



SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SACOG)

2015 REGIONAL LOCAL FUNDING PROGRAM

APPLICATION AND GUIDELINES RELEASE DATE: April 27, 2015

APPLICATIONS DUE: 4 p.m, Friday, July 10, 2015

This document contains information about the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Regional/Local Funding Program. The program grants funding from a variety of sources to local government agencies and their partners to projects that meet performance outcomes, overall policy, and selection considerations identified by the SACOG Board. Grant cycles occur approximately every two years.

Please note: This Funding Program applies to the counties of Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba only. Placer and El Dorado Counties have their own programming process through a Memorandum of Understanding with SACOG. Projects must be located within the four-county portion of the region.

Section 1 contains the 2015 Guidelines for the Regional/Local Funding Program. Page1 provides the schedule for this funding round.

Section 2 contains the 2015 Application Instructions. Pre-submittal letters are due June 5, 2015. Applications are due to SACOG no later than 4:00 p.m. on July 10, 2015.

Section 3 contains the 2015 Regional/Local Program Guidance on addressing Performance Outcomes.

Table of Contents

Reference Information	1
Schedule.....	1
Program Contact.....	1
Section 1: Program Guidelines	2
This section addresses the policy and processes to be utilized for the competitive Regional/Local funding program. Application instructions can be found in Section 2.	2
A. Overview of Program	2
B. Goals of Program.....	2
<i>Emphasize Cost-Effective Programming Decisions.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Fix It First: Asset Management and Maintaining a State Of Good Repair</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Focus on Small or Medium-Sized Capital Projects.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Leverage Regional Funds for Near-term Project Development.....</i>	<i>3</i>
C. Funding.....	3
D. Project Eligibility.....	3
E. Project Ineligibility.....	4
F. Project Selection Process	4
<i>Pre-submittal letter for review by Working Group:.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Screening Projects Out:.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Evaluating Project Performance</i>	<i>5</i>
G. Implementation.....	6
Section 2: Application Instructions.....	7
H. Pre-submittal Letter (Required)	7
I. Application Contents	8
J. Application Format.....	9
K. Project Application	10
L. Cost and Schedule Summary.....	13
M. Engineer’s Estimate	14
N. Regional/Local Program Specific Questions.....	14
<i>Project Self-Screening Questions</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Performance Outcomes & Selection Considerations</i>	<i>15</i>
O. Emissions Benefit Calculations for Congestions Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding	15
P. STIP Project Programming Request (PPR) Form	16
Q. Applicant Checklist	16
Section 3: 2015 Regional Local Program Evaluation Guidance.....	18
Outcome 1, Regional Reduction in VMT Per Capita	19
Outcome 2, Regional Reduction in Congested VMT Per Capita.....	22
Outcome 3, Increase In Multi-Modal Travel/Alternative Travel/Choice of Transportation Options.....	26

Outcome 4, Provide Long-Term Economic Benefit within the Region, Recognizing the Importance of Sustaining Both the Urban and Rural Economies 29

Outcome 5, Improve Goods Movement, Including Farm-To-Market Travel, In And Through The Region 33

Outcome 6, Significantly Improve Safety And Security 37

Outcome 7, Demonstrate “State Of Good Repair” Benefits That Improve The Efficiency Of The Existing Transportation System 39

Complete Streets Pavement Rehabilitation:..... 39

Transit Asset Management: 41

Reference Information

Schedule

Please note all dates are subject to change. To view the most recent information please go to: sacog.org/regionalfunding/regionallocal.cfm

April 16, 2015	Call for projects approved by the SACOG Board
April 27, 2015	Applications made available Process begins
June 5, 2015	Final date to submit pre-submittal letter
July 10, 2015	Project applications due 4:00 p.m.
June to July 2015	Regional Local Working Group and SACOG staff review applications
July 22, 23, or 24, 2015	SACOG staff request additional information through phone calls or meetings.
July to August 2015	SACOG staff draft recommendations for funding and make recommendations to the SACOG Board of Directors.
October 7, 2015	Recommendations are presented for information to the Regional Planning Partnership
December 10, 2015	The SACOG Board adopts the final project funding recommendations.

Program Contact

Please direct any questions regarding the Regional/Local Funding Program or the application process to the SACOG Program Coordinator:

Sam Shelton, Associate Planner
Phone: (916) 340-6257
E-mail: sshelton@sacog.org

Section 1: Program Guidelines

This section addresses the policy and processes to be utilized for the competitive Regional/Local funding program. Application instructions can be found in Section 2.

A. Overview of Program

The Regional/Local Program is SACOG's largest competitive program. The emphasis of the program is to fund projects that will help implement the 2012 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012 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. The policy framework adopted by the SACOG Board on April 16, 2015 provides the policy foundation for this program

B. Goals of Program

The SACOG Board sets the goals of the Program at the beginning of each funding round. The 2015 Goals listed below provide the emphasis areas which the Working Group will consider in the evaluation of projects and cumulative recommendation:

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).

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:

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

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.

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.

C. Funding

Financial support for this and other SACOG programs will come primarily from federal funding sources expected to be available to the region. The SACOG Board of Directors will approve the amounts allocated to each program before the start of the project selection process, according to the 2012 MTP/SCS and the agency’s more immediate priorities. The overall selection of projects, across programs, is dependent on the funding and fund sources available.

Most of the projects selected for this and other SACOG programs must qualify for the four federal/state funding sources available to SACOG.¹ Federal funding requirements from the *Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)* are applicable. For capital projects, federal funds may be used for the preliminary engineering phase, which includes environmental work and design, as well as for right-of-way and construction phases. It should be noted that the Federal Highway Administration is still in the process of drafting implementation guidance for MAP-21 and the State of California must find the appropriate state implementation mechanism to accommodate these changes. As such, SACOG’s final project selection and eligibility determination will depend on the outcome of this guidance and its implementation.

SACOG reserves the right to fund less than the amount reserved for each funding program in a given funding cycle. Additionally, SACOG encourages project sponsors to seek other sources of funding that may be available.

D. Project Eligibility

Any projects listed in the 2012 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 Active Transportation Program (ATP) or the Bike &

¹ These sources are currently the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), the Congestion Management and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Pedestrian program will not be considered.

E. Project Ineligibility

Projects which fit within the framework of SACOG's other funding programs should apply directly to those programs. Projects that do not meet federal eligibility rules for Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) fund sources are ineligible to apply.

F. Project Selection Process

The application process has changed from the last Regional/Local. New this year is a mandatory pre-submittal letter in place of the prior optional "snapshot."

Pre-submittal letter for review by Working Group:

Applicants must submit a pre-submittal letter to SACOG prior to submitting a full application. Details for what needs to be included in the letter are outlined in Section 2. After submitting the letter, an applicant can expect a reply letter from the Working Group 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 potentially strongest performance outcomes of the project.

Applicants are encouraged to be responsive to the feedback of the Working Group within the application itself. The Working Group will be looking for application rich with relevant data and supporting evidence of need. The response letter will be utilized by the Working Group as part of their evaluation of the project when it returns in the full application form.

Screening Projects Out:

A full application must be submitted to SACOG staff for preliminary screening.

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 evaluation process. Failure to meet each screening consideration will eliminate the project from further consideration.

1. The project must be currently listed in the 2012 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 Federal Fiscal Year

2021 with preliminary engineering and environmental analysis scheduled within three years.

3. The project costs and schedule estimates for environmental, engineering, right-of-way 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 to complete similar projects.
5. A request for construction funding must demonstrate that environmental, engineering and right-of-way 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>).

Applications are then forwarded to the Working Group from SACOG staff if Screening Criteria are met.

Working Group prioritizes and ranks the projects

The Working Group prioritizes and ranks the projects, according to an iterative process that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. The Working Group will meet over several sessions and evaluate the projects both against the criteria listed in Section 3 and the pool of candidate projects. The applicant will be provided the opportunity to address the Working Group by phone to discuss topic questions related to scope of work, budget, timeline, and performance outcomes. Applicants will be provided with a set of questions in advance of the call. All applicants will be afforded the same amount of time to respond to questions regardless of the number of projects submitted.

Evaluating Project Performance

There are seven general evaluation criteria and special considerations used by the Working Group to determine whether a project will be recommended for funding. These are fully defined, with examples in Section 3. Applicants should use Section 3 to understand the approach that the Working Group will take when considering the proposed project against the performance outcomes. Applicants should also consider this when selecting competitive projects. The Working Group will be looking for applications rich with relevant data and supporting evidence of need. Applicants must select three outcomes which are supportive of their project. The pre-submittal process is designed to allow project sponsors to share their evidence based approach and have the opportunity to receive direct Working Group feedback on the proposed choice of outcomes and available data resources. The Working Group will be looking for responsiveness to feedback provided.

The compilation of projects recommended by the Working Group must meet the intentions of the Board approved Goals and Priorities for the Regional/Local Program. The Working Group recommendation upon completion will be provided to SACOG staff for use in the development of the final draft recommendation of projects to the SACOG Board. Selection and funding of projects is limited to the available state and federal funding available at the time of programming action.

G. Implementation

Successful applicants who are awarded a grant will be asked to:

- Amend their project into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) via SACTrak.
- Follow SACOG's "Use It or Lose It" policy for obligating and spending the grant funds. The policy requires that project sponsors honor the MTIP schedule and/or delivery commitment schedules for obtaining funds and implementing the phases of the project.
- Provide a local (non-federal) match. The required match for most federal funding is 11.47 percent of the participating phase cost and/or the total participating project cost required for projects receiving federal funding in the Sacramento region, with a few exceptions. 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.
- Comply with the California Transportation Commission's State Transportation Improvement Program Guidelines; the Caltrans' Local Assistance Procedures Manual; and Caltrans' Local Assistance Program Guidelines.
- 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. Please note that this is a new requirement for those applying for funds.

