



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

Item #15-9-3 Information

August 21, 2015

Preliminary Rank of Regional Active Transportation Program Projects

Issue: What is the preliminary ranking of projects competing for 2015 Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds?

Recommendation: This item is for information and discussion purposes in advance of the final 2015 Regional ATP funding recommendations being released in October.

Discussion: Pursuant to the passage of Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101, the Active Transportation Program (ATP) was created and is being administered by Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC). 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. Approximately \$359 million has been budgeted for ATP Cycle 2 across the state for the three-year period beginning with fiscal year (FY) 2017 and ending with FY 2019. Per statewide ATP guidelines, the goals of the ATP are to:

- 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.

All ATP funds are distributed competitively, with 50 percent of the funds channeled through a statewide competitive program, 10 percent through small urban and rural regions with populations of 200,000 or less, and the final 40 percent being distributed through metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000, such as the SACOG six-county region.

State ATP

Fifty percent of the ATP funding available over the next three years (\$180 million) is in the process of being competitively awarded for projects selected by the CTC on a statewide basis. In the SACOG region, 37 applications were submitted, requesting \$61 million in funds. The CTC expects to release their funding recommendations for the State ATP Cycle 2 competition on September 15, 2015. Despite submitting eight fewer applications to the state competition, the average request for State ATP funds was \$1.6 million per project, a significant jump from the region's average project request of \$1 million per project in Cycle 1.

Following the announcement of the State ATP recommendations, SACOG staff will update for the September 17 Board meeting the preliminary ranked list of projects (Attachment A) still competing for Regional ATP funding. The region collectively requested approximately \$13 million more in Cycle 2 than in Cycle 1.

2015 Regional ATP Process

As the MPO, SACOG is responsible for the selection and recommendation of \$9.6 million in ATP projects within the six-county region. The Regional ATP is implemented collaboratively between SACOG, El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA).

Following the process pioneered in ATP Cycle 1, staff examined how best to build on the State ATP application process to allow local agency staff to submit supplemental materials in support of projects also competing for Regional ATP funds, rather than entirely new applications. Additionally, staff explored possibilities to streamline the Regional ATP call for projects and evaluation process with the anticipated Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program in response to local agency discussions following ATP Cycle 1. Building on input from Board committees in February 2015, staff developed policy frameworks that could implement a joint call for projects while retaining unique funding program elements related to regional policies and goals.

Board engagement on development of the Regional ATP framework culminated in the approval of the Regional ATP framework (Attachment B) by the SACOG Board and the CTC. The six-county call for projects was issued May 28, 2015, with applications due June 19, 2015.

Regional ATP Project Applications, Evaluation and Preliminary Ranking

A total of 41 applications were received through the Regional ATP call for projects, requesting over \$62 million. Seventeen agencies were able to take advantage of the streamlined process by submitting materials to supplement their State ATP applications for 36 projects. An additional five projects were submitted directly to the Regional ATP without first competing in the State ATP.

All project applications were screened for eligibility by SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA staff using the criteria identified in the Regional ATP Framework. All projects submitted were deemed eligible to compete for funding and were referred to the 11-member multidisciplinary Active Transportation Working Group (Working Group) for evaluation. The Working Group was comprised of geographically diverse volunteers with expertise in bicycle and pedestrian transportation, engineering, public health, Safe Routes to School, transit, air quality, community groups, and land use planning (Attachment C), and facilitated by a non-voting SACOG staff person.

The Working Group was charged with developing a preliminary ranked list of projects based on the Board-approved policy direction and the implementing scoring criteria. Each project was reviewed by eight Working Group members, with each application being reviewed by at least one Working Group member with each of the following expertise areas: bike/ped planning and engineering, advocacy and outreach, and project engineering. Each project was discussed by the Working Group to establish strengths, weaknesses, and clarifying questions for the project sponsors; the Working Group facilitator relayed questions to project sponsors by email and received responses through scheduled phone interviews. The facilitator documented the responses from the phone interviews and provided written summaries to the Working Group to use in developing final project scores.

Average project scores were generated by gathering the eight final scores, omitting the high and low scores for each project, and averaging the remaining six scores. In the event that projects received the same numeric score, the Working Group ranked the tied projects to create an order of priority. The resulting preliminary

ranked list (Attachment A) was unanimously approved by the Working Group and prioritizes the submitted projects for the Regional ATP funding recommendation following the release of the State ATP funding recommendation on September 15th.

