



## **Transportation Committee**

March 4, 2014

### **SACOG Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines**

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

**Recommendation:** None, this item is for information and discussion only.

**Discussion:** Working draft program guidelines and application questions have been prepared that reflect the input received from stakeholders and the ongoing collaborations between EDCTC, PCTPA, and SACOG staff. Attachment A offers an overview of the proposed regional program guidelines, while Attachment B provides a comparison of the state and regional program criteria and draft application questions. Input and direction provided at the March committee meeting will inform any refinements made to the staff recommendation before coming back through the April committee cycle for Board action.

#### *Background on the ATP*

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

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

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

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

Staff is seeking input on conducting a supplemental MPO-specific call for projects and utilizing the option to customize the statewide ATP guidelines and scoring criteria to best meet regional needs for a six-county MPO program. Any modifications to the state guidelines and scoring criteria by MPOs are subject to CTC approval or rejection.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RDO:LSH:gg  
Attachments

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

1400202

## DRAFT 2014 6-COUNTY REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

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

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

### PROGRAM GOALS

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

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

### ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

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

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

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

### INELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

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

### PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A Regional ATP Team comprised of representatives from the three involved regional transportation planning Agencies (RTPA)(EDCTC, PCTPA, SACOG) will screen applications for eligibility. Applications will be removed

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

Next, the Regional ATP Team forwards the eligible applications to the ATP Working Group (see below for the composition of this Group).

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

**Working Group Membership**

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

The application process will be specific to the ATP. The Regional ATP Team in conjunction with the ATP Working Group will go through the ranking process to insure that 25% of available funds are dedicated to projects and programs in Disadvantaged Communities as identified in the State Guidelines.

**SCREENING PROJECTS OUT**

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

- 1. Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Master Plan or the Regional Transportation Plan for EDCTC or PCTPA.** Only under special circumstances will an application be considered that is not listed in one of these sources.
- 2. Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of three eligibility requirements identified in the preceding section.**
- 3. Project must be ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.** The project application may include the cost of preparing environmental documents. When project design, right-of-way or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the projects cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project's ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to appropriate RTPA (EDCTC, PCTPA, or SACOG) following completion of the environmental process for re-evaluation.
- 4. Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources** (i.e. TAP, HSIP, State Highway Account funds).
- 5. Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects and includes at least an 11.47%**

**local match; application is to all project categories.**

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

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

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

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

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

**Project Performance Outcomes**

- 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.
- 2. Project has the potential to reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries.
- 3. Project improves public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.
- 4. Project demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits;
- 5. Project is located within a disadvantaged community and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community.
- 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.

**Other Considerations**

- 7. Performance on Past Grants and/or Federal Aid Projects. Applications from agencies with good performance on delivering prior projects or programs are most likely to succeed with an ATP project award.
- 8. Project sponsor demonstrates readiness to move forward on a timely schedule with the proposed project (i.e. application provides clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project).
- 9. Project applicant demonstrates evidence of strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located.

