This project applied to the State ATP prior to competing through the Regional ATP—pages 2-40 reflect their Regional ATP supplemental application and pages 41 through 100 reflect their original State ATP application.
June 17, 2015

Victoria S. Cacciatore
Active Transportation Project Coordinator
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Submittal of Application for SACOG Regional ATP/Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds

Dear Mrs. Cacciatore:

As the Public Works Director of the City of Rancho Cordova, I am pleased to submit this application for your consideration for Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds and Regional ATP for the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Project. I have also attached a copy of the City Council resolution that gives me the authority to apply for funds and enter into contracts.

If you have any questions, please contact Chris Boyer or me at (916) 851-8907.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Cyrus Abhar
Public Works Director - City of Rancho Cordova
Six-County Regional
Active Transportation Program
Cycle 2
&
Four-County Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program

Joint Application
Supplement to the State ATP Application
O. Sections I-V

Please read the Application Instructions at
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html
and
http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm
prior to filling out this application.
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This Supplemental Application is for projects that applied through the State ATP and also want to compete in the Regional Active Transportation Program (available to jurisdictions within El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties) and/or the Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program (available to jurisdictions within Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties). With this streamlined approach, your project has the opportunity to compete for regional funding in the event your project is not awarded funding through the state competition.

Note: Please note that these materials constitute the release of the call for projects for the Regional ATP. The framework, which dictates all application materials related to the Regional Active Transportation Program, was adopted by the California Transportation Commission on May 28, 2015, marking the formal release of the Regional ATP call for projects. All materials are available online at:

http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm
I. Project Sponsor Information

(Please read the Caltrans “ATP instructions” and the SACOG “Program and Application Guidelines” documents prior to responding to the questions in this application.)

PROJECT SPONSOR: This agency must enter into a Master Agreement with Caltrans and will be financially and contractually responsible for the delivery of the project within all pertinent Federal and State funding requirements.

PROJECT SPONSOR’S NAME:  
City of Rancho Cordova

PROJECT SPONSOR’S ADDRESS:  
2729 Prospect Park Drive

PROJECT SPONSOR’S CONTACT PERSON:  
Chris Boyer

CONTACT PERSON’S TITLE:  
Associate Engineer

CONTACT PERSON’S PHONE NUMBER:  
916-851-8907

CONTACT PERSON’S EMAIL ADDRESS:  
cboyer@cityofranchocordova.org
II. Project Information

1. Project is applying for (check all that apply): ☒ Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Program (4-county) ☒ Regional Active Transportation Program (6-county)

2. Application number: __1__ out of __3__ applications (ranked by project sponsor priority)

3. Project Name (To be used in the CTC project list)
Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Project

4. Project Location (Include a map in the Appendix)
This project is located within the City of Rancho Cordova’s Stone Creek neighborhood. The project is located where the Stone Creek bike loop intersects with Zinfandel Dr. and Prospect Park Dr.

5. Project Description/Scope:
   a. What is the full project description and scope for the project applying for funds?
      The project will install new bicycle/pedestrian actuated signals, striping and signage, and curb cuts with ADA ramps at two locations where the existing Stone Creek Community Bike Trail intersects Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive.
   b. Is there a usable partial scope of the project? Describe the scope and cost estimate.
      Both the Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive bike/pedestrian crossing improvements are critical to improving safety and increasing bike and pedestrian use for the Stone Creek Trail System. There would not be a usable partial scope for this project that met the minimum project amount requirements.

6. Project Funding Request:
   Please verify your funding request meets the minimum dollar amount and matching requirements identified in Screening Criteria #5.

   Project funding request: $ __442,000_________
   Project matching funds: $ __58,000_________
   TOTAL PROJECT COST: $ __500,000_________

7. Project Programming Request (PPR) and Cost & Schedule Summary:
   Please include Excel versions of the completed PPR and the Cost & Schedule Summary with your electronic application submittal. (Project status and expected delivery schedule.) The project status and expected delivery schedule must assume use of federal funding.
   If your funding request to the Regional ATP and/or Regional BPFP is different from what was requested through the State ATP, please ensure that information is updated in your PPR.