Developing the Final Regional ATP Funding Recommendation

Staff will use the preliminary ranked list to develop the final Regional ATP Funding Recommendation after accounting for any projects awarded funds through the State ATP. SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA staff will verify that the final funding recommendation complies with statewide ATP requirements that a minimum of \$2.4 million (one quarter of the regional share) is recommended towards projects that benefit a disadvantaged community as defined by the statewide ATP guidelines.

In order to utilize all funding available through the Regional ATP and diminish the risk of losing regional funds, staff will work with sponsors of the top-ranked projects to program Regional ATP funding efficiently. Projects will be fully funded to the greatest extent possible, although inadequate funds may prohibit projects near the \$9.6 million cut-off from being recommended for full funding. In this event, staff would recommend partially funding projects, either for early phases of project development or for reduced-scope projects as voluntarily described in the regional applications. As a final measure to utilize all available Regional ATP funding, staff would consider eliminating the local match on top-ranked projects, which was required regionally but not in the statewide ATP guidelines.

A contingent project list will also be included with the final funding recommendation, based on the next projects from the ranked project list, in the event of delivery failure by any of the recommended projects. This approach is consistent with Cycle 1. If a recommended project is unable to allocate the awarded funds within the timeframe identified by the CTC or to obtain an extension, a project on the contingency list would receive ATP funds in its place. In this instance, the project that failed to meet its delivery timeline would forfeit their ATP funds and would have to compete again to receive funds from the ATP or any other funding source. Inclusion on the contingent list would not guarantee funding. Unless receiving funds as a contingency, projects on the list would need to re-compete in future ATP cycles or other funding rounds to receive funds. The contingent list would expire after the approval of ATP Cycle 3 projects.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RDO:VC:ts

Attachments: A - Ranked List of Regional ATP Projects with Scoring Details
B - Approved Regional ATP Framework
C - Active Transportation Working Group Roster

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247
Reneé DeVere-Okie, Team Manager of Programming & Project Delivery, (916) 340-6219
Victoria S. Cacciatore, Project Coordinator of Active Transportation, (916) 340-6214

