



Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

Item #16-12-5
Information

November 23, 2016

Final Regional Active Transportation Program Funding Recommendation

Issue: How should SACOG invest Regional Active Transportation Program funds?

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

Discussion: The third cycle of the Active Transportation Program (ATP) is now being administered by Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Approximately \$250 million—roughly two-thirds of the amount available in prior ATP Cycles—has been budgeted for Cycle 3 across the state for the two-year period of fiscal years (FYs) 2020 and 2021. Per statewide 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. CTC released a funding recommendation in October 2016 for \$131 million through the State ATP, including four projects in the SACOG region receiving \$9,529,000 (Attachment E).

2017 Regional ATP Process

As the MPO, SACOG is responsible for the selection and recommendation of over \$7 million in ATP projects within the six-county region. The Regional ATP is implemented collaboratively between SACOG, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA). Board engagement on development of the Regional ATP framework culminated in the approval of the Regional ATP framework (Attachment B) by the SACOG Board in May and the CTC in June 2016. A total of 30 applications were received in July through the Regional ATP call for projects, requesting over \$55 million. Project sponsors submitted supplemental applications, in addition to their State ATP applications, to compete in the Regional ATP and provide information specific to the regional criteria. All 30 project applications were screened using the criteria identified in the Regional ATP Framework and determined to be eligible by SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA staff. The projects were then referred to the seven-member multidisciplinary Active Transportation Working Group (Attachment C) for evaluation according to their own process (Attachment D).

Regional ATP Funding Recommendation and Contingent Project List

Four projects totaling \$7,031,000 are recommended for Regional ATP funding (Attachment A). The final funding recommendation was developed using the preliminary ranked list shared with the SACOG Board

in October 2016. SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA staff verified that the final funding recommendation complies with statewide ATP requirements that a minimum of \$1.8 million (one quarter of the regional share) is recommended towards projects that benefit a disadvantaged community as defined by the statewide ATP guidelines. The final funding recommendation exceeds this minimum by including \$4,581,000 benefitting disadvantaged communities. Upon Board approval, staff will work with sponsors of these top-ranked projects to ensure accurate programming of Regional ATP funds, minimize the need for funding allocation extensions through the CTC, and mitigate the risk of losing Regional ATP funds.

Similar to Cycles 1 and 2, a prioritized contingent project list is also included in conjunction with the recommended list in the event of delivery failure by any of the recommended projects. Projects awarded ATP funding must be ready to allocate funds within FY 2019-20 or FY 2020-21. If a recommended project is unable to allocate the awarded funds within the timeframe identified by the CTC or to obtain an allocation 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. The contingent list would be in effect only until the adoption of the next statewide program (anticipated in spring 2019). Consistent with the development of this recommended list and as a measure to utilize all available Regional ATP funding, staff would pull from the ranked contingent project list and would recommend partially funding projects, either for early phases of project development or for reduced-scope projects as voluntarily described in the regional applications.

In preparation for ATP Cycle 4, project sponsors will have the opportunity to discuss previously submitted and new proposed projects with SACOG staff to build strong applications for subsequent ATP funding rounds, and technical assistance will continue to be offered.

Programming Schedule

The Regional Planning Partnership recommendation will go to the Transportation Committee on December 1; from there, the Transportation Committee recommendation will go to the SACOG Board for approval at its December 15 meeting. Following Board approval, staff will provide the CTC with approved funding recommendations by the January 27, 2017, deadline in anticipation of an adoption of MPO recommendations at the March 2017 CTC meeting. Projects in the SACOG region will then need to be amended into the MTIP, and project sponsors must be prepared to allocate ATP funds as programmed through the CTC process.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:VC:ds

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Victoria S. Cacciatore, Associate Analyst, 916-340-6214

Attachments

- A - Regional ATP Funding Recommendation and Contingent Project List with Scoring Details
- B - Approved Regional ATP Policy Framework
- C - Active Transportation Working Group Roster
- D - Working Group Evaluation Process
- E - State ATP Awards Project List