8. Current state of the project area:

   For infrastructure projects:
a. Are there existing bike/ped facilities?
   Yes, the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail is constructed with the exception of formal crossings at the trail’s intersection with Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive.

b. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what is the posted speed limit?
   Zinfandel Drive is 40 MPH; Prospect Park Drive is 35 MPH

c. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what are the daily traffic volumes? Peak hour traffic volumes?
   Zinfandel Drive 2014 ADT is 13,992, and the 20 year projection by SACOG is 40,000 ADT; volumes for Prospect Park Drive are unknown at this time.

d. Are there any projects near the project area anticipated for construction in the immediate future (next 4 years)?
   Within 1 mile of the project area are 64 acres of developable land equivalent to an estimated 3,627 homes. It is assumed that at least 50% has the potential to begin construction in the next 4 years.

For non-infrastructure projects:

a. What other plans or programs are currently in place within the project area, or recently concluded?
   Click here to enter text:

b. Are there any plans or programs in or near the project area anticipated to begin in the immediate future (next four years)?
   Click here to enter text:
III. Screening Criteria

Please fill out Part III in its entirety.

1. Explain how this project is consistent with the EDCTC Regional Transportation Plan, PCTPA Regional Transportation Plan, or the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). (Please only answer the option most applicable to your project.)

   A. Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan, MTP/SCS, and/or the Regional Transportation Plan of EDCTC or PCTPA. Provide the project name and number (if available) and the applicable document title and page number. Part B Screening Criteria #2, pages 3-5, of the statewide ATP application specifically describe where the proposed crossing improvements are identified in the applicable plans mentioned in the question above.

   B. If your infrastructure project is not included as described above, please explain any special circumstances that precluded it from being included in the applicable Regional Transportation Plan. Click here to enter text:

   C. Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility requirements:

      1) Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, training, and awareness, Click here to enter text:

      or

      2) Perform studies and develop plans that support one or more of the project performance outcomes of the program. Click here to enter text:

2. Project is identified in the project sponsor's Statement of Intent to Apply correspondence. Please include a copy of the letter in the application Appendix.

   Yes ☒ No ☐

3. Project is ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.

   Yes ☒ No ☐

   a. Please include an appropriate project description per the below guidelines:

      [[Location:] + (Limits) + (;) + (Improvement)]

      Example: In Bakersfield: Between 1st Street and Pine Boulevard; fill in sidewalk gaps and add a protected bike lane.

      In the City of Rancho Cordova: at the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail crossing with Zinfandel Drive and Prosept Park Drive; construct pedestrian activated traffic signals to provide a red light to vehicular traffic, cut the curbs at the sidewalks and medians to provide ADA ramps, realign the trail entrance points with sidewalk connections where necessary, and provide crosswalk markings.

4. Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources. (i.e. ATP for ATP-only applications; CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP for BPFP-only applications; ATP, CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP for applications to both programs)

   Yes ☒ No ☐
5. Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure project and includes at least an 11.47% local match; local match requirements apply to all project categories.
   A. Infrastructure project minimum total cost is $282,390 ($250,000 funding request + $32,390 local match).
      Yes ☒ No ☐

   B. Non-Infrastructure project minimum total cost is $56,478 ($50,000 funding request + $6,478 local match).
      Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Project proposal culminated from a community-based public participation process.
   Yes ☒ No ☐
   A. Is the total project cost over $1 Million? Yes ☐ No ☒
      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, circulation element of a general plan, or other publicly approved plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation plan?
      Yes ☒ No ☐
      List the plan and project number or page number to demonstrate project priority:
      SACOG Regional Bike, Ped, and Trails Master Plan – Meets goals 1B, 2A, 3A, 3B and 4D.

7. Project demonstrates coordination with the California Conservation Corps (CCC) or a certified community conservation corps. (Applies to infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects applying to the Regional ATP.)