Preliminary Ranked List of Regional ATP Projects with Scoring Details

Lead Agency	Title	Request	Recommended for State ATP funding?	Average Score	Rank	Benefits a DAC?*	Submitted an application to State ATP?
City of Sacramento	North 12th Complete Street	\$3,610,000	TBD	80	1	Yes	Yes
City of Rancho Cordova	Rod Beaudry - Routier Bikeway Project	\$1,814,719	TBD	72	2	Yes	Yes
Sacramento County	Power Inn Road Sidewalk Improvements	\$2,088,000	TBD	70	3	Yes	Yes
Sacramento County	Thomas Edison Elementary Safe Routes to School – Hurley Way and Morse Avenue	\$1,278,000	TBD	69	4	Yes	Yes
City of Rancho Cordova	Stone Creek Trail Pedestrian Signals at Kilgore Rd and Zinfandel Dr	\$442,000	TBD	68	5	No	Yes
City of Woodland	West Woodland Safe Routes to School	\$1,592,000	TBD	66	6	Yes	Yes
Town of Loomis	Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan - Phase 2	\$1,436,000	TBD	66	7	No	Yes
City of Placerville	Upper Broadway Bike Lanes Project	\$1,792,000	TBD	65	8	No	Yes
City of Sacramento	Del Rio Trail	\$2,213,000	TBD	65	9	No	Yes
City of Folsom	Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail	\$1,048,036	N/A	65	10	No	No
City of Elk Grove	Laguna Creek Trail and Bruceville Road SRTS Improvements	\$1,837,000	TBD	65	11	Yes	Yes
City of Sacramento	D. W. Babcock School ATP	\$1,963,000	TBD	65	12	Yes	Yes
City of Yuba City	Franklin Ave Pedestrian Improvements	\$376,188	TBD	64	13	Yes	Yes
City of Sacramento	Franklin Boulevard Cycle Track	\$2,028,000	TBD	64	14	No	Yes
City of Sacramento	Northwood Elementary ATP	\$3,185,000	TBD	64	15	Yes	Yes
Sacramento County	Hazel Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	\$1,239,000	TBD	64	16	No	Yes
Yuba County	Seventh Avenue Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements	\$849,000	TBD	63	17	Yes	Yes
City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Trail Phases 2 & 3	\$6,965,000	TBD	63	18	Yes	Yes
City of West Sacramento	Clarksburg Branch Line Trail	\$1,484,000	TBD	62	19	No	Yes
Sacramento County	Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project	\$1,485,000	N/A	62	20	No	No
City of Elk Grove	SAFE (Streets are For Everyone!) Routes to School Project	\$601,000	TBD	61	21	No	Yes
El Dorado County	Cameron Park- Merrychase & Country Club Drive Ped/Bike Improvements	\$793,390	TBD	61	22	No	Yes
Yuba County	McGowan Parkway Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements	\$1,204,000	TBD	61	23	Yes	Yes
City of Placerville	Placerville Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project	\$250,000	TBD	59	24	Yes	Yes
El Dorado County	EDH-El Dorado Hills Boulevard Class I Bike Path	\$942,961	TBD	59	25	No	Yes
El Dorado County	Placerville- U.S. Highway 50/Weber Creek Class I Bike Path	\$1,068,529	TBD	59	25	No	Yes
City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Improvements	\$1,652,000	TBD	58	27	No	Yes
Yolo County	I-80 Corridor Bicycle Route Improvements	\$669,245	TBD	58	28	No	Yes
City of West Sacramento	West Capitol Ave Cycletrack	\$513,000	TBD	56	29	Yes	Yes
City of Roseville	City of Roseville Downtown Pedestrian Bridge	\$1,262,000	TBD	56	30	Yes	Yes
City of Sacramento	Old Sacramento Gap Closure Project	\$455,000	TBD	56	31	Yes	Yes
City of Rancho Cordova	Cordova Park Sidewalk Project	\$3,043,000	TBD	56	32	Yes	Yes
City of Lincoln	Lincoln Boulevard Trail Bridge and Intersection Improvements	\$1,193,985	TBD	54	33	No	Yes
City of Citrus Heights	Old Auburn Road Bicycle Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$3,237,722	N/A	54	34	No	No
City of Elk Grove	East-West Arterial Road Bike Lane Improvements	\$584,000	TBD	53	35	No	Yes
City of West Sacramento	Linden Rd. Sidewalk Extension	\$429,000	TBD	50	36	No	Yes
City of Woodland	Sports Park Drive POC	\$1,087,000	TBD	48	37	Yes	Yes
City of Galt	Galt Bike / Pedestrian Path Gap Closure	\$486,000	N/A	44	38	No	No
Capital Southeast Connector JPA	White Rock Road Corridor Bike Path	\$2,862,000	TBD	39	39	No	Yes
City of Rocklin	Antelope Creek Elementary Safe Routes to School Project	\$831,000	TBD	37	40	No	Yes
UC Davis	Sprocket Bikeway Improvement	\$412,000	N/A	35	41	Yes	No

El Dorado County Projects

City of Placerville

Amount requested:
\$250,000

Placerville Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project

Total Project Cost:
 \$295,000

Along Placerville Dr. from west of the US 50 undercrossing to Green Valley Rd., and on Green Valley Rd. from Placerville Dr. to Mallard Ln.: Design cycle tracks and sidewalks along Placerville Dr., and sidewalk on Green Valley Rd.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	16	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	5	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)	Yes	

City of Placerville

Amount requested:
\$1,792,000

Upper Broadway Bike Lanes Project

Total Project Cost:
 \$2,251,000

Along Broadway between Schnell School Rd. and Jacquier Rd.: Construct a Class II bike lane along eastbound Broadway and a Class III bike route along westbound Broadway, with minor signing and striping to connect to the El Dorado Trail at each end.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	19	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	4	10
Cost Effectiveness	8	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

El Dorado County

**Amount requested:
\$793,390**

Cameron Park - Merrychase and Country Club Drive Ped/Bike Improvements

*Total Project Cost:
\$896,182*

In Cameron Park, along the entire length of Merrychase Dr. and along Country Club Dr. from El Norte Rd./Trinidad Dr. to Placitas Dr.: Construct curb, gutter, and sidewalks, ADA ramps, crosswalks, crosswalk beacons, stop signs, and Class II and III bikeways adjacent to a library and two schools.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	16	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

El Dorado County

**Amount requested:
\$942,961**

El Dorado Hills - El Dorado Hills Blvd Class I Bike Path

*Total Project Cost:
\$1,065,132*

In El Dorado Hills, to the west of El Dorado Hills Blvd. between Governor Dr. and the north side of Brittany Way: Upgrade existing multi-use path to a Class I multi-use trail, and construct infill Class I multi-use trail.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	16	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	5	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