Program Criteria	Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>State Program</u>	State Point Scale (min - max)	Working Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>Regional MPO Program</u> (SACOG, EDCTC, PCTPA)	Regional Point Scale (min - max) & Source for Criteria
<p><b>Increasing Walking and Bicycling</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and cycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of non-motorized users.</p> <p><b>Application Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how your project encourages increased walking and bicycling, especially among students.</li> <li>Describe how this project improves walking and bicycling routes to and from, connects to, or is part of a school or school facility, transit facility, community center, employment center, state or national trail system, points of interest, and/or work.</li> <li>Describe how this project increases and/or improves connectivity, removes a barrier to mobility and/or closes a gap in a non-motorized facility.</li> <li>Describe the number and type of possible users and their destinations and the percentage increase in users upon completion of your project.</li> </ul>	<p>0 - 30</p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Potential for increased walking and bicycling through support for key outcomes: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities.</p> <p><b>Application Questions:</b></p> <p><b>Infrastructure projects</b> should describe how the project supports one or more of these outcomes relate to increased walking and biking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Increased access to transit services.</b> Will the proposed project increase bicycle and pedestrian access to transit stops and transfer centers? The FTA’s policy identifies pedestrian catchment areas as within a one-half mile radius around transit stops and stations, and a bicycle catchment area as within a three mile radius. Please use FTA’s guidance to illustrate this project’s support for public transit.</li> <li><b>Increased access to schools.</b> Will the proposed project increase bicycle and pedestrian access to schools? Please demonstrate this by including documentation that the school(s) is supportive of and involved in this project. (If the proposed project is the result of a school site needs assessment, site assessment, or walk audit, please include information about how the need for the project was identified).</li> <li><b>Eliminated gaps in the existing bicycle/pedestrian network.</b> Will the proposed project help form complete bicycle and pedestrian networks, enabling bicyclists and pedestrians to travel on a continuous network? Please specify any known issues concerning the gap(s) in the network.</li> <li><b>Removed physical barriers in the bicycle and pedestrian network.</b> Will the proposed project remove physical barriers, using grade-separated crossings when appropriate, to complete the bicycle and pedestrian network and enable through travel by bicyclists and pedestrians? Please specify the need for removal of this physical barrier.</li> <li><b>Facility completion.</b> Will the project “complete” a street or corridor by adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities (e.g., pathways, lanes, shoulders, crossings, and sidewalks) in areas with high existing or potential transportation use? Please specify why these treatments are appropriate for the facility and community, and how.</li> </ul> <p><b>Non- Infrastructure projects</b> should describe how they support one or more of the outcomes described above through strategies, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public information, education, training, and awareness</li> <li>Studies or plans that offer relevant data and analysis</li> </ul>	<p>0-30</p> <p><b>Source:</b> SACOG Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Funding Program Guidelines</p>

Program Criteria	Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>State Program</u>	State Point Scale (min - max)	Working Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>Regional MPO Program</u> (SACOG, EDCTC, PCTPA)	Regional Point Scale (min - max) & Source for Criteria
<p><b>Reducing Walking/Bicycling Fatalities and Injuries</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p><b>Application Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how the project will reduce pedestrian and/or serious bicycle injuries or fatalities.</li> <li>Describe if/how your project will mitigate each of the following safety hazards- bicycle/pedestrian collisions within the project limits (or within 2 miles of target school), inadequate or no crosswalks, bike lanes and/or sidewalks or children walking or biking in the street, low visibility of bicyclists or pedestrians, high speed vehicles, poor sight distances, no traffic control devices, inadequate enforcement of speed limits, or other.</li> <li>Describe the extent and severity of each safety hazard, how each was determined to be a risk/hazard (e.g. accident reports, community observation, surveys, audits) and how the project will mitigate each?</li> </ul>	<p>0-25</p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Same as State Program Guidelines</p> <p><b>Application Questions:</b> <i>(similar to State Program, but with emphasis on data for evidence)</i>                      Infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects should demonstrate benefits through addressing the following questions, using available data* to the greatest extent possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how the project will reduce pedestrian and/or serious bicycle injuries or fatalities.</li> <li>Describe if/how your project will mitigate specific safety hazards. Examples include bicycle/pedestrian collisions within the project limits, inadequate or no crosswalks, locations where pedestrians are walking or biking in the street, low visibility of bicyclists or pedestrians, high speed vehicles, poor sight distances, no traffic control devices, or inadequate enforcement of speed limits.</li> <li>Describe the extent and severity of each safety hazard, how each was determined to be a risk/hazard (e.g. accident reports, community observation, surveys, audits) and how the project will mitigate each?</li> </ul> <p>* data references for demonstrating benefits can include pedestrian safety audits, bicycle Level of Service (LOS), bicycle compatibility audits, or field audits. Additional methods can be found at FHWA, Texas DOT, TIMS [hyperlinks to these resources would be available on regional ATP website]</p>	<p>0-25</p> <p><b>Source:</b>                      Informed by State ATP Guidelines</p>