   The applicant must send the following information to the CCC and CALCC prior to application submittal to SACOG:
   - Project Description
   - Detailed Estimate
   - Project Schedule
   - Project Map
   - Preliminary Plan

   The corps agencies can be contacted at:
   California Conservation Corps representative:
   Name: Wei Hsieh
   Email: atp@ccc.ca.gov
   Phone: (916) 341-3154

   Community Conservation Corps representative:
   Name: Danielle Lynch
   Email: inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org
   Phone: (916) 426-9170

   A. The applicant has coordinated with the CCC to identify how a state conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes ☒ No ☐
      • Please include a copy of the correspondence in the application Appendix.
B. The applicant has coordinated with a representative from the California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC) to identify how a certified community conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes ☒ No ☐
- Please include a copy of the correspondence in the application Appendix.

C. The applicant intends to utilize the CCC or a certified community conservation corps on all items where participation is indicated? Yes ☐ No ☐

I have coordinated with a representative of the CCC; and the following are project items that they are qualified to partner on:

*Click here to enter text:

I have coordinated with a representative of the CALCC; and the following are project items that they are qualified to partner on:
*Click here to enter text:

*If the applicant has indicated intended use of the CCC or CALCC in the approved application, a copy of the agreement between the implementing agency and the CCC or CALCC must be provided by the implementing agency, and will be incorporated as part of the original application, prior to request for authorization of funds for construction.

Or

D. Did the CCC and a certified community conservation corps indicate they cannot participate in the project? Yes ☒ No ☐

Or

E. The project sponsor is electing to provide demonstration of the cost-effectiveness clause 23 CFR 635.204 and provide the relevant documentation. (include in Appendix) Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Project is not part of developer-funded basic good practices in a new development.
See the Federal Highway Administration’s guidance for more background on basic good practices. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm

Yes ☒ No ☐

If applicable, please explain how the project falls outside of developer-funded basic good practices (100 words or less).

The Stone Creek Community Bike Trail is already constructed. The proposed bike and pedestrian road crossing improvements will close a gap in the existing trail network by providing safe trail crossing points of two major arterial streets. The project also removes ADA barriers created by the lack of ADA ramps and a median dividing the roadway and access to the trail connectivity.
IV. Narrative Questions (Sections 1-6)
15 pages maximum, 12 point font
(ATP: 0-95 points total; BPFP: 0-83 points total)

Please note: The Supplemental Application offers applicants the opportunity to provide additional, relevant information focused on the priorities of the Regional Funding Programs, allowing project sponsors to add pertinent information not included in the State ATP application and help projects compete effectively at the regional level. DO NOT include information already included in your State ATP application.

1. Increasing Walking & Biking
   (ATP: 0-30 points; BPFP: 0-44 points)
   Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP places additional emphasis on clearly demonstrating how well the project supports improving access to transit services, increasing access to schools, and eliminating gaps or barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network. In each of your responses, be sure to describe the current and projected types and numbers/rates of users. The suballocation of points further establishes areas of emphasis for the Regional BPFP.

A. Schools/Students
   Describe the potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools. Please include any relevant walk audit, needs assessment, or other supporting materials. The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application in addition to any information included below to determine points earned for this question.
   (ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