El Dorado County

**Amount requested:
\$1,068,529**

Placerville - U.S. Highway 50/Weber Creek Class I Bike Path

*Total Project Cost:
\$1,206,968*

In Placerville adjacent to eastbound U.S. Highway 50 from Weber Creek (PM 15.5) to Forni Rd. at the U.S. Highway 50/Forni Rd./Placerville Dr. Interchange (PM 15.8): Construct the final phase of a Class I multi-use trail that will connect Missouri Flat Rd. Interchange to Forni Rd./Placerville Dr. Interchange along Highway 50 over Weber Creek.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	14	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Placer County Projects

City of Lincoln

Amount requested:

\$1,193,985

Lincoln Blvd Trail/Bridge

Total Project Cost:

\$1,348,678

Along Lincoln Blvd. between Sterling Pointe and Lincoln Hills Town Center: Construct a Class I multi-use trail and bike/ped bridge.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	16	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	4	10
Improved Public Health	5	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

City of Rocklin

Amount requested:

\$831,000

Antelope Creek Elementary Safe Routes to School Project

Total Project Cost:

\$991,000

Along S. Whitney Blvd. from Lincoln Ave. to Bryce Way, and along Springview Dr. from S. Whitney Blvd. to Antelope Creek Elementary: Construct ADA-compliant replacement sidewalk along S. Whitney Blvd. and install new curb ramps on Springview Dr.; and stripe new crosswalk (continental or ladder style) in front of school and provide a Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	10	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	8	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	3	10
Improved Public Health	4	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Roseville

Amount requested:

\$1,262,000

City of Roseville Downtown Pedestrian Bridge

Total Project Cost:

\$3,129,000

Spanning Dry Creek, starting mid-block on Oak St. between S. Grant St. and Washington Blvd., ending in Royer Park adjacent to the existing Veteran's Hall: Construct a new pedestrian bridge with landings over Dry Creek connecting Vernon St. Town Square and Royer Park, and create pedestrian and bicycle friendly plazas.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	16	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	12	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	5	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

Town of Loomis

Amount requested:

\$1,436,000

Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan - Phase 2

Total Project Cost:

\$1,786,000

Taylor Rd. from Horseshoe Bar Rd. to just south of Oak St.: Construct new ADA-compliant sidewalk, replace non-compliant sidewalk, new curb and gutter, 5' bike lanes, irrigation and new trees, new St. lighting, four in-Rd. warning lights at the crosswalks, and pedestrian-friendly features at intersections.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	21	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	17	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	8	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Sacramento County Projects

City of Citrus Heights

Amount requested:

\$3,237,722

Old Auburn Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvement Project (Sunrise to Garry Oak Drive)

Total Project Cost:

\$3,667,216

Old Auburn Rd. between Sunrise Blvd. and Garry Oak Dr.; Fair Oaks Blvd. from Old Auburn Rd. to Villa Oak: Replace and infill curb, gutter, and sidewalk; landscape and install lighting; construct raised medians; stripe continuous Class II bike lanes; and construct ADA and pedestrian-friendly features and add bike/ped detection at intersections.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	18	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	14	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	5	10
Improved Public Health	3	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

City of Elk Grove

Amount requested:

\$584,000

East/West Arterial Road Bike Lane Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$660,000

Elk Grove Blvd., Laguna Blvd., and Bond Rd. between Harbour Point Dr. and Bradshaw Rd: Install, renovate, and remove bike lane, vehicle lane striping, and Rd.side signs to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility. Improvements include construction of new escape ramps and bike lanes.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	15	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Elk Grove

Amount requested:

\$1,837,000

Laguna Creek Trail and Bruceville Road SRTS Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$2,076,000

On trails along Laguna Creek from Lewis Stein Rd. to Bruceville Rd., and between Bruceville Rd., Mannington St., and Center Pkwy.: Construct sidewalks along Bruceville Rd., south of Center Pkwy to Big Horn Blvd., and north of Laguna Blvd.; construct trail extensions and gap closures of the Laguna Creek Trail.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	21	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	18	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

City of Elk Grove

Amount requested:

\$601,000

SAFE (Streets are For Everyone!) Routes to School Project

Total Project Cost:

\$679,000

In various locations in the City of Elk Grove, the south area of the City of Sacramento, and southern regions of the unincorporated area of south Sacramento County: Implement a district-wide Mobile Bike Fleet, Parent Corps, Active4.me and Youth-led Middle School programs to increase active transportation in nine school attendance areas.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	18	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	14	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	8	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Folsom

