



## Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

October 18, 2016

### Update on Cycle 3 Active Transportation Program, State and Regional

**Issue:** What is the status of the Active Transportation Program call for projects?

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

**Discussion:** The third cycle of the Active Transportation Program (ATP) is now being administered by Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The ATP was created to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. Approximately \$240 million has been budgeted for Cycle 3 across the state for the two-year period of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, with an additional \$10 million of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund recently identified for fiscal year 2017. Approximately \$125 million is available through the State ATP and our region submitted 35 applications requesting \$81 million (Attachment A). The State ATP recommendations will be announced October 28th.

Of the 35 projects submitted to the State ATP, 30 projects went on to compete for Regional ATP funds (Attachment B). Using the Regional ATP Policy Framework (Attachment C), a multi-disciplinary working group (Attachment D) evaluated all 30 projects and ranked them in priority order to receive funding. Staff will use the ranked ATP list (Attachment A) to develop the final recommendation for Regional ATP funding 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 requirements that a minimum of one quarter of the regional share is recommended towards projects that benefit a disadvantaged community as defined by the statewide 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 funding 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.

**Attachments:**

- A: State and Regional ATP Cycle 3 Competing Projects
- B: Regional ATP Project Details
- C: Regional ATP Policy Framework
- D: Active Transportation Working Group Roster

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff: Victoria Cacciatore, Associate Analyst, (916)-340-6214

**Competing Active Transportation Program Projects  
State and Regional (in ranked order)**

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Final Regional ATP Score*	Recommended for State ATP Award**	Regional ATP Rank	Funding Request (Regional request may differ from State)
City of Sacramento	Broadway Complete Streets Project	79	TBD	1	\$ 2,763,000
City of Sacramento	Northwood School and Transit Access Improvements	76	TBD	2	\$ 1,818,406
City of Citrus Heights	Citrus Heights Electric Greenway (Class 1 Multi-Use Trail)	75	TBD	3	\$ 350,000
City of Citrus Heights	Mariposa Safe Routes to School Project (Phase IV)	74	TBD	4	\$ 2,135,000
City of Marysville	Marysville Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project	74	TBD	5	\$ 515,000
City of Elk Grove	Elk Grove Florin Rd Sidewalk Infill SRTS	74	TBD	6	\$ 814,000
Yuba County	Eleventh Avenue Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian Route Improvements	74	TBD	7	\$ 1,505,000
City of Roseville	Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project, Roseville	72	TBD	8	\$ 2,000,000
City of Rancho Cordova	Cordova Park Safe Routes to School Project	70	TBD	9	\$ 1,889,230
City of Sacramento	Meadowview Road Complete Street Phase 2	70	TBD	10	\$ 1,618,000
Yuba County	McGowan Parkway Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian Route Improvements	70	TBD	11	\$ 1,108,000
Sacramento County	Howe Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Sacramento County	69	TBD	12	\$ 1,761,000
City of Rancho Cordova	City of Rancho Cordova - Safe Routes to School Plan	68	TBD	13	\$ 245,228
City of Yuba City	Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure	67	TBD	14	\$ 1,972,000
City of Sacramento	Franklin Boulevard Class IV Protected Bikeway	67	TBD	15	\$ 1,644,000
City of Sacramento	Old Sacramento Riverfront Access	67	TBD	16	\$ 265,590
City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Bicycle and Pedestrian Overpass & Safe Routes to School Program	66	TBD	17	\$ 5,813,765
Sacramento County	Fourth Ave Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	64	TBD	18	\$ 3,009,000
City of Rancho Cordova	Folsom South Canal Trail Crossing Improvements at White Rock Road	63	TBD	19	\$ 613,000
City of Sacramento	Two Rivers Trail (Phase II)	63	TBD	20	\$ 3,333,000
City of West Sacramento	Clarksburg Branch Line Trail Extension	62	TBD	21	\$ 1,484,648
Sacramento County	Folsom Boulevard Complete Street Improvements, Phase 1	62	TBD	22	\$ 4,180,000
City of Davis	Providing Safe Passage: Connecting Montgomery Elementary and Olive Drive	62	TBD	23	\$ 3,540,000
Sacramento County	Watt Avenue Complete Street Improvements, Sacramento County	58	TBD	24	\$ 2,787,000
City of Placerville	Upper Broadway Pedestrian Connection Project	57	TBD	25	\$ 1,886,000
City of Roseville	Washington Boulevard Bikeway and Pedestrian Pathways Project	55	TBD	26	\$ 2,212,000
City of Yuba City	Bridge Street SR2S Shared Path	55	TBD	27	\$ 577,000
City of Sacramento	Fourth Street Pedestrian Access	55	TBD	28	\$ 266,000
City of Lincoln	Lincoln Boulevard Pedestrian and Intersection Improvements	54	TBD	29	\$ 2,014,058
Sutter County	Sutter Class I Bike Path Conversion to Class IV Trail	36	TBD	30	\$ 1,231,000
<b><i>The below projects competed through the State ATP but did not submit to the Regional ATP.</i></b>					
El Dorado County	El Dorado Trail - Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado	N/A	TBD	N/A	\$ 3,429,000
El Dorado County	El Dorado Trail - Bike and Pedestrian Overcrossing	N/A	TBD	N/A	\$ 4,532,000
Rocklin B Street Pedestrian Corridor	Rocklin B Street Pedestrian Corridor	N/A	TBD	N/A	\$ 535,000
Placer County	Sheridan Safe Routes to School and Multimodal Improvements	N/A	TBD	N/A	\$ 6,482,000
City of Woodland	Sports Park Drive Pedestrian Overcrossing	N/A	TBD	N/A	\$ 1,320,000

