



Regional Planning Partnership

March 19, 2014

SACOG Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines

Issue: SACOG is working with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) on a new six-county regional active transportation program (ATP).

Recommendation: That the Regional Planning Partnership recommend that the Transportation Committee recommend that SACOG Board approve the draft ATP guidelines for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) funding round and authorize staff to submit the guidelines to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for action, and upon action of the CTC, authorize the Chief Executive Officer to issue the Call for Projects.

Discussion: Pursuant to the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 99, the CTC has developed draft guidelines for the ATP. Beginning in October 2013, the CTC conducted extensive outreach to develop the guidelines, utilizing public work group meetings, subgroups, and public hearings. The ATP combines many federal and state funding streams previously used for bicycle, pedestrian, safety, and other related purposes into one funding stream with broad eligibilities. At the February Transportation Committee, staff introduced the ATP with an overview of the draft statewide guidelines, and in March shared draft MPO guidelines along with recommended scoring criteria and application questions.

The purpose of the ATP is to accomplish the following goals:

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

RPP Input

Staff is seeking the RPP's recommendation on the draft final ATP guidelines, scoring, and application questions for the six-county MPO region. The draft MPO-specific guidelines utilize the option to customize the statewide ATP guidelines and scoring criteria to best meet regional needs for a six-county MPO program. SACOG staff has been collaborating with our El Dorado and Placer Regional Transportation Planning Agency partners (Regional ATP Team) on the development of the guidelines and will continue to work together to conduct a supplemental MPO-specific call for projects. Any modifications to the state guidelines

and scoring criteria by MPOs are subject to CTC approval or rejection. Below is a description of the changes to the MPO guidelines. Following the March RPP meeting, the draft final guidelines will be submitted to the Transportation Committee in April to recommend that the Board of Directors release the guidelines and a call for projects.

Attachment A—The Regional ATP Team recommends sharpening the focus of the State ATP guidelines in order to best meet our regional needs. The guidelines are consistent with previous SACOG funding round practices and policies. RPP recommendation is requested.

Attachment B—The Regional ATP Team recommends slight modifications to the State ATP scoring criteria and weighting for the MPO funding round. The modifications increase consistency with RTPA funding program guidelines in the region. RPP recommendation is requested.

Attachment C—The Regional ATP Team recommends requesting applicants to fill out a supplemental application for the MPO funding round in addition to the State ATP application. The questions are designed to support the guidelines and target strong performance outcome objectives. RPP feedback is requested.

Fund Estimate

The fund estimate for the ATP approximates that \$179,550,000 will be available through a statewide competitive funding program that is anticipated to start with a call for projects on March 21 and applications due on May 21. Prescribed within the guidelines are dates and actions that MPOs can take if they choose to conduct a supplemental MPO-specific call for projects. SACOG's six-county regional share is approximately \$9,600,000 for programming in state fiscal years 14/15-15/16. Projects that are unsuccessful for statewide funds will be considered through the regional program.

MM:RDO:LSH:gg
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Renée DeVere-Oki, Team Manager of Programming and Project Delivery, (916) 340-6219
Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Team Manager of Active Transportation, (916) 340-6212

DRAFT 2014 6-COUNTY REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

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

In order to help implement active transportation projects in the six-county region, EDCTC, PCTPA, and SACOG invest regional funds regularly for infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects. ATP funds from the State of California provide an important new funding source for active transportation projects.

PROGRAM GOALS

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

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

ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

The infrastructure projects eligible for this funding program are largely derived from the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan) that is amended every two years, with the last update in June 2013. The Master Plan provides an expansive set of policies and projects for regional bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts across the six-county SACOG region, and was developed through a working group and approved by the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and SACOG Board of Directors. Additionally, bicycle and pedestrian projects included in the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for EDCTC or PCTPA are also eligible. Projects must support the performance outcomes identified in the sections below.

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

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

INELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

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

PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A Regional ATP Team comprised of representatives from the three involved regional transportation planning Agencies (RTPAs) in the region (EDCTC, PCTPA, SACOG)

will screen applications for eligibility. Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible based on the guidelines below. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition, but deemed eligible for the state program will be considered; applicants will be encouraged to submit a supplemental application.

Next, the Regional ATP Team forwards the eligible applications to the ATP Working Group (see below for the composition of this Group). The Working Group then prioritizes and ranks the applications, according to its own process, but does not discard any applications. Working Group members will not vote or comment on applications from their own organizations. The Working Group and/or Regional ATP Team staff reserves the right to contact applicants during this project selection process for additional information. The Working Group makes its recommendations to the Regional ATP Team. The Work Group will be multidisciplinary in nature and members should represent diverse geography. One Regional ATP Team representative from EDCTC, PCTPA and SACOG will participate on the Working Group.