Amount requested:

\$1,048,036

Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail

Total Project Cost:

\$1,184,036

On Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail parallel to Bidwell St. between the existing Humbug-Willow Creek Trail and Scholar Way, and from Broadstone Pkwy to Iron Point Rd.: Construct approximately 1.3 miles of Class I multi-use trail.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	22	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	14	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	8	10
Cost Effectiveness	8	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

City of Galt

Amount requested:

\$486,000

Galt Bike / Pedestrian Path Gap Closure

Total Project Cost:

\$550,000

In the area bounded by Twin Cities Rd. to the north, UP RR tracks to the south, State Route 99 to the west and Marengo Rd to the East: Complete the design and environmental for bike improvements in the northeast area of the City of Galt. Improvements include: Class II bike lanes on the west side of Marengo Rd.; Class I multi-use trail on the north side of Deadman's Gulch between Vintage Oak Ave. and Emerald Vista Dr.; and Class III bike routes along Lake Park Ave., Park Terrace Dr., Bay Shore Dr., Elk Hills Dr., Vintage Oak Ave., Cedar Flat Ave., Lake Canyon Ave., Fermoy Way, Adare Way and Emerald Vista Dr.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	13	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	11	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	5	10
Improved Public Health	5	10
Other Considerations	6	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Rancho Cordova

Amount requested:

\$3,043,000

Cordova Park Sidewalk Project

Total Project Cost:

\$3,625,000

Along Coloma Rd, Dolcetto Dr, Ellenbrook Dr, Garrett Way, Gilbert Way, and Malaga Way in the Cordova Park Neighborhood: Construct curb, gutter, sidewalks, ADA sidewalk ramps and crosswalks; install traffic calming devices on surrounding streets of Dawes St., Dolcetto Dr., and Chase Dr.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	19	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	13	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	5	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

City of Rancho Cordova

Amount requested:

\$1,814,719

Rod Beaudry/Routier Bikeway Project

Total Project Cost:

\$2,052,851

On Rod Beaudry Dr. between Goethe Park Rd. and Folsom Blvd.; Folsom Blvd. between Rod Beaudry Dr. and Routier Rd., and Routier Rd. between Folsom Blvd. and Old Placerville Rd.: Construct cycle tracks and intersection improvements along Routier Rd. and Rod Beaudry Dr.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	23	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	20	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	8	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Rancho Cordova

Amount requested:
\$442,000

Stone Creek Trail Pedestrian Signals at Kilgore Rd and Zinfandel Dr

Total Project Cost:
\$500,000

On the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail in the Stone Creek neighborhood: Install bike/ped actuated signals, realign multi-use trail approaches, striping, signage, and curb cuts with ADA ramps where the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail intersects Zinfandel Dr. and Prospect Park Dr.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	19	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	20	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)	No	

City of Sacramento

Amount requested:
\$1,963,000

D. W. Babcock School ATP

Total Project Cost:
\$2,219,000

On Frenza Ave. from Connie Dr. to Albatross Way; Albatross Way from Frenza to Woolley Way; Woolley Way from Albatross to DW Babcock School, and Cormorant Way from DW Babcock School to Babcock Park: Install a signalized intersection with accessibility compliant crosswalks at the intersection of Albatross Way and El Camino Ave.; and construct sidewalks, curb ramps, and other access improvements for students who attend D.W.Babcock School.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	18	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	5	10
Improved Public Health	8	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Sacramento

Amount requested:

\$2,213,000

Del Rio Trail

Total Project Cost:

\$2,500,000

Along the unused rail corridor near Freeport Blvd. from Sutterville Rd. to south of Meadowview Rd./Pocket Rd.: Design 4.5 miles of rails-to-trails project along an old railroad line through existing neighborhoods. Project would remove railroad tracks along the corridor and include grade crossings and intersection modifications at each major arterial location.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	17	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	6	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

City of Sacramento

Amount requested:

\$2,028,000

Franklin Blvd Cycle Track

Total Project Cost:

\$2,448,000

On Franklin Blvd. between Cosumnes River Blvd. and Calvine Rd.: Construct a two-way cycle track on Franklin Blvd.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	17	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	18	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Sacramento