When a project is programmed in the MTIP and is ready for implementation, the project sponsor requests a federal authorization (E-76) from Caltrans. Only after the project is authorized, can the sponsor incur expenses that will then be reimbursed from the grant. A project sponsor submits invoices for the entire cost incurred, and is reimbursed at the authorized reimbursement rate.

Many projects selected for the Regional/Local program will receive STIP funding. Projects receiving this funding will be included in the SACOG Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) that is submitted to the California Transportation Commission for approval. As such these projects will require supplemental information to be included in this document.

Section 2: Application Instructions

This section directly addresses the documentation requirements for applying for a Regional/Local Grant. Please read the instructions in this section with the information in Section 1 when considering and preparing your grant request documents. This is a two-step process which includes a mandatory pre-submittal letter and subsequent application.

H. Pre-submittal Letter (Required)

Applicants must submit a pre-submittal letter to the Regional/Local Program Coordinator prior to submitting a full application. Letters must be received any time between April 27 and June 5. The Working Group will prepare a written response within seven business days of receipt of the pre-submittal indicating:

- a. whether the project is eligible or ineligible to apply or may contain ineligible scope elements based on funding source eligibility (RSTP, CMAQ, STIP),
- b. any foreseeable concerns with the project's scope of work, budget, and timeline that would lead to the project being screened out at the application stage; and
- c. feedback on the potential strongest performance outcomes of the project.

The pre-submittal letter must not be longer than four pages and address the following topics:

1. Name of the Sponsoring Jurisdiction
2. Name of the Project
3. Project Manager contact information
4. Project planning process description, specifically, how this process helped define your project's purpose and need.
5. Project purpose and need.
6. Project Scope, specifically, how it will improve accessibility and/or mobility from current options. **This should be the focus of your letter.**
7. Draft project cost and schedule summary (Part L from the full application, this form is not included in the 4-page maximum).
8. Context Map (not included in the page count)
9. Which three performances outcomes do you consider best measure your project's performance and what data sources best support those outcomes? (You will only be asked to describe your project's benefits in relation to three outcomes in the full application)

SACOG staff will strive to reply with as much feedback as possible related to elements a., b. and c. outlined above. The level of feedback will correlate to the level of information included in the pre-submittal. Applicants are encouraged to submit pre-submittal letters well in advance of the pre-submittal deadline. The pre-submittal letter and the reply letter will move forward with the application during the Working Group prioritization process.

I. Application Contents

After receiving a written response to the pre-submittal letter, the applicant may submit an application. Applications must contain the following Content Elements with page limits as listed. Applicants must also use appropriate content templates, such as word documents or excel spreadsheets when indicated under Content Description.

Content Element	Content Description	Maximum Pages
Project Application	Complete form provided by SACOG (Part K). <i>Download Word document from SACOG.</i>	5 application, 1 page context map
Cost and Schedule Summary	Complete form provided by SACOG (Part L). <i>Download Excel Spreadsheet from SACOG and use the "advanced" sheet, not the "basic" sheet.</i>	1
Engineer's Construction Estimate	Complete form provided by SACOG (Part M) to the level of detail necessary for the scope of the project.	No Maximum
Program Specific Questions	Complete program specific questions provided by SACOG (Part N).	7
Maps or Exhibits	Insert maps/exhibits to describe project area and existing conditions, and/or to justify project need	4
Miscellaneous	In this space, you may address additional items not identified.	1
Emissions Calculations for CMAQ Funding	Follow California Air Resources Board methodology and attach calculations (Part O). <i>Download database from ARB.</i>	2
STIP PPR	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Project Programming Request form (PPR) (Part P). <i>Download spreadsheet from Caltrans.</i>	No Maximum
Partner Commitment Letters	Letters from project partners explaining responsibilities and contributions to the project.	No Maximum
Pre-Submittal Letter and Working Group Response Letter	Letters from the first step in the application process.	No Maximum

J. Application Format

1. All narrative text shall have at least one 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.
2. 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 as only one page.
3. Divider pages are allowed if they are made of colored paper that can be recycled. These do not count toward the page limits. Please do not insert plastic or non-recyclable tabs on the divider page. The divider page may show section titles; no other narrative or graphic content is allowed.
4. 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 described below shall serve as the cover for the application. One blank white sheet of paper may serve as the back page.

K. Project Application

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION	
Project Title	
SACOG ID number (if available)	
PPNO and/or EA number (if applicable) Federal ID number (if applicable)	
Responsible Project Manager/Contact Name: Position: Address: Phone: E-mail:	
Co-sponsor/Partner Agencies	
PROJECT PLANNING AND SCOPE	
Project Location (Also attach a map)	
Project Scope/ Description	
What planning documents or other sources describe the purpose and need for your project?	
Are associated land use changes anticipated to occur due to the proposed project? (e.g, has zoning changed, will potential development take place, etc.)	
Summarize the purpose and need for the project based on these documents.	

Describe the project area’s current transportation facilities, by mode.	
Once your project is built, how will users benefit from your project?	
For projects on the State Highway System, please enter the Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent completion date or expected completion date (if PSR completed, attach electronic file to CD of application packet)	

<p>PROJECT FUNDING STRATEGY (reference parts L, M, and P as needed)</p> <p>While projects will be primarily prioritized using performance outcomes, SACOG’s Regional Local Program goals emphasize cost-effective programming decisions, a focus on small or medium sized capital projects, and leveraging funds for near-term project development. SACOG staff will assess project performance relative to the funding amount requested, the flexibility of eligible funding sources to meet the needs of your project, and the potential to leverage funding for near-term projects.</p>	
Total Project Cost	
Total Funding Request	
<p>Funding secured from other sources by phase:</p> <p>Environmental/preliminary engineering</p> <p>Engineering/design</p> <p>R/W acquisition & utilities</p> <p>Construction/procurement</p> <p>TOTAL</p> <p>List any other potential funding sources and describe planned steps to secure those funds.</p>	
<p>PROJECT DELIVERY CONSIDERATIONS</p>	
Can you build a usable partial stage of this project? If so, describe scope and cost.	

<p>Have you identified any significant and reasonably likely risks to the project? Describe: (150 words maximum total)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks that would change scope • Risks that would change schedule • Risks that would change cost • Risks previously identified by outside agencies involved in permitting or clearance approvals. 	
<p>Project Study Report or equivalent completion date (if PSR completed, attach electronic file to CD of application packet). If PSR is pending, please estimate a completion date.</p>	

L. Cost and Schedule Summary

Please see the [Regional/ Local webpage](#) to download a copy of the cost and schedule summary form to fill out. **Complete the “advanced” sheet and not the “basic” sheet,** which is used by other programs.

Advanced Tool: Cost and Schedule Summary						
Required for 2015 Funding Round Regional/Local, Optional for Community Design & Bike/Ped						
Fill in BLUE SECTIONS where appropriate. Edit the formula cells at your own risk.						
Project Sponsor						
City, County, or other local agency						
Project Title						
Basic Project Title Here						
Project Description (scope and limits)						
The project description is a bit smaller. But can take up to two rows.						
SUMMARY	End	Months	Costs	Requests	Applicant Comment Summary	
Programming	Feb-15	14	NA	NA	exempt project	
Non-capital Activities	Mar-16	13	\$ 365,000	\$ 268,000	marketing of project	
Environmental	Aug-15	5	\$ 50,000	\$ 44,265	CEQA complete	
Design	Dec-15	4	\$ 150,000	\$ 132,795	none needed	
Right-of-Way	Jan-16	1	\$ -	\$ -	1 year to complete	
Construction	Nov-17	22	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,770,600		
TOTAL	Nov-17	59	\$ 2,565,000	\$ 2,215,660		

Federal Aid Delivery Steps	Date Completed	Duration in Months	Costs	Requests	Comments
ENVIRONMENTAL					
Request PE authorization (RFA)	Feb-15	0			CEQA already complete, 2010
Receive PE authorization (E76)	Mar-15	1			NEPA is expected to be Cat Ex
Field Review	Apr-15	1			
	NEPA	CEQA			
Environmental Type (NEPA/CEQA)	CE	Cat Ex			
	CE	Cat Ex			
Technical Reports to Caltrans	May-15	1			
Environmental Circulation/Permits	Jul-15	2			
Environmental Adopted	Aug-15	1	\$ 50,000	\$ 44,265	
Totals	Aug-15	5	\$ 50,000	\$ 44,265	
DESIGN					
30% Design, Preliminary Plans	Sep-15	1			Some design already completed prior to application
50% Design, (Cross sections)	Oct-15	1			
90% Design, Detailed Plans	Nov-15	1			
Final Design (Plans, Specs, & Est)	Dec-15	1	\$ 150,000	\$ 132,795	
Totals	Dec-15	4	\$ 150,000	\$ 132,795	
RIGHT-OF-WAY					
Request ROW Authorization (RFA)	Dec-15	0			Right of way not required for this project
Receive ROW Authorization (E76)	Dec-15	0			
Need ROW Acquisition?		No	\$ -	\$ -	
Need Utilities Relocation?		No	\$ -	\$ -	
ROW Certified by Caltrans	Jan-16	1			
Totals	Jan-16	1	\$ -	\$ -	
CONSTRUCTION					
Request CON Authorization (RFA)	Feb-16	1			
Receive CON Authorization (E76)	Mar-16	1			
Advertise Date	Apr-16	1			
Contract Award Date	May-16	1			
Project Completion (open to public)	May-17	12	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,770,600	1 year to build project
Project Closeout	Nov-17	6			
Totals	Nov-17	22	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,770,600	

M. Engineer's Estimate

Please use the [Excel version available online](#).

R. ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE									
PROJECT NAME									
SPONSOR									
ITEM NO.	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT \$	PARTICIPATING COSTS	NON-PART COSTS	RSTP Eligible	CMAQ Eligible
SUBTOTAL					0	0	0	0	0
Contingency (XX%)					\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0
Construction Management/Contract Administration					\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST					\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0
Total Participating Costs						0			
Maximum Federal Funds (88.53%)						0			

Please circle current status of project: Feasibility Study, PSR, Environmental, 30% Design, 60% Design, 90% Design, 100% Design
 If you have questions about how to complete this form, please contact Sam Shelton at sshelton@sacog.org or at 916.340.6251.

N. Regional/Local Program Specific Questions

Using a maximum of seven pages, please complete the Project Self-screening questions and address the Performance Outcome and Selection Considerations as part of the application.

Project Self-Screening Questions

Please respond yes/no. If no, please explain.

1. Is the project listed in the 2012 MTP/SCS or a lump sum project category? Please list Tile/ID if available.
2. Will the project be able to begin construction no later than Federal Fiscal Year 2021 with preliminary engineering and environmental analysis scheduled within three years?
3. Are the project costs and schedule estimate for environmental, engineering, right-of-way and startup construction believable, based on standards for similar projects?
4. Does the project sponsor have a track record that demonstrates technical capacity and reliability for similar projects? If you agency has experienced a project delay on a

previously awarded Regional/Local project similar to the application's proposed project, please provide information on reasoning for delay and solutions.

5. A request for construction funding must demonstrate that environmental, engineering and right-of-way will be ready by the time funds are requested and the financial ability for ongoing operations and maintenance. Can this be demonstrated?
6. Is the project consistent with complete streets requirements, as applicable; see: <http://www.sacog.org/complete-streets/toolkit/START.html>

Performance Outcomes & Selection Considerations

Demonstrate how your project supports three of the seven performance outcomes

1. Please use Section 3 as well as pre-submittal letter feedback as a guide. The Working Group will be looking for responses related to the feedback.
2. All SACOG reference sources are available on the SACOG website: <http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding>
3. If you have other substantial information regarding additional performance outcomes or other project related information, please include this information in the 1-page miscellaneous section of your application.
4. Please do not hesitate to contact SACOG staff if you have any questions about the process or materials. This is a collaborative effort in which SACOG staff want to support your efforts to produce strong applications for consideration. The Working Group will be looking for data rich project applications supporting project need.

O. Emissions Benefit Calculations for Congestions Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding

Applicants are required to complete these calculations if your project is eligible for CMAQ funding.

Projects funded under this program may be candidates for funding under the CMAQ program. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds are intended to support projects that improve air quality and relieve congestion. Under the passage of MAP-21, there is an increased emphasis on addressing Particulate Mater_{2.5} (PM_{2.5}) emissions in non-attainment and maintenance areas. The [PM_{2.5} nonattainment and maintenance areas in our region](#) include the Sacramento area (Sacramento County, Yolo County from Winters to the eastern county border, eastern portions of Solano County, and the western portions of Placer and El Dorado counties), and the Yuba City/Marysville area (Sutter County and a the southern two-thirds of Yuba County).

To show that air quality objectives are being met, state and local governments must demonstrate the benefits of individual CMAQ projects. Therefore, project applicants must submit a calculation of emissions reductions showing each of the following pollutants, Carbon monoxide (CO) (if measurable), volatile organic compounds (VOC), mono-nitrogen oxides (NOx), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} in kilograms/day. While quantitative analysis is required whenever possible, a qualitative analysis is also considered acceptable when project

benefits cannot be quantified.

To assist in calculating the quantitative emission benefits reductions and the cost effectiveness of the reductions, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has produced a hard copy manual and an automated Microsoft Access database file. The manual and database are available online at: arb.ca.gov/planning/tsaq/eval/eval.htm

Print and attach the emission benefits calculations to the application.

For assistance with this process, please contact:

José Luis Cáceres
Transportation Planner, SACOG
(916) 340-6218
JCaceres@sacog.org

P. STIP Project Programming Request (PPR) Form

There is a high likelihood that many projects recommended for funding through the 2015 Regional/Local Program will be programmed using STIP funding. STIP programming policies require the use of PPRs for these programming purposes. Please complete this task last as your application's information will help you populate this form, such as basic information from Part K and funding and schedule information from Part L and Part M. Please download the latest version of the 2016 STIP PPR forms here:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ocip/2016stip.htm>

Q. Applicant Checklist

1. Program Updates: check for any program updates under the 2015 Regional/Local Program link at the SACOG website at www.sacog.org. While policy and guidelines changes are unlikely, available data, maps, and FAQs will be updated.
2. Optional Workshops: Attend the optional workshop on May 6, 2015. Attendees will be offered opportunities for feedback on draft pre-submittal letters by SACOG staff.
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. Pre-submittal letter: All applicants are required to provide a pre-submittal letter by June 5th to the Regional/Local Program Coordinator before an application is permitted. The Regional Local Working Group will provide a response to the letter. Review Part N.
5. Application contents: Review Part N for all application contents, including Project Application, Cost and Schedule Summary, Engineer's Construction Estimate, Program Specific Questions, Maps or Exhibits, Miscellaneous information, Emissions

Calculations for CMAQ Funding, STIP Project Programming Request form, and Partner Commitment Letters.

6. Electronic Files: Submit an Excel copy of your Engineer's Estimate. Scanned materials into the PDF file are acceptable, such as maps, graphics, etc. If a Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent is complete, please submit a PDF of the PSR on the compact disc/flash drive.
7. Program Schedule: Review the program schedule on page 1 for all timeline matters.
8. Submittal Deadline Please submit one (1) signed original, 15 (15) copies of the complete grant application, and one (1) compact disc or flash with a PDF of the complete application by no later than 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 10, 2015, to:

Sam Shelton, Regional/Local Program Coordinator
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mailed applications are not acceptable. This deadline will be strictly enforced.

Section 3: 2015 Regional Local Program Evaluation Guidance

Use the questions and information in this section to determine which three performance outcomes to use in completing **Part N, “Regional/Local Program Specific Question,”** of your application. Applicants can utilize the pre-submittal process to help in this selection.

The Regional/Local Funding Program focuses on funding projects that provide regional benefits. Similar to the other funding programs, the Regional/Local Funding Program’s goals, priorities, and performance outcomes guide the Working Group project recommendations towards projects that will best achieve the regional goals of the 2012 MTP/SCS or currently adopted Plan. Under each performance outcome are factors and sub-factors. Each sub-factor is phrased as a question with “High, Medium, and Low” performance ranges as answers that the Working Group will consider while rating your project.

Use data to describe your project’s regional benefits. Many questions refer to SACOG data sources from the 2012 MTP/SCS, while others depend on local or state data sources and studies. To answer questions that require SACOG data sources, please refer to SACOG’s interactive mapping website to access this data. The link will be available on the Regional Local Program webpage here: <http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/regionallocal.cfm>. In addition to SACOG data, staff encourages the use of local studies or planning documentation to support your application’s performance outcome claims.

Reviewers will use all factors and sub-factors in each applicant’s three chosen outcomes to measure a projects performance.

Outcome 1, Regional Reduction in VMT Per Capita

A. Outcome Overview

A vehicle mile traveled, or VMT, is literally one vehicle traveling on a roadway for one mile. Regardless of how many people are traveling in the vehicle, each vehicle traveling on a roadway within the Sacramento region generates one VMT for each mile it travels. The 2012 MTP/SCS describes key factors that contribute to the reduction of VMT: 1) Improvements in **Accessibility**, 2) Improvements in **Mix of Land Uses**, and 3) Improvements in **Transit Service and Walkability**. The 2012 MTP/SCS projects that “Total VMT per capita will decline from 25.8 miles in 2008, to 25.4 by 2020, and 24.1 by 2035.”

B. Example Projects:

[Sacramento Regional Transit, “Operating Assistance - Year 3 Start Up Blue Line Light Rail Expansion - Phase 2,”](#)

\$2 million awarded in 2013

- The project reduces VMT for commuters on the SR 99 corridor to the Sac/Elk Grove border who will have a rail transit commute alternative.
- The project emphasizes design features that support greater connectivity of all travel modes. Associated pedestrian improvements are planned for the light rail stations and there is a parking garage at Cosumnes River College (CRC) to support the large increase in commuters anticipated.

[City of West Sacramento, “Broadway Bridge Project Study Report”](#)

\$442,700 awarded in 2013

- The project has been identified as a regionally important investment in the MTP/SCS. The recently completed Sacramento River Crossings Alternatives Study demonstrated the significant travel and economic benefits from a new river crossing in the Broadway Bridge area.
The project scope would examine the area—the Broadway Bridge Area—with the highest current and projected population and employment growth projected among the seven river crossing study areas.
- The project has the potential to reduce VMT by providing a multi-use path river crossing and spur economic development within the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento.
- The successful prior planning work is evident of strong multi-agency coordination between the two cities involved and raises the prospect that the PSR will lead to subsequent efforts towards implementation.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “high,” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Land Use & Site Enhancement	
1. Center/Corridor Design	
<i>Is the project located within or serve a MTP/SCS Center and Corridor community? If so, does it include design features to support multi-modal travel and infill development?</i>	
Project is <u>located substantially within or clearly serves</u> a Center and Corridor community and includes design features to support multi-modal travel and infill development.	High
Project is located <u>at least within 1 mile and potentially serves</u> a Center and Corridor community and <u>includes design features</u> to support multi-modal travel and infill development.	Medium
Project is <u>farther than 1 mile and is not clear if it serves</u> a Center and Corridor community. It also <u>does not include design features</u> that support multi-modal travel and infill development.	Low
2. Employment or Housing Density	
<i>Does the project serve an area with medium to high employment density today or an area that improves significantly in the future? If so, how well does the project's design help reduce VMT in that area?</i>	
Project serves an area with medium to high employment <u>and</u> housing density today or an area that <u>improves significantly in the future</u> . The project design is <u>very likely</u> to help reduce VMT in that area.	High
Project serves an area with <u>medium to high</u> employment or housing density today or <u>has plans to improve in the future</u> . The project design can <u>potentially</u> help reduce VMT in that area.	Medium
Project serves an area with <u>low</u> employment or housing density today. The area <u>does not have plans to increase</u> employment or housing density in the future. The project design is <u>not likely</u> to help reduce VMT in that area.	Low
3. Low VMT Area	
<i>Does the project directly serve an area that has low VMT/per capita today or significantly reduced VMT/per capita in the future? If so, how well does the project's design help reduce VMT in that area?</i>	
Project <u>clearly serves</u> an area that has low VMT/per capita today or significantly reduced VMT/per capita in the future. The project's design <u>clearly helps reduce VMT</u> in that area.	High
Project <u>could serve</u> an area that has low VMT/per capita today or significantly reduced VMT/per capita in the future. The project's design <u>could help reduce VMT</u> in that area.	Medium
Project <u>does not directly serve</u> an area that has low VMT/per capita today or significantly reduced VMT/per capita in the future. The project's <u>design does not help</u> reduce VMT in that area.	Low