   Pages 6-8 of Part B Question #1 of the statewide ATP application describes current and projected use numbers. Although the two crossing points do not provide direct access to schools there are several indicators that show kids and students would utilize the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail and eventually cross Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drive. Those indicators include:
   - Census data for adjacent neighborhoods: There are over 1,600 kids under the age 18 within the vicinity of the proposed improvements. See Exhibit 1 in Appendix I.
   - Future school site: As part of the future Stone Creek Community development a future elementary school, Navigator Elementary School, is proposed to be constructed just south of the project area. The proposed crossing improvements will eventually make the Stone Creek Trail system safer for kids who may use the trail to access the new school. The future school site is depicted in Exhibit 1, Appendix I.
   - 288 parcels of retail/commercial/health facilities/employment within 1 mile of the project area: Students may not necessarily use the Stone Creek Trail for school access, but there is a good chance they are using the trail and crossing Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drives to access jobs, or ride or walk to the shopping opportunities nearby after school and on the weekends.
   - Recreation opportunities: The overall 4 mile Stone Creek Community Bike Trail not only connects residential areas to nearby commercial, but also provides families and kids a recreational opportunity encouraging kids to get outside and be active. The trail network also provides connectivity to nearby parks.
B. Transit Services
Describe the potential for increased walking and bicycling access to and from transit services, including transit stops and transfer centers. If a pedestrian project, is it located within one-half mile radius of transit stops? If a bicycle project, is it located within a 3 mile radius of transit services? The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application in addition to any information included below to determine points earned for this question.
(AP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

The Rancho CordoVan Villages Transit Service, bus #177, utilizes both Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive for circulation patterns. There is an existing bus stop approximately 400 feet south of the Stone Creek Community Bike Trial on Zinfandel Drive, and an existing bus stop approximately 250 feet south of the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail on Prospect Park Drive. A transit service map in relation to the proposed improvements, Exhibit 2, is provided in Appendix I. Improving the bike and pedestrian crossing where the Stone Creek Trail crosses both Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drive will create continuity between the bike and pedestrian trail to transit, as well as improving safety for those who utilize the trail system to access the transit stops, and are required to cross the major streets.

C. Barrier Removal and Gap Closure
Describe how the project removes a barrier, closes a gap, or otherwise completes a facility related to non-motorized mobility. Include a description of the existing barriers and/or gaps, how the barriers and gaps within the existing facility discourage walking or biking, and how non-motorized mobility will be effectively addressed upon project completion. The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application in addition to any information included below to determine points earned for this question.
(AP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-22 points)

The proposed Stone Creek Community Bike Trail crossing improvements at Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drives will remove a barrier, close a gap in connectivity, and improve overall access to non-motorized mobility meeting several goals of the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan April 2015, as well as local goals established by the City of Rancho Cordova as described in Part B, pages 3-4 (#2 of the screening criteria) of the statewide ATP application. Further discussion of the projects ability to remove barriers, close a gap, and encourage use of the existing trail system is further discussed in Part B Question #1 section B and C, pages 9-11 of the statewide ATP application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance (sum of sub-scores)</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects with significant potential</td>
<td>21 to 30 points</td>
<td>30-44 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with moderate potential</td>
<td>11 to 20 points</td>
<td>16-29 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with minimal potential</td>
<td>1 to 10 points</td>
<td>1-15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with no potential</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians
(AP: 0-25 points; BPFP: 0-19 points)
Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP places additional emphasis on providing data that demonstrates the benefits this project will have on reducing walking/bicycling fatalities and injuries. Please describe the 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. The suballocation of points further establishes areas of emphasis for the Regional BPFP.
A. History of Collisions
Describe the plan/program influence area or project location’s history of collisions (both the number of collisions and the rate of collisions in relation to the population around the area, and/or the number of people biking or walking exposed to the risk of collision) resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users and the source(s) of data used (e.g. collision reports, community observation, surveys, audits). The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application in addition to any information included below to determine points earned for this question.
(ATP: 0-10 points; BPPF: 0-4 points)

Part B Question #2 section A, pages 12-15, of the statewide ATP application provide information related to the influence area on the project location and cause of collisions and the potential for future collisions. Page 16 (Part B Question #2) of the statewide ATP application also includes the history of collisions in the project area. It is important to emphasize that there was a pedestrian fatality on Zinfandel Drive where a vehicle struck a pedestrian crossing the road near the project area.