Program Criteria	Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>State Program</u>	State Point Scale (min - max)	Working Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>Regional MPO Program</u> (SACOG, EDCTC, PCTPA)	Regional Point Scale (min - max) & Source for Criteria
Cost-Effectiveness	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered.</li> <li>Quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Application Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the alternatives that were considered.</li> <li>Discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of all the alternatives.</li> <li>Quantify the safety for each alternative, in relationship to both the total cost and the funds provided.</li> <li>Quantify the mobility benefit for each alternative, in relationship to both the total and the funds provided.</li> <li>Describe how this project utilizes other funding resources.</li> </ul>	0 - 10	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Project demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and ongoing operating costs while offering strong performance benefits and the leveraging of resources.</p> <p><b>Application Questions:</b></p> <p><b>Infrastructure Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe any alternatives to the proposed project that have been analyzed and provide similar benefits? What are the relative costs of these alternatives to the proposed project?</li> <li>Are other revenue sources being leveraged to build the proposed project? What is the funding source? Are these revenues fully secured?</li> <li>What are the projected lifecycle (eg. operations and maintenance) costs? Have revenues been secured to cover these expenses? Are agreements and/or commitments in place with the responsible organization/department?</li> </ul> <p><b>Non- Infrastructure Projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe any alternatives to the proposed project that have been analyzed and provide similar benefits? What are the relative costs of these alternatives to the proposed project?</li> <li>If the program is anticipated to be an ongoing activity, have revenues been secured to cover ongoing expenses? Are agreements and/or commitments in place with the responsible organization/department?</li> <li>Are other revenues or in-kind (non-revenue) resources being leveraged to implement the proposed program? Are these revenues or in-kind resources secured?</li> <li>If you include walking or bicycling benefits of specific groups (eg. students, transit riders, disadvantaged communities) in your cost-effectiveness calculations, please describe how you engaged these groups in the public planning process.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Source:</b> Informed by various EDCTC, PCTPA and SACOG Funding Program Guidelines</p> <p>0 - 10</p>
Improved Public Health	<p><b>Criteria:</b> Improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.</p> <p><b>Application Question:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how the project will improve public health through the targeting of populations who have a high risk factor for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues.</li> </ul>	0 - 10	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Same as State Program Guidelines</p> <p><b>Application Question for Infrastructure and non-infrastructure:</b> <i>(same as State Program, but with emphasis on data for evidence)</i> Describe how the project will improve public health through the targeting of populations who have a high risk factor for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues. Use relevant data to the greatest extent possible in support of this outcome.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> State ATP Guidelines</p> <p>0 - 10</p>

Program Criteria	Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>State Program</u>	State Point Scale (min - max)	Working Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>Regional MPO Program</u> (SACOG, EDCTC, PCTPA)	Regional Point Scale (min - max) & Source for Criteria
<p><b>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Demonstrate benefits to disadvantaged communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• median household income &lt; 80% of the statewide median</li> <li>• among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state</li> <li>• at least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP</li> </ul> <p><b>Application Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project predominately benefit a disadvantaged community? Y/N</li> </ul> <p>Which criteria does the project meet? (Select all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o median household income &lt; 80% of the statewide median</li> <li>o among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state</li> <li>o at least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP</li> <li>o CTC approved other</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe the disadvantaged community and their benefit from the project.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>* At least 25% of the available 6 County Share of ATP funding must go to projects in disadvantaged communities.</p>	<p>0 - 10</p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> The project is located within a disadvantaged community and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community.</p> <p><b>Application Question for Infrastructure and non-infrastructure: (similar to State Program)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project in an area [census tract?] that meets one or more of these qualifications as a disadvantaged community? (select all that apply) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o median household income &lt; 80% of the statewide median</li> <li>o among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state</li> <li>o at least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Describe any project features that target benefits towards disadvantaged community members.</li> <li>• Does the project predominately benefit a disadvantaged community?</li> </ul> <p>*Application of points to the ranking process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 25% of the available 6 County Share of ATP funding must go to projects in disadvantaged communities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Projects will initially be ranked by the Working Group including 10 points for this criteria. This in to insure that the 25% threshold is reached.</li> <li>o After reaching the 25% threshold, the remaining projects will be ranked by the Working Group without the 10 points for this criteria. The Working Group can review both ranking lists when making their final recommendation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Source:</b> Informed by State ATP Guidelines</p> <p>0 - 10</p>
<p><b>Supporting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals in SB 375 and SB 391</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> not a scored criterion in the State program, but one of the six stated goals of the program:</p> <p>“Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391.”</p> <p><b>Application Questions:</b> Not Applicable</p>	<p><u>Not Applicable</u></p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> The 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.</p> <p><b>Application Questions for Infrastructure and non-infrastructure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate that the project is in an area where it can immediately serve utilitarian purposes (eg. trips to school, work, shopping) that have the potential to replace or shorten vehicle trips.</li> <li>• Demonstrate that the project is a placemaking strategy for the future land use and transportation vision for the local area it is located, as described in the MTP/RTP and/or the local general/specific plan. Placemaking is defined as a combination of strategies (eg. zoning, context-sensitive design standards, planned infrastructure, etc.) that lead to a built environment where walking and biking can become a primary mode for shorter distance trips.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Source:</b> Informed by various SACOG Funding Program Guidelines</p> <p>0 – 10</p>