Factor 2: Increase Multi-Modal Connectivity	
1. Transit Network	
<i>A transit investment also offers significant connectivity benefits to other travel modes</i>	
Transit project <u>clearly includes direct</u> connections that tie into other modal networks.	High
Transit project <u>includes some direct and indirect</u> connections that tie into other modal networks.	Medium
Transit project <u>does not include any</u> connections that tie into other modal networks.	Low
2. Bike/Ped Network	
<i>A bike/ped improvement also offers significant connectivity benefits to other travel modes?</i>	
Project's bike/ped improvements <u>clearly includes direct</u> connections that tie into other modal networks.	High
Project's bike/ped improvements <u>includes some direct and indirect</u> connections that tie into other modal networks.	Medium
Project's bike/ped improvements <u>do not include any</u> connections that tie into other modal networks.	Low
3. Carpooling Mode Shift	
<i>Road project document provides good evidence that the improvement will increase carpooling for travelers who would otherwise drive a single-occupancy auto for the trip</i>	
Project level analysis offers strong evidence to address all aspects of the Factor Question. For example, evidence is offered that a road project attracts choice riders and there is also good evidence or analysis about this leading to a mode-shift	High
Project level analysis offers some evidence to address at least a portion of the Factor Question. For example, evidence is offered that a road project supports carpooling, but there is no evidence or analysis about this leading to a mode-shift	Medium
No project level analysis is offered that provides evidence to answer the Factor Question	Low

Factor 3: Transportation Demand Management to Reduce VMT	
1. TDM, Existing integration	
<i>Is the project integrated with existing TDM programs or policies that can demonstrate a good potential to contribute to VMT reduction?</i>	
Project is <u>closely integrated</u> with existing TDM programs or policies that suggest <u>good potential</u> to contribute to VMT reductions	High
Project is <u>integrated</u> with existing TDM programs or policies that <u>potentially</u> contribute to VMT reductions.	Medium
Project is <u>loosely</u> integrated with existing TDM programs or policies where VMT reductions are <u>unclear</u> .	Low
2. TDM, new integration	
<i>Is the project integrated with or propose new TDM programs or policies that suggest good potential to contribute to VMT reduction?</i>	
Project is <u>closely integrated</u> and proposes new TDM programs or policies that suggest <u>good potential</u> to contribute to VMT reductions.	High
Project is <u>integrated</u> with new TDM programs or policies that <u>potentially</u> to contribute to VMT reductions.	Medium
Project is <u>loosely</u> integrated with new TDM programs or policies where <u>potential</u> VMT reductions are <u>unclear</u> .	Low

Outcome 2, Regional Reduction in Congested VMT Per Capita

A. Outcome Overview

SACOG has always focused more on the presence of congestion on roadways rather than an amount of delay. Specifically, SACOG estimates and tracks how much of the total VMT occurs on roadways that are at or above their reasonable capacities. SACOG defines a congested VMT (CVMT) as a VMT that occurs on roadways with volume-to-capacity ratios of 1.0 or greater. An example of CVMT is a vehicle and its driver and passenger(s) going westbound on I-80 during the busy morning commute period between Madison Avenue and the I-80/Capital City Freeway split, or on Hazel Avenue between Madison and Winding Way during commute hours.

The reduction in congested travel is driven by two basic factors in the MTP/SCS: 1) **Roadway capacity** and **optimal utilization investments** that resolve or improve **major existing bottlenecks**, and 2) **new transit options** on major congested travel corridors. The 2012 MTP/SCS estimates that

- per capita congested VMT was estimated to be 1.49 miles in 2008, and 1.39 miles by 2035 for the MTP/ SCS, a decline of 6.9 percent
- the percentage of VMT which occurs at optimal utilization level from 28.5 percent in 2008 to 30.4 percent in 2035
- transit mode share increasing by 5 percentage points, from about 3 percent in 2008 to over 8 percent in 2035.

B. Example Projects:

[Caltrans District 3, "I-80, SR51, SR99 Ramp Meters,"](#)

\$11.5 million awarded in 2013

- The project would install 15 ramp meters with High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Bypass lanes on I-80, SR51/Capital City Freeway, and SR 99, focusing the project on SR 99 southbound afternoon traffic from downtown to Cosumnes Blvd.
- The information provided in the application and subsequent staff review identified project need and benefits along a key travel corridor with significant population and projected travel.
- The application demonstrated the project would fulfill performance outcomes, such as reducing CVMT, supporting goods movement, and reducing VMT by creating more High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) incentives.

[City of Elk Grove, "ITS Master Plan - Phase 4 Implementation"](#)

\$2.38 million awarded in 2013

- The information in the application effectively demonstrates that the ITS investment would help the City make more efficient use of existing road capacity, provide traveler information, and enhance safety. Each of these outcomes is an objective of the region's ITS Partnership.
- The project would facilitate non-motorized travel with the innovative design features, including bicycle detection hardware and improved pedestrian accessible

push buttons.

- Improvements in goods movement travel are supported by the projects coordinating signals along federal and state truck routes.
- The project improves safety and security with a CCTV camera real-time monitoring system that allows real-time signal modification due to congestion or accidents and facilitates better emergency response.
- By replacing older signal equipment that is more prone to signal malfunction, this project helps maintain a state of good repair.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Project Supports Congestion Relief in a Specific Location	
1. SACOG Regional Corridor Congestion	
<i>How severe is current congestion in the project area?</i>	
Current project roadway (or a parallel route relieved by the project) congestion is severe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion persists for 2 hours or more during peak periods; or • Peak period volume-to-capacity ratios on SACOG’s 2008 congestion map are shown as greater than 1.1; or • Existing peak hour intersection LOS is “F” during AM or PM peaks 	High
Project roadway (or a parallel route relieved by the project) congestion is above average: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion persists for less than 2 hours periods; or • Peak period volume-to-capacity ratios on SACOG’s 2008 congestion map are shown as greater than 1.0, and less than or equal to 1.1; or • Peak hour intersection LOS is “E” during AM or PM peaks 	Medium
Project roadway (or a parallel route relieved by the project) congestion is average or below average: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion persists for less than 1 hours periods; or • Peak period volume-to-capacity ratios on SACOG’s 2008 congestion map are shown as less than or equal to 1.0, or • Peak hour intersection LOS is “D” or better during AM or PM peaks 	Low
2. SACOG Regional Corridor Congestion, 2035	
<i>Is the project along a SACOG corridor with peak period Congestion in 2035 (add v/c ranges) and the application demonstrates congestion should be reduced from the project?</i>	
Expected project future roadway (or a parallel route relieved by the project) congestion is severe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base year congestion is above average or worse, and VMT growth in the corridor is expected • Peak period volume-to-capacity ratios on SACOG’s 2035 congestion map are shown as greater than 1.1; or • Planning horizon peak hour intersection LOS is “F” during AM or PM peaks 	High
Expected project future roadway (or a parallel route relieved by the project) congestion is severe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base year congestion is above average or better, and high VMT growth in the corridor 	Medium

<p>is expected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peak period volume-to-capacity ratios on SACOG’s 2035 congestion map are shown as greater than or equal to 1.0, and less than or equal to 1.1; or Planning horizon peak hour intersection LOS is “E” during AM or PM peaks 	
<p>Expected project future roadway (or a parallel route relieved by the project) congestion is severe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base year congestion is average or better, and average or low VMT growth in the corridor is expected Peak period volume-to-capacity ratios on SACOG’s 2035 congestion map are shown as greater than or equal to 1.0, and less than or equal to 1.1; or Planning horizon peak hour intersection LOS is “D” or better during AM or PM peaks 	Low
<p>3. Other Current Congestion Relief</p> <p><i>Will the project relieve congestion in the project area (or on a congested parallel route)?</i></p>	
<p>A project-level study <u>clearly demonstrates</u> that there is congestion currently (study no more than 3 years old) and the application <u>clearly demonstrates</u> that congestion should be reduced from the project <u>using assumptions derived from SACOG's model data.</u></p>	High
<p>A project-level study <u>does demonstrate</u> that there is congestion currently (study is less than 3 years old) and the application <u>suggests</u> that congestion should be reduced from the project, <u>but makes questionable assumptions.</u></p>	Medium
<p>A project-level study <u>does not clearly demonstrate</u> that there is congestion currently (<u>study older than 3 years</u>) and the application <u>does not clearly demonstrate</u> that congestion should be reduced from the project.</p>	Low

Factor 2: Congestion Management Design Features

1. Operational Improvements

Does the project effectively incorporate operational elements, such as geometrical improvements, grade separations for individual modes, access management, ITS/signalization improvements, turning movement improvements, traveler information, or special signage/wayfinding?