Amount requested:
\$3,610,000

North 12th Complete Street

Total Project Cost:
\$4,468,000

On 12th St./North 12th St. from the American River to H St.; includes one block of Sunbeam Ave. and one block of Richards Blvd. to complete the connection: Construct a two-way cycle track on the west side of 12th St. between C St. and Richards Blvd. (by way of Sunbeam Ave. to Richards Blvd., connecting to Richards Blvd. and N. 12th St.) and construct a one-way, southbound cycle track on 12th between C St. and H St.; add traffic control devices, improve intersections with bike-friendly features, and add protected intersections at C St. and 12 St.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	23	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	22	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	9	10
Cost Effectiveness	8	10
Improved Public Health	8	10
Other Considerations	9	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)	Yes	

City of Sacramento

Amount requested:
\$3,185,000

Northwood Elementary ATP

Total Project Cost:
\$3,599,000

Along El Camino Ave. and surrounding pedestrian routes to Northwood School: Construct new sidewalks along Fianza Ave., Clay St., and El Camino Ave.; add a signalized intersection with accessibility compliant crosswalks at the intersection of Clay St. and El Camino Ave., curb ramps, and other access improvements for the students of Northwood School and other area residents.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	19	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	17	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Sacramento

**Amount requested:
\$455,000**

Old Sacramento Gap Closure Project

*Total Project Cost:
\$515,000*

In Old Sacramento along the Sacramento Riverfront, from the boardwalk to I St. by way of going under the I St. Bridge, and connecting to pedestrian access by the California State Railroad Museum parking lot: Design a Class I multi-use trail connection along the Old Sacramento Riverfront from the boardwalk to I St. and connecting to the West Tunnel ramps access sidewalk by the California State Railroad Museum parking lot.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	17	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	11	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

Sacramento County

**Amount requested:
\$1,485,000**

Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project

*Total Project Cost:
\$1,685,000*

Along the north side of Folsom Blvd. east and west of Butterfield Way adjacent to the Butterfield LRT Station, and along the north side of Cottage Way between Fulton Ave. and Watt Ave.: Construct sidewalks to complete the sidewalk network along Cottage Way, from Watt Ave. to Fulton Ave., and along Folsom Blvd., from Watt Ave. to Sunrise Blvd.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	19	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	16	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	8	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Sacramento County

Amount requested:

\$1,239,000

Hazel Avenue Sidewalk Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$1,409,000

On Hazel Ave. between Central Ave. and Elm Ave.: Construct a Class II bike lane, a signalized mid-block crossing, and transit stop improvements in accordance with the Sacramento County Bus Stop Transition Plan.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	19	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

Sacramento County

Amount requested:

\$2,088,000

Power Inn Road Sidewalk Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$2,374,000

On Power Inn Rd. from approximately 450 feet south of Loucreta Dr. to Florin Rd.: Construct continuous sidewalks and bike lanes on Power Inn Rd., from about 450 feet south of Loucreta Dr. to Florin Rd.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	19	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	20	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	9	10
Improved Public Health	8	10
Other Considerations	9	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Sacramento County

**Amount requested:
\$1,278,000**

Thomas Edison Elementary Safe Routes to School – Hurley Way and Morse Avenue

*Total Project Cost:
\$1,454,000*

On Hurley Way, between Fulton Ave. and Morse Ave.: Install sidewalk infill, curb, gutter, storm inlets, curb ramps and pedestrian lighting; conduct educational walking and biking programs.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	22	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	18	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	9	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

Capital Southeast Connector JPA

**Amount requested:
\$2,862,000**

White Rock Road Corridor Bike Path

*Total Project Cost:
\$4,278,000*

Just north of White Rock Rd. between Prairie City Rd. and Carson Crossing Rd. just south of the City of Folsom/US Highway 50: Construct a Class I multi-use trail.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	10	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	12	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	5	10
Improved Public Health	3	10
Other Considerations	6	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Sutter County Projects

City of Yuba City

Amount requested:

\$376,188

Franklin Ave Pedestrian Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$465,488

Along Franklin Ave., east of State Route 99 between South Palora Ave. and Gray Ave.: Construct sidewalks and curb ramps on north and south sides of the Rd.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	21	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	18	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	4	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Yolo County Projects

City of Davis

Amount requested:

\$1,652,000

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$1,867,000

Along suggested Safe Routes to School (SRTS) bike/ped routes in the vicinity of the following schools: Birch Lane E.S. (east Davis), Montgomery E.S. (south Davis), Pioneer E.S. (southeast Davis), and Emerson J.H.S (west Davis): Restripe/repaint crosswalks, add hi-vis signage and flashing beacons, and add intersection improvements (e.g. two-stage left-turn boxes) and other safety treatments designated in the City's recently completed Walk-Bike Audit Report. New infrastructure includes construction of Class I multi-use trail at Emerson Junior High; Class III bike routes and buffered bike lanes around Pioneer E.S.; and curb extensions at Montgomery E.S.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	18	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