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

\*\* Draft recommendation expected October 28, 2016.

# Project Scoring Details

Attachment B

## 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 &amp; Students</i>	2	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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: \$2,014,058**

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 &amp; Students</i>	4	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	4	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.*

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 &amp; Students</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	7	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 Request: \$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 &amp; Students</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	6	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 Request: \$2,407,000**  
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 &amp; Students</i>	10	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	7	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 &amp; Students</i>	10	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	6	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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: \$245,228**

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 &amp; Students</i>	11	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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

*City of Rancho Cordova*

**Cordova Park Safe Routes to School Project**

**Funding Request: \$1,889,230**

**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.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>	<b>Average Reviewer Score</b>	<b>Total Points Possible</b>
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools &amp; Students</i>	10	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>	<b>Average Reviewer Score</b>	<b>Total Points Possible</b>
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Schools &amp; Students</i>	1	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	2	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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

*City of Sacramento*

**Broadway Complete Streets Project**

**Funding Request: \$2,763,000**

Total Project Cost: \$4,414,000

On Broadway between 3rd St. and 16th 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 &amp; Students</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	1	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.



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 &amp; Students</i>	3	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	3	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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

*City of Sacramento*

Northwood School and Transit Access  
Improvements

**Funding Request: \$1,818,406**  
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 &amp; Students</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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: \$265,590**  
Total Project Cost: \$2,767

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 &amp; Students</i>	2	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 &amp; Students</i>	3	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	3	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 27<sup>th</sup> 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 &amp; Students</i>	4	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 &amp; Students</i>	3	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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

**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 &amp; Students</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	7	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 &amp; Students</i>	2	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	7	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	1	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	1	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 &amp; Students</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	6	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	7	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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 &amp; Students</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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: \$1,484,648**  
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 &amp; Students</i>	5	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	4	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

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: \$5,813,765**  
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 &amp; Students</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	6	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	6	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.



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 &amp; Students</i>	9	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	6	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 &amp; Students</i>	8	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Transit</i>	7	12
Increasing Walking & Biking: <i>Barriers &amp; 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 were ranked based on the average cumulative project scores, which subtracted the outliers (i.e. high and low) and does not include the Disadvantaged Community Score per the Policy Framework. Information provided in the Project Scoring Detail reflects scoring breakdowns and totals from the 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 D.

## 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*