choices – encouraging people to walk, ride bicycles, carpool or ride the bus, light rail or train.
- housing diversity- providing a variety of places where people can live – apartments condominiums, townhouses, and single family detached houses.
- compact development – creating environments that are more compactly built and use space in an efficient but more aesthetic manner that can encourage more walking, biking and public transit use.

- mixed land uses – building homes near or with other uses, such as business or commercial areas that create active, vital neighborhoods.
- use of existing assets – focusing development in communities with vacant land or intensifying development of underutilized land that can make better use of public infrastructure, including roads.
- natural resource protection – preserving and maintaining open spaces and natural places and agricultural lands by encouraging energy-efficient design and land use, water conservation and storm water management.
- quality design – how the built environment is developed, the relationship to the street, and how buildings are oriented, which all contribute to a community's attractiveness and how likely residents are to walk, bike or have a sense of community pride.

Criterion #2: How realistic is this project to be implemented within the program timeline?

Although these criteria have a high degree of subjectivity, the evaluation committee is comprised of peer professionals who are experienced in evaluating project performance and deliverability. SACOG staff will review the recommendations from the review committees of all three programs and take them into account for the full recommendation package sent to the board.

### **FUNDING RECIPIENT REQUIREMENTS:**

All program fund recipients must expend the project funds within three years if programming funds are available in the 2015-16 or 2016-17 fiscal years. If not, use of program funds is extended to match available programming capacity.

Recipients must submit a quarterly update on all projects receiving funding during the 2015 SACOG Programming Cycle. Failure to do so could result in negative impacts for future funding rounds.

## 2015 REGIONAL/LOCAL FUNDING PROGRAM: SACRAMENTO, SUTTER, YOLO, YUBA COUNTIES

The Regional/Local Program is SACOG's largest competitive program. The emphasis of the program is to fund projects that will help implement the MTP/SCS by providing regional benefits. The program seeks to promote effective and efficient use of limited state and federal funding resources to both develop and maintain the regional transportation network. This is accomplished through the funding of capital and lump sum projects included in the 2012 MTP/SCS, asset management planning and projects, and the development of shelf-ready projects.

### GOALS AND PRIORITIES

In September 2009, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board of Directors approved several policy considerations for the Regional/Local Funding Program that have been applied to subsequent Funding Rounds. The 2015 Funding Round has revised these policies as informed by feedback from prior cycles and new policy direction from 2016 MTP/SCS update committee dialogues:

#### 1. EMPHASIZE COST-EFFECTIVE PROGRAMMING DECISIONS

The constrained federal and state funding environment calls for placing an even greater emphasis on making the most cost-effective programming decisions, which is achieved by maximizing performance outcomes and minimizing project costs. Priority will be given to projects for which the sponsor has already funded the initial phases with its own resources (i.e., environmental, design and/or right-of-way).

#### 2. FIX IT FIRST: ASSET MANAGEMENT AND MAINTAINING A STATE OF GOOD REPAIR

Local and state transportation budgets are strained under the weight of stagnant revenues, the loss of gas tax buying power and growing deferred maintenance costs, reducing the ability of member agencies to operate and maintain existing facilities and services. The 2015

Regional/Local Program will continue to focus regional support on the maintenance of federal-aid eligible transportation facilities. Investment priorities include fix it first projects that address:

- complete streets/corridors elements that serve an existing or forecasted demand.
- innovative cost-effective practices to extend the life of existing assets, such as the use of recycled asphalt or rolling stock rehabilitation.
- planning and budgeting studies to better manage existing assets, such as Pavement Management Systems and Transit Asset Management Plans.

#### 3. FOCUS ON SMALL OR MEDIUM-SIZED CAPITAL PROJECTS

The Regional/Local Funding Program is an important source of capital funding. As in past funding cycles, capital projects providing regional benefits have been awarded funds through the Regional/Local program. A challenge for this policy priority is the limited number of projects that can be funded if the programming revenue is severely constrained. For the federal and state funds that are available, the emphasis will be on small- and medium- sized projects. **Project performance outcomes will be assessed relative to the funding request amount.**

#### 4. LEVERAGE REGIONAL FUNDS FOR NEAR-TERM PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Funding from competitive programs likely to appear in the near future need to have "shelf ready" capital projects that are deliverable and thereby ready to utilize funding. A relatively small but strategically allocated portion of the total revenue may go to early project development efforts for projects included within the next 10 years of the 2012 MTP/SCS.

## ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

Any projects listed in the MTP/SCS or a lump-sum project category are eligible. Any project eligible under the Community Design Program can apply without any maximum cost limitations, but will only be evaluated in the context of the Regional/Local program. Projects applying for the State or Regional ATP or the Bike & Pedestrian program will not be considered.

## PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The application process has changed significantly from the last Regional/Local Program to increase transparency and external agency involvement.

A Regional/Local Working Group will review all pre-submittal letters and applications to draft a recommended list of prioritized projects to submit to SACOG staff for consideration. Working Group members will include SACOG and external agency staff who will evaluate letters and applications against their performance outcome area of expertise.

**Pre-submittal letter for review by Working Group:** Applicants must submit a pre-submittal letter to SACOG prior to submitting a full application. The Working Group will reply with a letter indicating:

- a. whether the project is eligible or ineligible to apply,
- b. any foreseeable concerns with the project's scope of work, budget, and timeline; and
- c. feedback on the potential strongest performance outcomes of the project.

**Full applications prioritized by Working Group:** A full application must be submitted to SACOG staff for preliminary screening; applications are then forwarded to the Working Group.

The Working Group prioritizes and ranks the projects, according to an iterative process that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. The applicant will be provided the opportunity to address the Working Group either by phone or during a meeting to ensure the scope of work, budget, timeline, and performance outcomes meet program requirements and achieve high

performance outcomes. The Working Group will recommend a list of prioritized projects to SACOG staff for review.

SACOG staff will review all applications against screening criteria, project performance outcomes, and Working Group recommendations to recommend projects to the SACOG Board for funding.

## SCREENING PROJECTS OUT

Projects must provide a minimum of 11.47% match in non-federal funds, as is required in all federal aid funding projects. For every \$100,000 of total project costs (grant and match combined), the program will pay up to \$88,530 for every \$11,470 of match provided by the project sponsor.

All of the following conditions must be met for a project to proceed in the programming process. Failure to meet each screening consideration will eliminate the project from further consideration.

1. The project must be currently listed in the MTP/SCS or a lump-sum project category. Non-exempt projects must align with SACOG's air quality conformity and greenhouse gas objectives.
2. The project must be scheduled to begin construction no later than FFY 2021 with preliminary engineering and environmental analysis scheduled within three years.
3. The project costs and schedule estimates for environmental, engineering, ROW and start-up construction must be believable, based on standards for similar projects.
4. The project sponsor must have a track record that demonstrates technical capacity and reliability for similar projects.
5. A request for construction funding must demonstrate that environmental, engineering and ROW will be ready by the time funds are requested, and the financial capacity for ongoing operations and maintenance.
6. The project must be consistent with complete streets requirements (as applicable;

<http://www.sacog.org/complete-streets/toolkit/START.html>).

SACOG Programming Cycle. Failure to do so could result in negative impacts for future funding rounds.

## **EVALUATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE**

There are seven general evaluation criteria used by the review committees and SACOG staff to determine whether a project will be recommended for funding. The following performance outcomes will be used to evaluate projects submitted to the Regional/Local Funding Program:

1. A regional reduction in VMT per capita;
2. A regional reduction in congested VMT per capita;
3. An increase in multi-modal travel/alternative travel/choice of transportation options;
4. Provide long-term economic benefit within the region, recognizing the importance of sustaining both the urban and rural economies;
5. Improve goods movement, including farm-to-market travel, in and through the region;
6. Significantly improve safety and security;
7. Demonstrate "state of good repair" benefits that improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system.

### **Special considerations:**

1. Special consideration will be given to agencies submitting a joint-proposal project; in other words, a project that can demonstrate multi-jurisdictional participation and benefits will receive some level of priority.
2. Special consideration will be given to agencies submitting a project for which the agency has already funded the initial phases with its own resources (i.e., environmental, design and/or right-of-way).
3. Special consideration will be given to projects that maximize the use of available federal and state funds.

## **FUNDING RECIPIENT REQUIREMENTS**

Recipients must submit a quarterly update on all projects receiving funding during the 2015