**Regional Active Transportation Program
Final Funding Recommendation**

| Project Sponsor | Project Name | Final Regional ATP Score* | Funding Recommendation | Project clearly and significantly demonstrates a direct benefit to a disadvantaged community** |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| City of Sacramento | Broadway Complete Streets Project | 79 | \$2,763,000 | Yes |
| City of Sacramento | Northwood School and Transit Access Improvements | 76 | \$1,818,000 | Yes |
| City of Citrus Heights | Citrus Heights Electric Greenway (Class 1 Multi-Use Trail) | 75 | \$350,000 | No |
| City of Citrus Heights | Mariposa Safe Routes to School Project (Phase IV) | 74 | \$2,100,000*** | No |

Regional ATP Contingency List

| Project Sponsor | Project Name | Final Regional ATP Score* | Contingency Priority | Regional Funding Request |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| City of Citrus Heights | Mariposa Safe Routes to School Project (Phase IV) | 74 | 1 | \$35,000 |
| City of Elk Grove | Elk Grove Florin Rd Sidewalk Infill SRTS | 74 | 2 | \$814,000 |
| City of Rancho Cordova | Cordova Park Safe Routes to School Project | 70 | 3 | \$1,889,000 |
| City of Sacramento | Meadowview Road Complete Street Phase 2 | 70 | 4 | \$1,618,000 |
| Yuba County | McGowan Parkway Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian Route Improvements | 70 | 5 | \$1,108,000 |
| Sacramento County | Howe Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Sacramento County | 69 | 6 | \$1,761,000 |
| City of Rancho Cordova | City of Rancho Cordova - Safe Routes to School Plan | 68 | 7 | \$245,000 |
| City of Yuba City | Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure | 67 | 8 | \$1,972,000 |
| City of Sacramento | Franklin Boulevard Class IV Protected Bikeway | 67 | 9 | \$1,644,000 |
| City of Sacramento | Old Sacramento Riverfront Access | 67 | 10 | \$266,000 |
| City of West Sacramento | Sycamore Bicycle and Pedestrian Overpass & Safe Routes to School Program | 66 | 11 | \$5,814,000 |
| City of Rancho Cordova | Folsom South Canal Trail Crossing Improvements at White Rock Road | 63 | 12 | \$613,000 |
| City of Sacramento | Two Rivers Trail (Phase II) | 63 | 13 | \$3,333,000 |
| City of West Sacramento | Clarksburg Branch Line Trail Extension | 62 | 14 | \$1,485,000 |
| Sacramento County | Folsom Boulevard Complete Street Improvements, Phase 1 | 62 | 15 | \$4,180,000 |
| City of Davis | Providing Safe Passage: Connecting Montgomery Elementary and Olive Drive | 62 | 16 | \$3,540,000 |
| Sacramento County | Watt Avenue Complete Street Improvements, Sacramento County | 58 | 17 | \$2,787,000 |
| City of Placerville | Upper Broadway Pedestrian Connection Project | 57 | 18 | \$1,886,000 |
| City of Roseville | Washington Boulevard Bikeway and Pedestrian Pathways Project | 55 | 19 | \$2,212,000 |
| City of Yuba City | Bridge Street SR2S Shared Path | 55 | 20 | \$577,000 |
| City of Sacramento | Fourth Street Pedestrian Access | 55 | 21 | \$266,000 |
| City of Lincoln | Lincoln Boulevard Pedestrian and Intersection Improvements | 54 | 22 | \$2,014,000 |
| Sutter County | Sutter Class I Bike Path Conversion to Class IV Trail | 36 | 23 | \$1,231,000 |

* Final score is the average of all reviewer scores, without outliers.

**Projects that earned an average score of 8 out of 10 or higher on the Benefit to Disadvantaged Community question are shown as clearly and significantly demonstrating a direct benefit to a disadvantaged community. For detailed scoring breakdowns, please see the following pages.