<p>The project effectively fully integrates many operational improvements into the strategy for congestion relief and provides clear evidence they can be effective in the project area location</p>	High
<p>The project includes some operational improvements into the strategy for congestion relief and provides some evidence they may effective in the project area location</p>	Medium
<p>The project does not include operational improvements in the project scope and/or does not offer any evidence they can be effective in the project area location</p>	Low

Factor 3: Minimizes Induced VMT

1. Undeveloped area policies

If the project adds roadway capacity in an area not projected to grow during the timeframe of the MTP/SCS, does the project have access controls and land use policies in place to avoid the urbanization of the corridor?

<p>The project adds roadway capacity in an undeveloped area with growth included in the <u>early years of the MTP/SCS</u> and has <u>adopted</u> access controls or land use policies in place to <u>avoid excessive urbanization</u> of the corridor.</p>	High
--	------

The project adds roadway capacity in an undeveloped area <u>with growth assumed in the later years of the MTP/SCS</u> and has <u>pending</u> access controls or land use policies in place to avoid potential urbanization of the corridor.	Medium
The project adds roadway capacity in an undeveloped area <u>without growth included in the MTP/SCS</u> and <u>does not</u> have access controls or land use policies in place to avoid potential urbanization of the corridor.	Low

Factor 4: Multi-Modal Connectivity & TDM	
1. Transit Capacity	
<i>Does the project support additional Transit Capacity along a congested regional corridor?</i>	
The project <u>directly</u> supports additional Transit Capacity <u>along a</u> congested regional corridor.	High
The project <u>indirectly</u> supports additional Transit Capacity <u>along or parallel to a</u> congested regional corridor.	Medium
The project <u>does not</u> support additional Transit Capacity along a congested regional corridor.	Low
2. Non-motorized Capacity	
<i>Does the project support additional Non-Motorized Mode Capacity along a congested regional corridor?</i>	
The project <u>directly</u> supports additional Non-motorized mode Capacity <u>along a</u> congested regional corridor.	High
The project <u>indirectly</u> supports additional Non-motorized mode Capacity <u>along or parallel to a</u> congested regional corridor.	Medium
The project <u>does not</u> support additional Non-motorized mode capacity along a congested regional corridor.	Low
3. Targeted TDM	
<i>Does the project support TDM strategies to reduce travel demand to the project area?</i>	
The project <u>directly</u> supports TDM strategies to reduce travel demand <u>specifically</u> in the project area.	High
The project <u>indirectly</u> supports TDM strategies to reduce travel demand <u>generally</u> in the project area.	Medium
The project <u>does not</u> support TDM strategies to reduce travel demand to the project area.	Low

Outcome 3, Increase In Multi-Modal Travel/Alternative Travel/Choice of Transportation Options

A. Outcome Overview

Transit and Non-motorized travel investments 1) reduce VMT, through shifts from low-occupancy modes like driving alone to a very high occupancy mode of travel and 2) for commute trips, which tend to occur at peak periods of travel demand when congestion is highest, can provide substantial congestion relief.

The MTP/SCS envisions a larger and more complete bicycle and pedestrian network that will provide greater mobility through walking and biking and associated transit use. The MTP/SCS focuses transit investments especially in areas most capable of supporting robust transit service. Combining significant housing and employment growth in Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) with high-frequency service of 15 minutes or better in these areas allows the MTP/SCS to provide quality transit service to higher concentrations of people where it is most cost-effective.

The MTP/SCS describes four of the most important factors in increasing transit use, bicycling and walking: 1) Improvements in **Mix of Land Uses**, 2) Improvements to **Transit Service**, 3) Improvements in **Bicycle System**, and 4) Improvements to **Street Pattern and Walkability**. The MTP/SCS projects that:

- Transit person trips are projected to increase from about 110,000 in 2008 to 390,000 by 2035 for the MTP/SCS, an increase of about 255 percent in total.
- Productivity of transit service is projected to more than double for the MTP/SCS, increasing from a regional average of 33.3 passenger boardings per service hour to over 70 by 2035.
- Bicycle person trips are projected to increase from 152,000 in 2008 to 229,000 by 2035 for the MTP/SCS, an increase of about 50 percent in total.

B. Example Projects:

[City of Sacramento, "Freeport Blvd. Road Diet"](#)

\$1.65 million awarded in 2013

- This project would provide substantial improvements for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes of travel while also rehabilitating pavement.
- With dedicated turn pockets and bus pullouts, the proposed road diet would move traffic efficiently with fewer travel lanes dedicated to automobile traffic.
- This project area is widely used by bicyclists, pedestrians, and drivers who access various land uses, including McClatchy High School, Sacramento City College, and multiple parks.

[City of Galt, "Complete Streets Rehabilitation - A St."](#)

\$1.3 million awarded in 2013

- The project includes complete street elements by adding new bicycle lanes and new

sidewalks while maintaining a state of good repair consistent with the City’s use of pavement management practices.

- City of Galt staff prioritized A St. rehabilitation and improvements to focus benefits on school-related bicycle and pedestrian network gap closures.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “high,” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Complete Streets & Corridors	
1. Roadway Elements, Urban	
<i>Urban & Suburban Areas: Does the project complete a street that includes context-sensitive street treatments appropriate to increase multi-modal travel along the corridor?</i>	
Project includes <u>significant</u> street treatments that <u>clearly</u> will increase multi-modal travel along the corridor.	High
Project includes <u>some</u> appropriate street treatments that <u>could potentially</u> increase multi-modal travel along the corridor.	Medium
Project <u>does not</u> include appropriate street treatments that will increase multi-modal travel along the corridor.	Low
2. Roadway Elements, Rural	
<i>Small Towns & Rural Areas: Does the project complete a corridor that includes context-sensitive street or road treatments appropriate to increase multi-modal travel along the corridor?</i>	
Project includes <u>significant</u> street treatments that <u>clearly</u> will increase multi-modal travel along the corridor.	High
Project includes <u>some</u> appropriate street treatments that <u>could potentially</u> increase multi-modal travel along the corridor.	Medium
Project <u>does not</u> include appropriate street treatments that will increase multi-modal travel along the corridor.	Low

Factor 2: Eliminate gaps in the existing transit service area or bicycle/pedestrian network	
1. Eliminate Gap	
<i>Does the project connect or extend existing pedestrian connections or bikeways and provides for a consistent, continuous through route?</i>	
Project <u>unifies</u> a bike/ped corridor and provides a <u>consistent and continuous</u> through route.	High
Project <u>connects parts</u> of pedestrian and bikeway networks for <u>improved</u> through routes.	Medium
Project <u>largely ignores</u> bike/ped travel, <u>leaving gaps</u> in nearby networks.	Low
2. New Transit for DAC	
<i>Does the project provide new or improved transit services in an underserved area with demonstrated demand?</i>	
Project provides <u>targeted new transit service</u> for an underserved area.	High
Project provides <u>enhanced</u> transit service along <u>existing routes</u> through underserved areas.	Medium
Project provides <u>marginally enhanced</u> transit service to a <u>currently served area</u> with low ridership.	Low

Factor 3: Remove physical barriers at transit stations/stops or along the bicycle and pedestrian network

1. Eliminate Big Bike/Ped Gap

Does the project overcome significant barriers to bicycle travel such as crossings of highways, major arterials, rail lines, rivers?

Project creates a <u>grade-separated crossing</u> over a highway, major arterial, rail line, or river.	High
Project creates a <u>safer direct crossing</u> across a major arterial or rail line.	Medium
Project provides a <u>safer indirect route</u> to crossing a highway, major arterial, rail line, or river.	Low

2. Eliminate Big Transit Gap

Significant barriers to transit stations/stops are overcome through the investment

Project creates a <u>grade-separated crossing</u> to a transit connection.	High
Project creates a <u>safer direct crossing</u> to a transit connection.	Medium
Project provides a <u>safer indirect route</u> to a transit connection.	Low

Factor 4: Transportation Demand Management

1. TDM, Existing integration

Does the project include TDM features that have previously been implemented in the project area and the benefits measured to demonstrate effectiveness?

Project will be <u>well integrated</u> with existing TDM program activities. Project does include previously implemented TDM features with the benefits measured to demonstrate they are effective.	High
Project is <u>associated with some existing TDM project</u> activities that have been <u>implemented in the project area</u> . Project does include new TDM features that are likely to be effective, though these outcomes have not been demonstrated.	Medium
Project is <u>not associated</u> with TDM activities. Project does not integrated with existing TDM activities in the project area.	Low

2. TDM, new integration

Does the project have promising TDM features that have not been previously implemented in the project area and the benefits measured?

Project helps <u>pilot new TDM</u> activities that have been <u>successful</u> elsewhere with evidence provided that they are effective features.	High
Project is <u>associated with some new TDM</u> activities that have <u>implemented elsewhere</u> . Project does include new TDM features that are likely to be effective, though these outcomes have not been demonstrated	Medium
Project is <u>not associated</u> with TDM activities. Project does not include new TDM features	Low

Outcome 4, Provide Long-Term Economic Benefit within the Region, Recognizing the Importance of Sustaining Both the Urban and Rural Economies

A. Outcome Overview

Integrated land use and transportation planning support the region’s economic vitality in several fundamental ways: 1) regional employment patterns that shape the commute to work and 2) support for commerce and employment generally in the region.