City of West Sacramento

Amount requested:

\$1,484,000

Clarksburg Branch Line Trail

Total Project Cost:

\$1,677,000

Parallel to Antioch Rd., beginning at River City High School and extending south 2.2 miles to South River Rd.: Construct a Class I multi-use trail and two road crossing enhancements.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	18	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	17	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of West Sacramento

**Amount requested:
\$429,000**

Linden Rd. Sidewalk Extension

*Total Project Cost:
\$486,000*

On the north side of Linden Rd. between the Clarksburg Branch Line Trail and Stonegate Blvd., and an 85 foot section on the south side of Linden Rd. west of the Clarksburg Branch Line Trail: Construct 620 feet of new sidewalk, underground existing drainage, and add new bike lanes.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	16	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	12	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	4	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

City of West Sacramento

**Amount requested:
\$6,965,000**

Sycamore Trail Phases 2 and 3

*Total Project Cost:
\$7,867,000*

From Westmore Oaks School over US 50 connecting with Joey Lopes Park and from Westmore Oaks Elementary School to the intersection of Park Blvd. and Stone Blvd.: Construct a 1,500 foot concrete overpass over US 50 (Phase 2); construct a 2,690 foot extension of the Sycamore Trail from Westmore Oaks to Stone Blvd. (Phase 3); and conduct a three year SRTS program at Westmore Oaks E.S.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	8	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	8	10
Other Considerations	6	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of West Sacramento

**Amount requested:
\$513,000**

West Capitol Ave Cycletrack

*Total Project Cost:
\$580,000*

On West Capitol Ave. between Garden St. and 5th St.: Construct a Class I multi-use trail and raised median within the public right-of-way; convert the vehicle travel way to one-way between UPRR underpass and 5th St.; and remove the signal and raised crossing at 5th St. intersection.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	18	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	14	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

City of Woodland

**Amount requested:
\$1,087,000**

Sports Park Drive POC

*Total Project Cost:
\$1,228,000*

Approximately 0.5 miles south of the State Route 113/East Gibson Rd. interchange: Design a bike/ped overcrossing of State Route 113.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	15	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	12	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	6	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	5	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

City of Woodland

**Amount requested:
\$1,592,000**

West Woodland Safe Routes to School

*Total Project Cost:
\$2,274,000*

On the west side of Woodland: Construct Class II bike lanes on W. Woodland Ave., California St., and W. Court St., with necessary pavement repair on W. Court St.; construct Class III bike routes and signage on Coloma Way, Hays St., First St., Clover St., Third St., West St., College Ave., Southwood Dr., Bartlett Ave., Gum Ave., and Beamer St.; construct ADA ramps at W. Woodland Ave.; and adapt intersections for bike/ped detection.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	21	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	17	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	6	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

UC Davis

**Amount requested:
\$412,000**

Sprocket Bikeway Improvement

*Total Project Cost:
\$466,000*

On the UC Davis Campus Sprocket Bikeway between Student Housing Authority building and California Ave.: Widen the existing Sprocket Bikeway from 16' to 20' paved width between the Housing Administration building and California Ave. and construct a 6' wide walkway on the south side of Sprocket Bikeway.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	8	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	8	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	5	10
Cost Effectiveness	4	10
Improved Public Health	3	10
Other Considerations	6	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Yolo County

**Amount requested:
\$669,245**

I-80 Corridor Bicycle Route Improvements

*Total Project Cost:
\$788,274*

On County Rd. 32A, east of Davis, between the Old Highway 40 Class I multi-use trail in the City of Davis and Interstate 80/Yolo Causeway bridge: Construct 6’ wide asphalt concrete bike lanes along the 1.46 mile section of County Rd. 32A.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	15	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	13	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	7	10
Cost Effectiveness	8	10
Improved Public Health	6	10
Other Considerations	8	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	No	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

Yuba County Projects

Yuba County

Amount requested:

\$1,204,000

McGowan Pkwy Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$1,385,000

In Olivehurst along McGowen Pkwy between Powerline Rd. and State Route 65: Construct curb, gutter, sidewalk, bike lanes, continuous turn lane, curb ramps, new crosswalk, lighting, and striping for a major urban collector that serves as a route to school for multiple schools.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	18	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	15	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	7	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

Yuba County

Amount requested:

\$849,000

Seventh Avenue Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements

Total Project Cost:

\$960,000

In Olivehurst along Seventh Ave. between the railroad tracks (400 feet east of Arboga Rd.) and Olivehurst Ave.: Construct curb, gutter, sidewalk, bike lanes, curb ramps, striping, traffic control devices, raised crosswalk, curb extensions, pedestrian refuge islands, rapid flash beacons, and improved pedestrian lighting.