*** Applicant requested \$2,135,000. \$2,100,000 was available funding. SACOG staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

Project Scoring Details

El Dorado County Projects

City of Placerville

Upper Broadway Pedestrian Connection Project

Funding Request: \$1,886,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,206,000

On Broadway between Schnell School Rd. and Point View Dr. (Jacquier Rd.): install strategically located sidewalks and widen shoulders.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 2 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| 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 | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

Placer County Projects

City of Lincoln

Lincoln Boulevard Pedestrian and Intersection Improvements

Funding Request: \$2,014,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,275,000

On Lincoln Blvd. between Sterling Pointe and Lincoln Hills Town Center: construct sidewalk and a prefabricated pedestrian bridge to close a 580' gap in the existing sidewalk; along Lincoln Blvd. at McBean Park Dr. and 7th St: construct corner bulbouts and ADA ramps, reduce lane widths, and enhance crosswalks at intersections.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 4 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 4 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 13 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 6 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 7 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 6 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 6 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 4 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Roseville

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project,
Roseville

Funding Request: \$2,000,000
Total Project Cost: \$12,152,000

Between Marlin Dr. at Eastwood Park to Rocky Ridge Dr: construct Class I multi-use trail to fill in system gaps.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 10 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 19 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 7 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 8 | 10 |

City of Roseville

Washington Boulevard Bikeway and Pedestrian
Pathways Project

Funding Request: \$2,212,000
Total Project Cost: \$3,982,000

On Washington Blvd. between Diamond Oaks Rd. and Sawtell Rd: construct Class I multi-use trail, 8-12' wide sidewalks, and Class II bike lanes.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 7 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 6 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 13 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 6 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 6 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 6 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 6 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

Sacramento County Projects

City of Citrus Heights

Citrus Heights Electric Greenway
(Class 1 Multi-Use Trail)

Funding Recommendation: \$350,000

Total Project Cost: \$7,015,000

Along the electrical corridor between the west side of Sunrise Blvd. and west side of Wachtel Way: design a Class I multi-use trail.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 6 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 19 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 8 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 9 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 6 | 10 |

City of Citrus Heights

Mariposa Safe Routes to School
Project (Phase IV)

Funding Recommendation: \$2,100,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,719,000

On Mariposa Ave. between Northeast Circle and Madison Ave: construct Class II bike lanes, infill sidewalk, street lights, pedestrian safety improvements, and signal improvements.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 10 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 7 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 6 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 9 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 7 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Elk Grove

Elk Grove Florin Rd Sidewalk Infill SRTS

Funding Request: \$814,000
 Total Project Cost: \$1,063,000

On Elk Grove Florin Rd. between E. Stockton Blvd. and Valley Oak Lane: construct infill sidewalk, install rectangular rapid flashing beacons at crosswalk, upgrade pedestrian facilities to ADA standards, and implement student walking and bicycling education.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 10 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 6 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 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 | 5 | 10 |

City of Rancho Cordova

City of Rancho Cordova - Safe Routes to School Plan

Funding Request: \$277,000
 Total Project Cost: \$277,000

Develop a city-wide Safe Routes to School Plan.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 11 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 6 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 15 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 6 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Rancho Cordova

Cordova Park Safe Routes to School Project

Funding Request: \$1,889,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,134,000

On Malaga Way, Ellenbrook Way, and Dolecetto Dr: construct infill sidewalk; along Coloma Rd: construct infill sidewalk, a bulb-out, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, crosswalks, signage, pedestrian lighting, and shade trees.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 10 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| 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 | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 8 | 10 |

City of Rancho Cordova

Folsom South Canal Trail Crossing Improvements at White Rock Road

Funding Request: \$613,000

Total Project Cost: \$693,000

Midblock on White Rock Rd. at the intersection with the Folsom South Canal Trail: construct median refuge island, mid-block curb extension, crosswalk speed bar markings, and a HAWK pedestrian beacon.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 1 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 2 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 17 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 9 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 5 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Sacramento

Broadway Complete Streets Project

Funding Recommendation: \$2,763,000

Total Project Cost: \$4,414,000

On Broadway between 3rd St. and 29th St: construct four-to-three lane road diet, buffered Class II bike lanes, marked pedestrian crossings and refuge islands, and intersection modifications.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| 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 | 9 | 10 |