	State Active Transportation Program	Regional Active Transportation Program	Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program	Community Design Funding Program	Regional/Local Funding Program
<b>Eligible Geographies</b>	Statewide				
	Six-County Region: El Dorado & Placer Counties				
	Four-County Region: Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, & Yuba Counties				
<b>Important dates*</b>					
<b>Draft guidelines released</b>	California Transportation Commission - January 22, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- February 25, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- February 25, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- February 25, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- February 25, 2015
<b>Final guidelines approved/ call for projects released</b>	California Transportation Commission - March 26, 2015	SACOG Board-April 16, 2015 California Transportation Commission - May 27, 2015 <i>SACOG CEO issues call- post California Transportation Commission action</i>	SACOG Board- April 16, 2015	SACOG Board- April 16, 2015	SACOG Board- April 16, 2015
<b>Applications due</b>	June 1, 2015	June 19, 2015	June 19, 2015	June 30, 2015	June 25, 2015
<b>Award recommendation announced</b>	California Transportation Commission - September 15, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- August 26, 2015 Adjusted September 15, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- October 7, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- October 7, 2015	Regional Planning Partnership- October 7, 2015
<b>Award recommendation approved</b>	California Transportation Commission - October 22, 2015	SACOG Board - October 29, 2015 California Transportation Commission - December 9, 2015	SACOG Board- December 10, 2015	SACOG Board- December 10, 2015	SACOG Board- December 10, 2015
<b>Program Description</b>					
<b>Goals/Objectives</b>	Statutory goals include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.</li> <li>• Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users.</li> <li>• Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to Senate Bill 375 and Senate Bill 391.</li> <li>• Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding.</li> <li>• Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program.</li> <li>• Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.</li> </ul>	The purpose of this funding program is to increase and attract active transportation users and provide facilities for walking and biking in urban, suburban, and rural portions of the region and to provide connections between them. The program is responsive to the statutory goals described in the State Active Transportation Program.	This program seeks to support the efforts of local agencies to construct infrastructure with walking, bicycling, and transit use as primary transportation considerations, and to provide facilities for walking and biking within and between the communities of the Sacramento region	This program seeks to promote the implementation of the SACOG Blueprint Principles through the construction of improvements in the public right-of-way that support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• housing options,</li> <li>• transportation choices,</li> <li>• mixed land uses,</li> <li>• compact development,</li> <li>• preservation of natural resource lands, and</li> <li>• utilization of existing resources and quality design.</li> </ul>	This program seeks to fund projects that provide regional benefits and that develop and maintain the regional transportation network by implementing projects included in the earlier years of the MTP/SCS.
<b>Program Details</b>					
<b>Opportunities for Streamlining</b>	Project sponsors in the six-county area are encouraged to utilize the streamlined process to apply to the State Active Transportation Program and Regional Active Transportation Program with one application.	Project sponsors in the six-county area are encouraged to utilize the streamlined process to apply to the State Active Transportation Program and Regional Active Transportation Program with one application.	Project sponsors in the four-county area are encouraged to utilize the streamlined process to apply to the State Active Transportation Program, Regional Active Transportation Program, and Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program with one application.	Project sponsors in the four-county area are encouraged to adapt unsuccessful Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities Program application concepts for this program, as appropriate.	Project sponsors in the four-county area are encouraged to adapt unsuccessful Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities Program application concepts for this program, as appropriate.
<b>Minimum/Maximum Funding Request</b>	\$250,000 minimum/no maximum request	Infrastructure projects: \$250,000 minimum/no maximum request Non-infrastructure projects: \$50,000 minimum/no maximum request	Capital projects: \$250,000 minimum/no maximum request Pre-construction-only projects: \$150,000 minimum/no maximum request Non-capital projects: \$50,000 minimum/no maximum request	Three award categories within the program: 1) Conventional: \$300,000 to \$4 million; pre-construction \$150,000-\$500,000 2) Complete Streets focus: \$1.5 million-\$4 million, 3) Non-Competitive: maximum \$100,000. Historically, for construction projects: \$500,000 to \$4 million.	Capital projects do not have minimum or maximum project size.
<b>Estimated Funding Available for Programs</b>	Fund estimate to be adopted by California Transportation Commission on March 25, 2015; anticipated \$179,550,000 available.	Fund estimate to be adopted by California Transportation Commission on March 25, 2015; anticipated \$9,615,000 available.	Anticipated \$11-13 million, based on prior cycles. Fund types: CMAQ, RSTP, STIP, SMF Fund estimate to be finalized by SACOG Board of Directors in August 2015.	Anticipated \$17-19 million based on prior cycles but highly subject to change Fund types: CMAQ, RSTP, STIP, SMF Fund estimate to be finalized by SACOG Board of Directors in August 2015.	Anticipated \$98-\$112 million, based on prior cycles. Fund types: CMAQ, RSTP, STIP Fund estimate to be finalized by SACOG Board of Directors in August 2015.
<b>Match requirements</b>	No match required, though leveraging of additional funds is encouraged.	11.47% match for all projects	11.47% match for all projects	11.47% match for projects in competitive category; 10% for non-competitive category projects	11.47% match for all projects

\*Dates linked to standing committees are subject to change.