Program Criteria	Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>State Program</u>	State Point Scale (min - max)	Working Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>Regional MPO Program (SACOG, EDCTC, PCTPA)</u>	Regional Point Scale (min - max) & Source for Criteria
<p><b>Public participation and planning</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b>                      Identification of the community-based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal, which may include noticed meetings and consultation with local stakeholders. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.</p> <p>For projects costing \$1 million or more, an emphasis will be placed on projects that are prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pursuant to Section 891.2, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, or circulation element of a general plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation plan. In future funding cycles, the Commission expects to make consistency with an approved active transportation plan a requirement for large projects.</p> <p><b>Application Questions for Infrastructure and non-infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal, such as noticed meetings/public hearings, consultation with stakeholders, etc.</li> <li>Describe the local participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the project.</li> <li>Planning- Is the project cost over \$1 Million? Y/N</li> <li>If Yes- is the project Prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, or circulation element of a general plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation ?</li> </ul>	<p>0 – 15</p>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Other Considerations for funding include past performance on projects, demonstrated project delivery readiness in the application, and evidence of strong stakeholder support to implement the project.</p> <p><b>Other Considerations for Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure Projects:</b> <i>(No additional questions proposed – evaluation is done through review of full application and informed by background information on project sponsors)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good Performance on Past Grants and/or Federal Aid Projects. Project sponsors with good performance on delivering prior projects or programs are most likely to succeed with an ATP project award.</li> <li>Project sponsor demonstrates readiness to move forward on a timely schedule with the proposed project (i.e. application provides clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project).</li> <li>Project applicant demonstrates evidence of strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located. Documentation of a thorough community-based public participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project is a means of demonstrating support for the implementation of the project. The level of support for the project can also be demonstrated through identifying external resources committed to the project and evidence that specific users targeted to use the project were fully engaged throughout the planning process.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Source:</b>                      Informed by various EDCTC, PCTPA and SACOG Funding Program Guidelines</p>

**Attachment B: Working Draft Criteria & Application Question Comparisons**

March 6, 2014

Program Criteria	Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>State Program</u>	State Point Scale (min - max)	Working Draft Criteria & Questions for <u>Regional MPO Program</u> (SACOG, EDCTC, PCTPA)	Regional Point Scale (min - max) & Source for Criteria
<b>California Conservation Corps (CCC)</b>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507 of the Public Resources Code, as partners to undertake or construct applicable projects in accordance with Section of Public Law 112-141. Points will be deducted if an applicant does not seek corps participation or if an applicant intends not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate.</p> <p>Direct contracting with the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps without bidding is permissible provided that the implementing agency demonstrates cost effectiveness per 23 CFR 635.204 and obtains approval from Caltrans. A copy of the agreement between the implementing agency and the proposed conservation corps must be included in the project application as supporting documentation.</p>	-5 - 0 (point deduction)	See above for inclusion into Other Considerations.	
<b>Performance on past grants</b>	<p><b>Criteria Description:</b> Applicant's performance on past grants. This may include project delivery, project benefits (anticipated v. actual), and use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps (planned v. actual). Applications from agencies with documented poor performance records on past grants may be excluded from competing or may be penalized in scoring.</p>	-10 - 0 (point deduction)	See above for inclusion into Other Considerations.	