City of Sacramento

Fourth Street Pedestrian Access

Funding Request: \$266,000

Total Project Cost: \$4,320,000

On Fourth St. between I St. and J St: conduct environmental phase for pedestrian access improvements.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 1 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| 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 | 7 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 8 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Sacramento

Franklin Boulevard Class IV Protected Bikeway

Funding Request: \$1,644,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,257,000

On the western side of Franklin Blvd. between Cosumnes River Blvd. and Calvine Rd: construct a two-way Class IV protected bikeway.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 3 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 16 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 7 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 5 | 10 |

City of Sacramento

Meadowview Road Complete Street Phase 2

Funding Request: \$1,618,000

Total Project Cost: \$3,119,000

On Meadowview Rd. between Coral Gables Ct. and Detroit Blvd: install buffered Class II bike lanes, separated sidewalks with planted zones, and raised medians with functional landscaping.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 3 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 8 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 9 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 10 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Sacramento

Northwood School and Transit Access
Improvements

Funding Recommendation: \$1,818,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,541,000

On El Camino Ave., Clay St., Frienza Ave., and Lexington St: construct separated sidewalks, curb returns, and crosswalks.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 8 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 10 | 10 |

City of Sacramento

Old Sacramento Riverfront Access

Funding Request: \$266,000

Total Project Cost: \$300,000

On the Sacramento Riverfront from the Old Sacramento boardwalk to I St. and the California State Railroad Museum: conduct environmental phase for a Class I multi-use trail connection.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 2 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 15 | 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 | 9 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Sacramento
Two Rivers Trail (Phase II)

Funding Request: \$3,333,000
Total Project Cost: \$6,291,000

On the south side of the American River from Sutter's Landing Park to H St: construct a Class I multi-use trail.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 3 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 3 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 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 | 7 | 10 |

Sacramento County
47th Ave Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

Funding Request: \$3,009,000
Total Project Cost: \$4,235,000

On 47th Ave. between 27th St. and Stockton Blvd: construct Class II bike lanes, sidewalk infill, and intersection improvements.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 4 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 15 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 6 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 6 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 9 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 7 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

Sacramento County

Folsom Boulevard Complete Street Improvements,
Phase 1

Funding Request: \$4,180,000
Total Project Cost: \$5,001,000

On Folsom Blvd. between Mayhew Rd. and Bradshaw Rd: construct infill sidewalk.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 3 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| 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 | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 7 | 10 |

Sacramento County

Howe Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian
Improvements, Sacramento County

Funding Request: \$1,761,000
Total Project Cost: \$2,152,000

On Howe Ave. between Cottage Way and El Camino Blvd: design and construct 675 feet of Class I multi-use trail, 0.6 miles of Class II bike lanes, 850 lineal feet of sidewalk, and intersection modifications.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 7 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 16 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 8 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 6 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 7 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 10 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

Sacramento County

Watt Avenue Complete Street Improvements,
Sacramento County

Funding Request: \$2,787,000
Total Project Cost: \$4,355,000

On Watt Ave. between Winona Way and Roseville Rd: construct Class II bike lanes, landscaped buffered sidewalks, curb, gutter, curb ramps, and landscaped median; construct intersection modifications at Watt Ave. and Winona Way, and at Watt Ave. and Myrtle Ave.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 2 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 7 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 6 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 14 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 5 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

Sutter County Projects

Sutter County

Sutter Class I Bike Path Conversion to Class IV
Trail

Funding Request: \$1,231,000
Total Project Cost: \$1,385,000

Between the Town of Sutter and the western city limit of Yuba City: Widen the existing 8' wide Class I multi-use path to 12'.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 1 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 1 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 2 | 11 |
| 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 | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 6 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of Yuba City

Bridge Street SR2S Shared Path

Funding Request: \$577,000

Total Project Cost: \$653,000

On Bridge St. between Gray Ave. and Hooper Ave: construct a Class I multi-use path.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 5 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 14 | 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 | 9 | 10 |

City of Yuba City

Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

Funding Request: \$1,972,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,241,000