Working Group Membership

Expertise	Recruited from	Number
Land Use Planners	Planners’ Committee	1
Project Engineers	Regional Planning Partnership	2
Bicycle/ Pedestrian Planning	Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee	4 (2 advocates, 2 planners/ engineers)
Air Quality	Air Districts	1
Public Health	Public Health Organization	1
Transit	Transit Coordinating Committee	1
Community Groups	Regional Community Based Organizations	1
Total		11

The application process will be specific to the ATP. The Regional ATP Team in conjunction with the ATP Working Group will go through the ranking process to insure that 25% of available funds are dedicated to projects and programs benefiting Disadvantaged Communities as identified in the State Guidelines. Following this step, the projects will ranked on a 95 point scale without the 10 points for the Disadvantaged Communities criteria. Projects will be ranked and selected for the remaining 75% of funding utilizing both lists for reference. Discretion will be placed on the Working Group and Regional ATP team to select a comprehensive package of projects.

PROJECT SCREENING

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

1. **Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Master Plan or the Regional Transportation Plan for EDCTC or PCTPA.** Only under special circumstances will an application be considered that is not listed in one of these sources.
2. **Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility requirements identified in the preceding section.**
3. **Project must be ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.** The project application may include the cost of preparing environmental documents. When project design, right-of-way or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the projects cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project’s ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to appropriate RTPA (EDCTC, PCTPA, or SACOG) following completion of the environmental process for re-evaluation.
4. **Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources** (i.e. TAP, HSIP, State Highway Account funds, Recreation Trails).

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

- a. Infrastructure project minimum is \$278,675 (\$250,000 funding request + \$28,675 local match). The infrastructure maximum project request is \$3 million, but there is no maximum total project cost.
- b. Non-Infrastructure project minimum is \$55,735 (\$50,000 funding request + \$5,735 local match).
- c. Public agencies applying for funding for smaller projects may want to consider combining projects to meet the project minimum thresholds, or consider a larger, multi-year program or project.

6. Public Participation & Planning. Project applicant must clearly demonstrate how a community-based public participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project. Inclusion of relevant notices and materials.

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

8. Projects are not part of developer-funded basic good practices.

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

PROJECT SCORING

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

Project Performance Outcomes (0-95 points)

- 1. Project has potential to increase walking and bicycling through targeted strategies: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities. **0-30 points**
- 2. Project has the potential to reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries. **0-25 points**
- 3. Project improves public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues. **0-10 points**
- 4. Project demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits. **0-10 points**
- 5. Project provides benefit to a disadvantaged community and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community. **0-10 points** (Please reference the project selection process section.)
- 6. Project advances active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reducing or shortening vehicle trips today and over time, as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391. **0-10 points**

Other Considerations (0-10 points)

- 7. Performance on Past Grants and/or Federal Aid Projects. Applications from agencies with good performance on delivering prior projects or programs are most likely to succeed with an ATP project award.
- 8. Project sponsor demonstrates readiness to move forward on a timely schedule with the

proposed project (i.e. application provides clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project).

9. Project applicant demonstrates evidence of strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located.

Program Criteria	State Scoring Description	Recommended Supplemental MPO Changes	State Scoring Range	MPO Scoring Range
Increasing Walking and Bicycling	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of non-motorized users.	Scoring focuses on how well the project supports approved performance measures: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities	0-30	0-30
Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries	Potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Scoring emphasizes providing data to demonstrate benefits	0-25	0-25
Cost Effectiveness	Project's relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered. Quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided.	Scoring focuses on demonstrated cost effectiveness achieved by minimizing projected capital and ongoing operating costs while offering strong performance benefits and the leveraging of resources.	0-10	0-10
Improved Public Health	Project demonstrates improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.	Scoring is on the same focus areas.	0-10	0-10
Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities*	Project demonstrate benefits to disadvantaged communities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • median household income < 80% of the statewide median • among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state • at least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP 	Scoring is on the same focus areas.	0-10	0-10
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals in SB 375 and SB 391	Project advances the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and SB 391 (C585, §2009);	Scoring focuses on projects demonstrating utilitarian purposes and placemaking strategies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reduced or shortened vehicle trips	0	0-10
Public participation and planning	Project demonstrates that a community-based public participation process culminated in the project proposal. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.	Scoring for Other Considerations for funding include past performance on projects, demonstrated project delivery readiness in the application, and evidence of strong stakeholder support to implement the project.	0-15	0-10 (other considerations)
California Conservation Corps (CCC)	Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code.		-5-0 (point deduction)	
Performance on past grants	Applicant's performance on past grants.		-10-0 (point deduction)	
TOTAL SCORING			100	105
*TOTAL SCORING AFTER REACHING 25 % FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES				95

DRAFT MPO Supplemental Questions

Please respond to the supplemental questions for the MPO funding round. Information provided in your State ATP application may substantially address these questions so cross-references to the relevant material is encouraged. Please attach the project application from the State ATP funding round.