B. Example Projects:

[Sacramento/West Sacramento/Regional Transit/Yolo County Transportation District Joint Application, “Downtown/Riverfront Transit \(Streetcar\) Project Development,”](#)

\$5 million awarded in 2013

- The application and supporting documentation demonstrate strong performance benefits from the project, including the reduction of VMT, expanded mobility options, and serving as a catalyst for economic development in the urban core of both Sacramento and West Sacramento.
- The project capitalizes on substantial private investment being made along the corridor, including a major infill project in West Sacramento and in downtown Sacramento.

[City of Sacramento, “Riverfront Reconnection Project - Phase 1”](#)

\$9 million awarded in 2013

- This project would provide substantial improvements to accommodate the anticipated growth in non-motorized travel in this area and provide continuity from 3rd Street into the City of West Sacramento.
- The proposed 2nd Street Bridge from Capitol Mall to Historic Old Sacramento would create a new intersection on Capitol Mall that would improve access to Old Sacramento and become a gateway.
- Removal of the N St. to Capitol Mall connection would open adjacent land to planned mixed-use infill development near I-5.
- The project improvements would complement future investments in the area, including the Entertainment Sports Complex and the Downtown Streetcar project.
- The City has invested considerable resources in this project to complete project development work and prepare it for construction.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “high,” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Employment Area Access Improvements	
1. Job Access	
<i>Does the project improve access to jobs within the sponsoring jurisdiction?</i>	
The jobs area served is large, or the problems the project is intended to resolve are severe.	High
Information provided on the size/location of the jobs areas served by the project. Information provided on the extent of problems the project is intended to resolve.	Medium
No information provided on the size/location of the jobs areas served by the project. No information provided on the extent of problems the project is intended to resolve.	Low
2. Center/Corridor Design	
<i>Is the project located substantially within or serves a Center and Corridor community and does it include design features to support multi-modal travel and infill development?</i>	
Project is <u>located substantially within or clearly serves</u> a Center and Corridor community and includes design features to support multi-modal travel and infill development.	High
Project is located <u>at least within 1 mile and potentially serves</u> a Center and Corridor community and <u>includes design features</u> to support multi-modal travel and infill development.	Medium
Project is <u>farther than 1 mile and is not clear</u> if it serves a Center and Corridor community. It also <u>does not include design features</u> that support multi-modal travel and infill development.	Low
3. TPA Mixed Use	
<i>Does the project directly support a mixed-use development in an identified Transit Priority Area?</i>	
Project does directly support a mixed-use development in an identified Transit Priority Area, and it's clear the project supports multi-modal travel and infill development.	High
Project does directly support a mixed-use development in an identified Transit Priority Area, but it's not clear how much the project supports multi-modal travel and infill development.	Medium
Project does not directly support a mixed-use development in an identified Transit Priority Area. It also <u>does not include design features</u> that support multi-modal travel and infill development.	Low

Factor 2: Disadvantaged Community Investments	
1. Environmental Justice	
<i>Is the project substantially within an identified MTP/SCS environmental justice area and does it provide demonstrated economic benefits?</i>	
Project is <u>substantially within</u> an identified MTP/SCS environmental justice area and provides <u>demonstrated</u> economic benefits.	High
Project <u>potentially supports</u> an identified MTP/SCS environmental justice area and provides <u>some</u> economic benefits.	Medium
Project is <u>over a mile</u> from an identified MTP/SCS environmental justice area and has <u>no clear</u> economic benefits.	Low
2. Opportunity Index benefits	
<i>Is the project substantially within a low Composite Opportunity Index area and does it provide demonstrated economic benefits?</i>	
Project is <u>substantially within</u> an identified low Composite Opportunity Index area and provides <u>demonstrated</u> economic benefits.	High

Project <u>potentially supports</u> an identified low Composite Opportunity Index area and provides <u>some</u> economic benefits.	Medium
Project is <u>over a mile</u> from an low Composite Opportunity Index area and has <u>no clear</u> economic benefits.	Low
3. Unemployment area investment <i>Is the project located within an area (jurisdiction-scale or community-level) with high unemployment, relative to other portions of the region, and does it provide demonstrated long-term economic benefit?</i>	
Project is <u>substantially within</u> an area with high unemployment and provides <u>demonstrated</u> economic benefits.	High
Project <u>potentially supports</u> an area with high unemployment and provides <u>some</u> economic benefits.	Medium
Project is <u>over a mile</u> from an area with high unemployment and has <u>no clear</u> economic benefits.	Low

Factor 3: Rural/Small Town Investments	
1. Rural/Small Town Direct Support <i>Does the project directly support the long-term vitality of a rural community? Benefits may be to small town businesses or the rural agricultural and resource-based economy</i>	
Project <u>directly supports</u> a small town business or rural ag economy with <u>improved</u> mobility or access.	High
Project <u>indirectly supports</u> a small town business or rural ag economy with <u>sustained</u> mobility or access.	Medium
Project <u>does not clearly support</u> a small town business or rural ag economy.	Low

Factor 4: Business Partnerships and Green Design	
1. Green Design <i>Does the project incorporate green streets/low-impact development principles, to address storm water runoff, energy conservation, low-water landscaping, and street trees?</i>	
The project fully integrates green streets/low-impact development principles in the project features.	High
The project includes some green streets/low-impact development principles into the project features	Medium
The project does not include any green streets/low-impact development principles into the project features	Low
2. Business and Civic Planning <i>Has the surrounding neighborhood or business district been actively involved in the project's development? Have economic development civic organizations endorsed the project as a priority for the community?</i>	
<u>Many</u> organizations were active participants in the planning process and have <u>publicly endorsed</u> the project.	High
<u>Some</u> organizations were involved in the planning process and <u>have supported</u> the project.	Medium
<u>Few</u> organizations were involved in the planning process but have <u>not yet endorsed</u> or support the project.	Low

3. Catalyst for near-term investment

If the project is implemented, are there specific increases in notable property investments or economic development activities that will result from private and/or public sectors? For example, is there evidence from business or property owners in the immediate area that the project will lead to private or public sector property investments in the near-term that would otherwise not occur?

The project is adjacent to near-term property investments or strongly supportive of economic development activities that <u>depend on this project's mobility investments</u> to be successful.	High
The project is <u>adjacent</u> to some property investments or strongly supportive of economic development activities that could be <u>potentially delayed but not abandoned</u> without the project.	Medium
The project is <u>not near</u> any significant near-term property investments.	Low

Outcome 5, Improve Goods Movement, Including Farm-To-Market Travel, In And Through The Region

A. Outcome Overview

The economic vitality of the Sacramento region is also dependent on the ability to transport consumer goods, which is critical to the viability of the manufacturing, distribution, and agricultural sectors. A region that has adequate goods movement infrastructure and is strategically located from a trade perspective can profit considerably from its ability to receive, sort, process and deliver goods and services quickly, inexpensively and effectively.

Rural transportation will need to be considered strategically for rural roads where transportation forecasts demand from agricultural-related workers and particularly heavier trucks and farm equipment. Heavy truck and equipment trips have greater impact on rural roads.

B. Example Projects:

[County of Yolo, "CR 98 Bike and Safety Improvement - Phase 2"](#)

\$1.59 million awarded in 2013

- This project would substantially improve goods movement, bicycle and pedestrian travel, and safety along this rural corridor that connects the City of Woodland with the City of Davis and University of California at Davis, and to I-80 in Solano County.
- The County of Yolo proposes to build this project in partnership with UC Davis, who has committed to providing the 11.47% local match for roadway improvements adjacent to campus lands.
- This project would provide enhanced mode choices by improving safety conditions for bicyclists traveling between the western portions of Woodland and Davis, including the Russell Blvd. multi-use path and the Hutchison Dr. bicycles lanes on the UC Davis campus.
- The project would improve the safety of a rural-to-urban-corridor that has a combination of high speed commute traffic, bicyclists, slow-speed farm equipment, farm to market trucking, and Cache Creek sourced aggregate materials trucking.

[County of Yuba, "Mathews Ln. and Ramirez Rd. Farm-to-Market Project"](#)

\$2.2 million awarded in 2013

- The project would repair pavement in poor condition along a route that requires reconstruction before agricultural trucks can use it.
- The project would cut agricultural trip distances by six miles by providing a more direct route to this area's rice dryers, and also eliminate the need for those trucks to drive through the City of Marysville.
- Complete streets elements include adding bicycle route signage, consistent with the Yuba County Bikeway Master Plan and the rural character of the roadway.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the

following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “high,” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Freight Networks	
1. State Freight Network	
<i>Project is <u>along the State Freight Network</u> (SFN) or directly serves a key facility identified in the State Freight Plan. Does the evidence demonstrate that the investment will have significant regional or inter-regional goods movement benefit?</i>	
SFN project has studies that show <u>significant</u> goods movement benefit.	High
SFN project has studies that show <u>some</u> goods movement benefit.	Medium
SFN project <u>does not</u> have studies that shows significant goods movement benefit.	Low
2. Non-State Freight Network	
<i>Project is <u>not along the State Freight Network</u> or directly serves a key facility identified in the State Freight Plan. Does the evidence demonstrate that the investment will have significant regional or inter-regional goods movement benefit?</i>	
Non-SFN project has studies that show <u>significant</u> goods movement benefit.	High
Non-SFN project has studies that show <u>some</u> goods movement benefit.	Medium
Non-SFN project <u>does not</u> have studies that shows significant goods movement benefit.	Low
3. Regional Goods Movement Corridor	
<i>Project is <u>along a Designated Trucking or Goods Movement Network corridor</u> from SACOG planning work and serves important destinations. Does the evidence demonstrate that the investment will have important goods movement benefits?</i>	
Truck route project has studies that show <u>significant</u> goods movement benefit.	High
Truck route project has studies that show <u>some</u> goods movement benefit.	Medium
Truck route project <u>does not</u> have studies that shows significant goods movement benefit.	Low
4. Locally Important Corridor	
<i>Project is <u>not along a Designated Trucking or Goods Movement Network</u> from SACOG planning work, but serves important needs. Does the evidence demonstrate that the investment will have important goods movement benefit?</i>	
Local goods movement project has studies that show <u>significant</u> goods movement benefit.	High
Local goods movement project has studies that show <u>some</u> goods movement benefit.	Medium
Local goods movement project <u>does not</u> have studies that shows significant goods movement benefit.	Low
5. Intermodal access	
<i>Does the project demonstrate it can resolve access issues and support intermodal connections, including First Mile-Last Mile challenges?</i>	
Project considers access issues and offers support intermodal connections with thorough documentation and evidence provided.	High
Project considers access issues and offers support intermodal connections, though limited documentation and evidence is provided.	Medium
Project has potential access problems that are not addressed and does not support intermodal connections	Low