On Harter Parkway from Butte House Rd. to Spirit Way: construct Class IV separated bikeways north of Hwy 20 and Class II bike lanes south of Hwy 20; from Jefferson Ave to Harter Parkway: construct Class I multi-use path.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 6 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 7 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 16 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 7 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 6 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

Yolo County Projects

City of Davis

Providing Safe Passage: Connecting Montgomery Elementary and Olive Drive

Funding Request: \$3,540,000
Total Project Cost: \$4,425,000

Within ¼-mile of Montgomery Elementary School, primarily Lillard Dr. between Cowell Blvd. and Drummond Ave: construct Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements for Montgomery Elementary School; on US 40 bike path between Union Pacific tracks and Interstate 80 at Pole Line Road overcrossing: design and construct a bicycle/pedestrian bridge from Olive Dr. to the two-way multi-use path on the Pole Line Rd. overcrossing.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 8 | 11 |
| 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 | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

City of West Sacramento

Clarksburg Branch Line Trail Extension

Funding Request: \$1,485,000
Total Project Cost: \$1,677,000

From River City High School to South River Rd: design and construct a Class I multi-use trail.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 5 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 4 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 6 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 15 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 9 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 7 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 8 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 3 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

City of West Sacramento

Sycamore Bicycle and Pedestrian Overpass & Safe Routes to School Program

Funding Request: \$5,814,000
Total Project Cost: \$7,718,000

Between Evergreen Ave. and Westmore Oaks Elementary School: construct a 1,500 foot concrete overpass over US 50; between Westmore Oaks Elementary School and Park Blvd: construct 2,690 feet of Class I multi-use trail; conduct a 3-year SRTS program at Westmore Oaks Elementary School.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 6 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 11 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 4 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 6 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 7 | 10 |

Yuba County Projects

City of Marysville

Marysville Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project

Funding Request: \$515,000
Total Project Cost: \$583,000

On 21 road segments throughout the city: construct Class II bike lanes, Class III bike routes, bike parking, close sidewalk gaps, and improve three crossings with high-visibility crosswalk markings, Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons, speed feedback signs, and raised intersections.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 6 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 10 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 16 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 9 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

Yuba County

Eleventh Avenue Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian
Route Improvement

Funding Request: \$1,505,000

Total Project Cost: \$2,313,000

In Olivehurst on Eleventh Ave. between Olivehurst Ave. and Powerline Rd: construct sidewalks, Class III bike routes, crosswalks, lighting, flashing beacons, striping, ADA compliant ramps; provide pedestrian and bicycle skills training.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 9 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 6 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 9 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 18 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 8 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 7 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

Yuba County

McGowan Parkway Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian
Route Improvements

Funding Request: \$1,108,000

Total Project Cost: \$1,559,000

In Olivehurst on McGowan Pkwy. between Hwy 70 and Olive Ave: construct sidewalks, Class II bike lanes, crosswalks, striping, and ADA compliant ramps; provide pedestrian and bicycle skills training.

| Project Scoring Criteria | Average Reviewer Score | Total Points Possible |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools & Students</i> | 8 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i> | 7 | 12 |
| Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers & Gaps</i> | 7 | 11 |
| Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians | 16 | 25 |
| Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals & Linking to MTP/SCS | 7 | 10 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 8 | 10 |
| Improved Public Health | 9 | 10 |
| Other Considerations | 8 | 10 |
| Benefits a Disadvantaged Community | 9 | 10 |

Projects are sorted alphabetically by county, project sponsor, then project name.

2017 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 funding source for active transportation projects.

PROGRAM GOALS

California Senate Bill (SB) 99 establishes California's ATP with six program goals that provide a foundation for the state and regional 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 state and federal funding. The majority of projects will need to meet the requirements of the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). 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. In administering the Regional ATP, SACOG will consider projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition. Project applicants are encouraged to discuss potential Regional ATP projects with regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) staff, and may elect to identify a reduced scope version of their state-submitted project for the Regional ATP competition.

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 seven experts from the areas of land use planning, bike/ped planning, project engineering, first-mile/last-mile access to transit, health and equity, and the impact of transportation infrastructure on greenhouse gas emissions.