Project Scoring Criteria	Average Reviewer Score*	Total Points Possible
Increasing Walking & Biking	20	30
Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	16	25
Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS	6	10
Cost Effectiveness	7	10
Improved Public Health	8	10
Other Considerations	7	10
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community <i>(as defined by the statewide ATP Guidelines)</i>	Yes	

*Projects were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low). Information provided in this Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the eight reviewing Working Group members to provide context on how project components contributed to the final score relative to other projects. These individual scores will not equal the cumulative average score listed on page 1 of Attachment A.

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

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

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

PROGRAM GOALS

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

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

ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

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

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

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

INELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

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

PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

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

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

Active Transportation Working Group Composition

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

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

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

Following the announcement of the statewide ATP awards, the Regional ATP Team will remove any projects successful in securing funds through the statewide competition from further consideration for the Regional ATP. The Regional ATP Team will then use the re-evaluated application scores to finalize the funding recommendation, and will confirm that a minimum 25% of available ATP funds are dedicated to projects and programs benefiting Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) as identified in the State Guidelines. In the event the minimum DAC threshold is not obtained, the DAC points (0-10) will be applied to the entire project list and the projects re-ranked. 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 of EDCTC or PCTPA.** Only under special circumstances will an application be considered for a project that is not listed in one of these sources.

2. **Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility criteria identified in the preceding section.**
3. **Project is identified in the project sponsor's intent to apply letter.**
4. **Project must be ready for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.** The project application may include the cost of preparing environmental documents. When project design, right-of-way, or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the project's cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project's ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to the appropriate RTPA (EDCTC, PCTPA, or SACOG) for re-evaluation following completion of the environmental process.
5. **Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources** (i.e., TAP, HSIP, State Highway Account funds, State SRTS).
6. **Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure project and includes at least an 11.47% local match; application is to all project categories.**
 - a. Infrastructure project minimum is \$282,390 (\$250,000 funding request + \$32,390 local match).
 - b. Non-Infrastructure project minimum is \$56,478 (\$50,000 funding request + \$6,478 local match).
 - c. Public agencies applying for funding for smaller projects may want to consider combining projects to meet the project minimum thresholds, or consider a larger, multi-year program or project.
7. **Public Participation & Planning.** The project applicant must demonstrate how a

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

8. **Partnering with Community Conservation Corps.** The project applicant must demonstrate that the California Conservation Corps, or a qualified community conservation corps, was sought out to participate as a partner to undertake the project; or provide demonstration of the cost-effectiveness clause 23 CFR 635.204 and provide the relevant documentation.
9. **Project is not part of developer-funded basic good practices.** The project applicant must demonstrate the project complies with the policy statement and design guidance adopted by FHWA to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel.

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

PROJECT SCORING

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

Project Performance Outcomes (0-95 points)

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

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

Other Considerations (0-10 points)

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

FUNDING RECIPIENT REQUIREMENTS

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

Active Transportation Working Group Roster

Name	Field of Expertise	Agency
Aaron Hoyt*	Land Use Planning	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
Heather Yee	Project Engineering	Sacramento County
Lucinda Willcox	Project Engineering	City of Sacramento
Chanell Fletcher	Bike/Ped Advocacy	Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Diane Swann	Bike/Ped Advocacy	Retired, formerly from Office of Family Planning; member of Bak2Sac
Jennifer Donofrio	Bike/Ped Planning/Engineering	City of Davis
Ben Moody	Bike/Ped Planning/Engineering	City of Yuba City
Jerry Barton*	Air Quality	El Dorado County Transportation Commission
Rachel Dubose	Public Health	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
Victoria Cacciatore*	Transit	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Zarah Wylly	Community Organizations	Sacramento Tree Foundation
José Luis Cáceres	Facilitator (non-voting)	Sacramento Area Council of Governments

**Member of Regional ATP Team*