Factor 2: Goods Movement Employment Areas	
1. Goods Movement to Jobs Areas	
<i>Does the project address a demonstrated goods movement need that will help the job center to prosper?</i>	
Goods movement/freight volumes to/from the jobs areas are high, and good evidence is provided that the project will solve a goods movement/freight problem.	High
Goods movement/freight activity in the project area is not high, or the evidence provided does not clearly demonstrate high activity. The project addresses an existing goods movement/freight problem, but the evidence is limited on whether the project will directly address a problem.	Medium
No information provided on the extent of goods movement/freight to/from the jobs areas served by the project. No evidence provided that the project will solve an existing goods movement/freight problem.	Low

Factor 3: Rural Goods Movement Investments	
1. Farm to Market High truck or commodity density	
<i>Does the project support Farm-to-Market travel by improving a corridor in an area with high truck and/or commodity densities?</i>	
Project <u>directly</u> supports Farm-to-Market travel by improving a corridor in an area with <u>high</u> truck and/or commodity densities	High
Project <u>indirectly</u> supports Farm-to-Market travel by improving a corridor in an area with <u>some</u> truck and/or commodity densities	Medium
Project <u>potentially</u> supports Farm-to-Market travel by improving a corridor in an area with <u>low</u> truck and/or commodity densities	Low
2. Ag processing or distribution access	
<i>Does the project support Farm-to-Market travel by improving access to an agriculture processing or distribution center?</i>	
Project <u>directly</u> supports Farm-to-Market travel by improving access <u>adjacent</u> to an agriculture processing or distribution center	High
Project <u>indirectly</u> supports Farm-to-Market travel by improving access <u>along routes</u> to an agriculture processing or distribution center	Medium
Project <u>potentially</u> supports Farm-to-Market travel by improving access <u>along routes</u> to an agriculture processing or distribution center	Low

Factor 4: Reduced Goods Movement Impacts	
1. Green Goods Movement	
<i>Does the project include good sustainability design features to reduce the impact of the goods movement improvement on the surrounding environment?</i>	
The project fully integrates sustainability design features and contextual considerations	High
The project includes some sustainability design features and contextual considerations	Medium
The project does not include sustainability design features	Low
2. Reduced truck impacts on roadway	
<i>Does the project include effective system maintenance strategies to minimize the projects impact? (eg. impact of heavier trucks on roadways)</i>	
Project fully considers system maintenance strategies to minimize the impacts of increased freight travel on the roadway. The investment is relatively large with positive impacts anticipated.	High
Project includes some maintenance strategies to minimize the impacts of increased freight	Medium

travel on the roadway, but the investment is modest or impacts unclear	
Project does not include system maintenance strategies to minimize the impacts of increased freight travel on the roadway	Low

Outcome 6, Significantly Improve Safety And Security

A. Outcome Overview

There are many aspects of the MTP/SCS that identify and allocate resources to improve the safety of the region’s transportation system as a means both to reduce risk for the region’s residents. The real contributing factors in crashes are often unclear, and it is hard to devise safety projects that will improve driver behavior. Data reporting is limited and planning efforts have only recently been increasing. Public agencies avoid identifying safety hazards to reduce lawsuit risk, which hampers safety programs.

There are significant investments in the MTP/SCS for safety and management strategies that create better driving conditions, provide improved facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, and reduce or prevent collisions and safety-related impacts. Incident management strategies can work on faster identification, quicker response and cleanup, and redirection of motorists to avoid the incident scene.

B. Example Projects:

[City of Folsom, “Green Valley Rd. Widening”](#)

\$3.5 million awarded in 2013

- The application provides solid documentation of congestion relief and safety benefits from the project.
- The roadway and bicycle capacity improvements described in the application are consistent with various plans. The relevant plans include SACOG’s Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan; the City of Folsom’s General Plan; and, the County of El Dorado’s General Plan.
- The project would increase bicycle travel and connectivity by closing a gap between the existing bicycle facilities in El Dorado County to the east, and at the East Natoma St. intersection to the west.
- The project would address safety concerns, such as documented collisions from cars crossing into opposing traffic, with improvements to the center median and to an evacuation route near Folsom Dam.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “high,” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Fatalities, Injuries, and Emergency Routing	
1. Fatalities and Injuries	
<i>Does your project address the causes of fatal or injury collisions in the area? Applicants should use Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) mapping and TIMS B/C Ratio tools to make the case.</i>	
TIMS B/C Ratio is <u>5 or greater</u> and project <u>targets collisions causes</u> shown on TIMS maps and local collision history in the project area.	High

TIMS B/C Ratio of <u>less than 5</u> and project <u>addresses most causes</u> shown on TIMS maps or local collision history in the project area.	Medium
TIMS B/C Ratio is <u>1 or less</u> and it is <u>unclear</u> if the project addresses any causes of collisions shown on TIMS maps or local collision history.	Low
2. Emergency Route	
<i>Does the project improve an existing emergency route or access to a care center as identified by the county OES?</i>	
The project <u>creates a new emergency route</u> or access to a care center as identified by the county OES.	High
The project <u>improves an existing emergency route</u> or access to a care center as identified by the county OES.	Medium
The project <u>indirectly improves an existing emergency route</u> or access to a care center as identified by the county OES.	Low

Factor 2: Public Place making / Safety in numbers

1. Public Place making / Safety in numbers

Does the project improve living space to invite more "eyes" to provide enhanced security?

The project <u>creates new</u> public seating or walking spaces to increase foot traffic and security.	High
The project <u>improves</u> security with modest amenities and relies on security patrols and CCTV.	Medium
The project <u>does little</u> to enhance security either through place making or automated security features.	Low

2. Planning & Audits

Were the projects security elements planned through well facilitated public planning processes or representative surveys?

Project directly addresses issues raised through <u>surveys or during well facilitated public workshops</u> that identified security issues.	High
Project addresses <u>some</u> security issues raised during <u>public comment periods</u> for project review.	Medium
Project <u>loosely addresses</u> security issues identified through <u>staff or consultant observations only</u> .	Low

Outcome 7, Demonstrate “State Of Good Repair” Benefits That Improve The Efficiency Of The Existing Transportation System

A. Outcome Overview

The MTP/SCS prioritizes preservation of the existing transportation system when making investment decisions with revenues that can be used for maintenance and rehabilitation purposes. The 2012 MTP/SCS prioritizes road maintenance and rehabilitation and transit services while reducing future road capacity expenditures by more than 30 percent from the 2008 MTP.

This Outcome is broken out into two sections. Respond to the Factors relevant to the project type.

Complete Streets Pavement Rehabilitation:

Resources for road maintenance do not keep pace with escalating costs and there continues to be a shortfall for road maintenance and rehabilitation. SACOG estimates that an additional \$110 million annually over the course of the MTP/SCS plan period would be needed to raise the region’s average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for local roads and bicycle/pedestrian facilities from the at-risk range to the good/excellent condition range. Funding constraints for road maintenance and rehabilitation can also mean missed opportunities in the region for developing more complete streets.

B. Example Complete Streets Projects:

[City of Yuba City, “Feather River Bridge at 5th St.”](#)

\$17.1 million awarded in 2013

- The purpose of the project is to replace a functionally-obsolete, seismic- and structurally-deficient bridge, which would, in turn, reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce congestion, and maintain a state of good repair.
- The application provides good documentation on how this is a regionally significant investment with strong performance outcomes. Strong multi-agency support is evident from the cities of Marysville and Yuba City and the counties of Sutter and Yuba.
- The project would create a modern, safer, and reliable river crossing to improve regional connectivity between SR 99 and SR 70/65, improving one of only two crossings across the Feather River between the cities of Yuba City and Marysville.
- The project would improve the regional transportation and circulation system, including improving emergency response times to the area’s only trauma center in Marysville.
- The project would also improve transit services, as Yuba-Sutter Transit does not currently operate fixed route services over the bridge due to the narrow bridge width and awkward approaches.
- This project would make bicycle and pedestrian improvements and provide users with a separated multi-use path with a minimal grade, making walking and biking easier, accessible, and more convenient.
- The project is being coordinated with state levee work that will replace stop logs

with new flood walls that will allow 5th St. to serve as an evacuation route during a 200-year flood event.

City of Woodland, “Kentucky Ave. Complete Streets Project”

\$11 million awarded in 2013

- This project would help maintain Kentucky Ave. in a "state of good repair," funded in part with a local sales tax measure for pavement maintenance.
- The project would offer many well-designed complete streets features that accommodate non-motorized travel in an area that currently does not support safe travel for pedestrians or cyclists.
- The project would serve to maintain a key east/west farm to market route, one of the few in the city, while interfacing with an existing neighborhood and abutting vacant lots that could be developed.
- This project is adjacent to environmental justice areas identified by SACOG where 45% or more of the population earns 200% or less of the federal poverty level.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank “high” “high,” “medium,” and “low” for each question.