Maximum 10 pages for supplemental application, including relevant material taken from your State ATP application.

1. Goal: Increase walking and bikingSupplemental Application Questions:*Infrastructure projects*

Please describe how the project supports one or more of these outcomes relate to increased walking and biking:

- A. Increased access to transit services. Will the proposed project increase bicycle and pedestrian access to transit stops and transfer centers? The FTA's policy identifies pedestrian catchment areas as within a one-half mile radius around transit stops and stations, and a bicycle catchment area as within a three mile radius. Please use FTA's guidance to illustrate this project's support for public transit.
- B. Increased access to schools. Will the proposed project increase bicycle and pedestrian access to schools? Please demonstrate this by including documentation that the school(s) is supportive of and involved in this project. (If the proposed project is the result of a school site needs assessment, site assessment, or walk audit, please include information about how the need for the project was identified).
- C. Eliminated gaps in the existing bicycle/pedestrian network. Will the proposed project help form complete bicycle and pedestrian networks, enabling bicyclists and pedestrians to travel on a continuous network? Please specify any known issues concerning the gap(s) in the network.
- D. Removed physical barriers in the bicycle and pedestrian network. Will the proposed project remove physical barriers, using grade-separated crossings when appropriate, to complete the bicycle and pedestrian network and enable through travel by bicyclists and pedestrians? Please specify the need for removal of this physical barrier.
- E. Facility completion. Will the project "complete" a street or corridor by adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities (e.g., pathways, lanes, shoulders, crossings, and sidewalks) in areas with high existing or potential transportation use? Please specify why these treatments are appropriate for the facility and community, and how.

Non- Infrastructure projects

Please describe how your project supports one or more of the outcomes described above through strategies, such as: public information, education, training, and awareness, or studies or plans that offer relevant data and analysis.

2. Goal: Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries

Supplemental Application Questions:

Please use available data to the greatest extent possible in demonstrate how the project will provide the safety benefits described in the State Guidelines. Data includes utilizing SACOG or State SWITTERS database.

3. Goal: Cost Effectiveness

Supplemental Application Questions:

Infrastructure Projects

- A. Please describe any alternatives to the proposed project that have been analyzed and provide similar benefits. What are the relative costs of these alternatives to the proposed project?
- B. Are other revenue sources being leveraged to build the proposed project? What is the funding source? Are these revenues fully secured?
- C. What are the projected lifecycle (eg. operations and maintenance) costs? Have revenues been secured to cover these expenses? Are agreements and/or commitments in place with the responsible organization/department?

Non- Infrastructure Projects

- A. Please describe any alternatives to the proposed project that have been analyzed and provide similar benefits? What are the relative costs of these alternatives to the proposed project?
- B. If the program is anticipated to be an ongoing activity, have revenues been secured to cover ongoing expenses? Are agreements and/or commitments in place with the responsible organization/department?
- C. Are other revenues or in-kind (non-revenue) resources being leveraged to implement the proposed program? Are these revenues or in-kind resources secured.

- D. If you include walking or bicycling benefits of specific groups (eg. students, transit riders, disadvantaged communities) in your cost-effectiveness calculations, please describe how you engaged these groups in the public planning process.

4. Goal: Improve Public Health

Supplemental Application Questions:

Please use relevant data to the greatest extent possible in demonstrate how the project will improve public health through the targeting of populations who have a high risk factor for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues. Data includes: air quality levels, travel modes, obesity rates, other?

5. Goal: Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities

Supplemental Application Questions:

Please use the maps provided and any additional data to demonstrate the project supports a disadvantaged community as described in the guidelines.

6. Goal: Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals in SB 375 and SB 391

Supplemental Application Questions:

- A. Please demonstrate that the project is in an area where it can immediately serve utilitarian purposes (eg. trips to school, work, shopping) that have the potential to replace or shorten vehicle trips.
- B. Please demonstrate that the project is a placemaking strategy for the future land use and transportation vision for the local area it is located, as described in the MTP/RTP and/or the local general/specific plan. Placemaking is defined as a combination of strategies (eg. zoning, context-sensitive design standards, planned infrastructure, etc.) that lead to a built environment where walking and biking can become a primary mode for shorter distance trips.

7. Other Considerations

Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure Projects:

No additional questions proposed – evaluation is done through review of full application and informed by background information on project sponsors.

- A. Good Performance on Past Grants and/or Federal Aid Projects. Project sponsors with good performance on delivering prior projects or programs are most likely to succeed with an ATP project award.
- B. Project sponsor demonstrates readiness to move forward on a timely schedule with the proposed project (i.e. application provides clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project).
- C. Project applicant demonstrates evidence of strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located. Documentation of a thorough community-based public participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project is a means of demonstrating support for the implementation of the project. The level of support for the project can also be demonstrated through identifying external resources committed to the project and evidence that specific users targeted to use the project were fully engaged throughout the planning process.