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. 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 may be provided the opportunity to address the Working Group either by phone, email, 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, and/or the definitions for low-income and minority communities used in the environmental justice analysis for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. 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. Project is one of the eligible types of non-infrastructure, infrastructure, or a combination of infrastructure and non-infrastructure** as identified under “Eligible Project Types”.
- 2. 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.
- 3. 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.

4. **Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources** (i.e., TAP, HSIP, State Highway Account funds, State SRTS).
5. **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.
6. **Public Participation & Planning.** The project applicant must demonstrate stakeholder support and how a community-based public participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.
7. **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.

8. **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 scoring criteria considerations 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 (0-90 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. **0-35 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 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 (up to 20 points)

1. Project sponsor demonstrates good performance on past grants and/or federal aid projects or programs. **0-5 points**
2. 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). **0-5 points**
3. 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.)

FUNDING RECIPIENT REQUIREMENTS

Recipients must submit a quarterly update on all projects receiving funding during the 2016 Regional ATP Cycle. Failure to do so could result in negative impacts for future funding rounds.

Active Transportation Working Group Roster

| Name | Organization and title | Role | Land Use Planning | Bike/Ped Planning | Project E.ngineering | First-mile/ Last-mile access to transit | Health and Equity | Impact of transportation infrastructure on GHG emissions |
|-------------------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| Aaron Hoyt | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, Associate Planner | Working Group member, Regional ATP Team member | | X | | X | | X |
| Jerry Barton | El Dorado County Transportation Commission, Senior Transportation Planner | Working Group member, Regional ATP Team member | | X | | X | | X |
| Raef Porter | SACOG, Senior Planner | Working Group member | | | | X | X | X |
| Lynne Goldsmith | Retired, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority | Working Group member | | X | | X | | |
| Andy Fisher | Placer County, Public Works, Parks Planner | Working Group member | X | X | X | | | |
| Casey Kempenaar | City of Citrus Heights, Senior Planner | Working Group member | X | X | | | | |
| Bernadette Austin | UC Davis Center for Regional Change, Associate Director | Working Group member | | X | | X | X | |
| Zach Bosch | City of Rocklin, Civil Engineer | Working Group alternate | | X | X | | X | |

Victoria Cacciatore SACOG, Active Transportation Analyst Working Group facilitator;Regional ATP Team member
Rene Handy SACOG, Administrative Assistant I Working Group staff

Regional ATP Evaluation Process

The Working Group was comprised of geographically diverse volunteers with expertise in land use planning, bicycle and pedestrian planning, project engineering, first-mile/last-mile access to transit, health and equity, and the impact of transportation infrastructure on greenhouse gas emissions, and was 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 all Working Group members and alternate, and discussed at meetings to establish strengths, weaknesses, and clarifying questions for the project sponsors. The facilitator emailed these questions to the project sponsors, compiled project sponsor responses, and distributed them to the Working Group for consideration in developing final project scores. Prior to submitting final scores, the Working Group had the opportunity to revisit all projects to share final impressions based on project sponsor responses.

The preliminary ranked list was developed using the average project scores, generated by gathering the final scores from each Working Group member, omitting the high and low scores for each project, and averaging the remaining scores. In the event that a Working Group member had a conflict of interest on a project and required a recusal, the Working Group alternate's score was used instead. Projects with the same average project score were ranked according to which project had the higher average sub-score with the outliers removed for specific scoring criteria: first, the potential to increase walking and biking; second, the potential to reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries; and third, the advancement of active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals.

State ATP Funding Recommendations

| Project Sponsor | Project Name | State ATP Recommended Funding Amount* |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| City of Marysville | Marysville Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project | \$515,000 |
| Yuba County | Eleventh Avenue Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian Route Improvements | \$1,505,000 |
| City of Roseville | Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project, Roseville | \$4,500,000 |
| Sacramento County | 47th Ave Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements | \$3,009,000 |
| | | \$9,529,000 |

**State ATP Funding Recommendations will be adopted at the December 7 CTC meeting.*