Factor 1: Asset Management Systems, Policies, and Strategy	
1. Updated Asset Management Systems	
<i>Has your Pavement Management System been updated in the last 2 to 5 years?</i>	
Local agency PMS updated in the <u>last 2 years</u> by recently trained staff or consultants.	High
Local agency PMS updated in the <u>last 5 years</u> by trained staff or consultants.	Medium
Local agency PMS updated <u>over 5 years ago</u> by consultants.	Low
2. Projected Shortfall Strategy	
<i>Assuming that your agency has a pavement rehabilitation shortfall, does your agency have a strategy to overcome this shortfall?</i>	
The agency has <u>clear plans</u> to address the pavement rehabilitation shortfall over the <u>next 10 years</u> .	High
The agency <u>understands</u> our pavement rehabilitation shortfall and could <u>potentially</u> address it over the <u>next 20 years</u> .	Medium
The agency does <u>not understand</u> its pavement rehabilitation shortfall and has <u>no plans</u> to address it over any period of time.	Low
3. Other funding pursued	
<i>Is the agency pursuing new local funding sources, such as local sales tax measures, to address pavement rehabilitation needs?</i>	
The agency is <u>pursuing many</u> new local funding sources, such as sales taxes, as demonstrated by past attempts or new public initiatives.	High
The agency is <u>considering</u> many new local funding sources, such as sales taxes, as demonstrated by public polling or draft expenditure plans.	Medium
The agency is <u>hesitant</u> to consider any new local funding sources, such as sales taxes, and will <u>rely on outside grants or state policy</u> .	Low

Factor 2: Complete Streets & Corridors Planning	
1. Complete Streets & Corridors	
<i>Project completes a street that includes context-sensitive street treatments appropriate to increase multi-modal travel along the corridor, as planned between city/county and transit operators.</i>	
Project includes <u>many new</u> complete street elements <u>leaving no foreseen additional improvements</u> in mobility for future projects.	High
Project includes <u>a number of complete street elements</u> , while additional investments could be completed <u>later</u> .	Medium
Project includes <u>few</u> complete street elements, leaving <u>future investments</u> in multimodal travel to other projects.	Low
2. Complete Streets & Corridors PW & Transit planning	
<i>Project completes a street that includes context-sensitive street treatments appropriate to increase multi-modal travel along the corridor, as planned between city/county and transit operators.</i>	
Project includes <u>many new</u> complete street elements addressing bike/ped and transit modes <u>as planned between city/county and transit operator staff</u> .	High
Project includes <u>a number of complete street elements</u> , that complements existing bike/ped/transit modes in <u>coordination</u> between city/county and transit operator staff.	Medium
Project includes <u>few</u> complete street elements, that <u>do not invest in improvements</u> listed in adopted bike/ped/transit improvement plans with <u>little coordination</u> between city/county and transit operator staff.	Low
3. Innovative Practices & preventative maintenance	
<i>Does the project use innovative pavement rehabilitation or preventative maintenance treatments to cost effectively extend the life of existing assets?</i>	
Project uses cold-in-place recycling, full depth reclamation, or rubberized asphalt to reduce costs or increase pavement longevity.	High
Project uses preventative maintenance treatments such as slurry seals or microsurfacing to extend the life of existing pavement.	Medium
Project uses expensive pavement rehabilitation treatments for failed roadways, such as reconstruction.	Low

Factor 3: Pavement Condition and Emergency Needs	
1. Road Reconstruction on High Volume Roadway	
<i>Project area experiences high average annual daily traffic and has low pavement condition requiring extensive roadway reconstruction activities.</i>	
Project has very low Pavement Conditions requiring street reconstruction and experiences high levels of regional traffic.	High
Project has very low Pavement Conditions that will likely require street reconstruction and experiences high levels of traffic relative to the surrounding community.	Medium
Project has relatively low pavement conditions that may require street reconstruction and experiences moderate traffic levels relative to the surrounding community.	Low

Transit Asset Management:

A. Outcome Overview

The region’s current fleet of nearly 400 transit buses, with a 14-year assumed service life, will need to be replaced twice over the next 25 years at an estimated cost of \$450,000 per

bus, totaling more than \$460 million. But Transit Asset Management is not just about purchasing vehicles, it's also about efficient planning. Increased operational efficiencies are a key aspect of the MTP/SCS in addressing the transit operations funding challenge. Already, the region's transit operators are approaching service restoration and expansion plans with an eye to prioritizing productive routes, such as Sacramento RT's 2012 comprehensive operational analysis, TransitAction Plan, to plan service restorations over the coming years in order to reflect a greater emphasis on corridors with transit-supportive land uses.

B. Example Transit Projects:

[Yolo County Transportation District, "Rehabilitate and re-tank CNG buses"](#)

\$783,000 awarded in 2013

- This project helps maintain a "State of Good Repair" for transit fleets.
- The benefits of the project would include reducing congestion, improving air quality, and offering more access and mobility options in Yolo County, with co-benefits also provided to Sacramento County because of the Yolobus services offered to downtown Sacramento and to the Sacramento International Airport.

C. Address All Factors and Sub-factors

Describe how your proposed project supports this outcome by addressing each of the following questions about the proposed project. For your information, we have provided a description of projects that would rank "high" "high," "medium," and "low" for each question.

Factor 1: Transit Planning and Asset Management	
1. Transit SRTP updates	
<i>Does your agency have an updated SRTP and/or CIP that informs your current and future fleet operating challenges?</i>	
The SRTP/CIP was <u>updated in the last 3 years</u> and <u>realistically</u> addresses today's operating environment and frequently informs assumptions of the 10-year fleet management plan.	High
The SRTP/CIP was <u>updated in the last 5 years</u> . <u>Some</u> assumptions no longer represent today's operating environment and occasionally helps inform some basic assumptions of the 10-year fleet management plan.	Medium
The SRTP/CIP was approved <u>over 5 years ago</u> . <u>Many</u> of its assumptions no longer represent today's operating environment and rarely informs updates of the 10-year fleet management plan.	Low
2. Transit 10-Year Fleet Plan updates	
<i>Does your agency have an up-to-date 10 year capital and operations plan as required under the SACOG TDA Guidelines? If so, please enter the date of your most recent 10 year plan.</i>	
The 10-year Fleet Replacement Plan was updated in <u>the last year</u> and <u>realistically</u> addresses today's operating environment.	High
The 10-year Fleet Replacement Plan was updated in <u>the last 2 years</u> and <u>some assumptions</u> no longer represent today's operating environment.	Medium
The 10-year Fleet Replacement Plan was approved <u>over 2 years ago</u> and many of its assumptions no longer represent today's operating environment.	Low

3. Transit Asset Management Practices	
<i>Is your agency currently implementing/practicing asset management processes as recommended by FTA? If so, please briefly describe these efforts.</i>	
Our agency <u>routinely practices</u> FTA recommended transit asset management practices as described in <u>recent studies and guidance documents</u> .	High
Our agency <u>often practices</u> FTA recommended transit asset management practices and has <u>plans to fully implement</u> them in the near future.	Medium
Our agency <u>plans to comply</u> with potential FTA regulations that could mandate asset management practices, should new FTA rule making occur.	Low
4. Dependence on Competitive SACOG Funds	
<i>Does your agency's SRTP and/or CIP identify sufficient non-SACOG funding sources for transit fleet replacement needs? If not, state the projected SACOG funding needs for capital or operating costs.</i>	
The SRTP/CIP <u>minimizes the need</u> for competitive SACOG funding to maintain existing service levels and reasonable spare ratios.	High
The SRTP/CIP <u>depends on some</u> competitive SACOG funding to maintain existing service levels and reasonable spare ratios.	Medium
The SRTP/CIP <u>depends heavily</u> on securing competitive SACOG funding to maintain existing service levels and reasonable spare ratios.	Low
5. Pursue other funds	
<i>What other funding sources does your agency pursue to fund the type of proposed transit project?</i>	
Our agency <u>receives</u> other dedicated local tax dollars and we pursue other grants for transit capital, maintenance, and operations.	High
Our agency is <u>pursuing</u> other grant sources to help fund some transit capital, maintenance, or operating costs.	Medium
Our agency has <u>no plans</u> to pursue other funding at this time for transit capital, maintenance, or operating costs.	Low

Factor 2: Transit Service Maintenance & Fleet Information	
1. Spare Ratio	
<i>Does the project allow the applicant to maintain a reasonable spare ratio at or below 20% in order to continue to provide the current levels of service?</i>	
This project will <u>improve</u> our fleet's spare ratio (if under 20%) and <u>improve</u> current levels of service.	High
This project will <u>maintain</u> (or improve if under 20%) our fleet's spare ratio and <u>maintain</u> current levels of service.	Medium
This project is <u>only part of a larger strategy</u> to maintain (or improve if under 20%) our fleet's spare ratio and is <u>unrelated</u> to current levels of service.	Low
2. Transit Vehicle road calls	
<i>For vehicles included in the project request, how do you monitor their incidences of repair road calls (miles between calls per bus per year) and how do these measurements compare to the rest of your fleet?</i>	
The vehicles included in the project experience road calls <u>far more often</u> when compared to the rest of the fleet or <u>other operator's fleets</u> in the region.	High
The vehicles included in the project experience road calls far <u>more often</u> than the rest of the fleet.	Medium

The vehicles included in the project experience road calls in amounts <u>similar</u> to the rest of the fleet.	Low
3. Useful life <i>Have they met or exceeded their FTA defined useful life? And/Or are their CNG tanks expiring?</i>	
Vehicles to be addressed by the project have <u>exceeded</u> their useful life and/or CNG tanks will <u>expire in 2-3 years</u> .	High
Vehicles to be addressed by the project have <u>met their useful life</u> and/or CNG tanks will expire in <u>4-6 years</u> .	Medium
Vehicles to be addressed by the project have <u>remaining years</u> of useful life and/or CNG tanks will <u>expire in 7 years</u> .	Low