B. Community Need
Please describe the need for the project and provide an analysis of the project’s benefit to your community and the region. Qualitative benefits can be measured using various factors. Factors to discuss, as applicable, include: accident reduction, existing and projected usage/ridership/productivity, increase or decrease in ADT, life cycle cost reduction, VMT decrease, pavement quality index, congestion relief (idle reduction, stop and go reduction, and travel time decrease), reduced operating or maintenance costs, etc.
(ATP: 0-5 points; BPPF: 0-4 points)

Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive serve as two major gaps in the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail that serves over 2,800 homes, commercial areas, employment centers, recreational opportunities, and regional trail connectivity to the Folsom South Canal Trail with connection to the American River Bike Trail. The two gaps created by Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drive are major safety hazards forcing bicyclists and pedestrians to cross a combined 10 lanes of traffic unprotected, which have led to one fatality, do not provide any ADA access, and create confusion as to where the trail ends and picks back up. All of these factors discourage trail use for the community and promote vehicular use. The Stone Creek Community is the perfect setup for non-motorized use with over 4 miles of class 1 trail constructed that has the opportunity for residents to enjoy the live, work, play scenario able to walk, bike, or take transit where ever they need to get. The proposed safety improvements will promote trail use and ensure all users have safe non-motorized access continually for over 4 miles. Continuity and Safety of the community’s active transportation network will also aid in reduced VMT, less vehicular congestion, accident reduction, and overall improvements in community health and well-being. As identified in the projected use numbers provided in the statewide ATP application (Part B Question #1 section B page 7) this community is expected to grow substantially. It will be critical to improve the safety and close the gaps in connectivity for the existing alternative transporation network promoting bicycling, walking, and transit to ensure future growth does not lead to substantial increases in VMT and accidents.

C. Safety Hazards
Describe how the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities (discussed in A and B above); including but not limited to the following possible areas; include a description of the existing facility, how the incomplete facility discourages walking or biking, and how the completed facility will be better utilized upon project completion. The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application in addition to any information included below to determine points earned for this question.
(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)
- Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users.
- Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users.
- Eliminates potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including creating physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users.
- Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users.
- Addresses inadequate traffic control devices.
- Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users.
- Addresses inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks.

Part B Question #2 section B, pages 16-18, of the statewide ATP application describes in detail how the project will remedy the safety hazards that have contributed to many injuries and one fatality on Zinfandel Drive. This section of the statewide ATP also describes the proposed improvements to address the bullet points above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects with significant potential</td>
<td>16 to 25 points</td>
<td>12-19 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with moderate potential</td>
<td>8 to 15 points</td>
<td>6-11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with minimal potential</td>
<td>1 to 7 points</td>
<td>1-5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with no potential</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Supporting greenhouse gas reduction goals & linking to MTP/SCS
(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-21 points)
Describe below how the project advances the active transportation efforts of SACOG to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals while improving health and sustainability as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391, and supports implementation of the 2012 MTP/SCS. Figure 7.7 of the 2012 MTP/SCS (“Greenhouse Gas Emissions per Capita from On-Road Sources”, page 179) may be used to demonstrate your project’s potential to support greenhouse gas reduction goals; if you already completed a project-specific GHG analysis for this project, please describe the methodology used and the results of the analysis. The Regional BPFP places emphasis on a project’s potential role in a placemaking strategy, and on the project’s potential to replace vehicle trips or reduce vehicle miles traveled.

A. Supportive Development Efforts
Please describe how the project supports land use and economic development efforts in alignment with MTP/SCS performance goals and the land use vision for the area, as described in the SCS, or the local general and/or specific plan.
(ATP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-5 points)

1. Please describe the project’s Community Type (i.e. development context) as described in the MTP/SCS for 2035 (i.e. Centers and Corridors, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, or Lands Not Identified for Development)—definitions of the Community Types can be found in Chapter 3 of the MTP/SCS for 2035: [http://sacog.org/mtpscs/mtpscs/](http://sacog.org/mtpscs/mtpscs/). Next, please describe the amount of development and type of uses that are expected to be built over the next 20 years for that Community Type in your jurisdiction (reference Appendix E-3 of the 2012 MTP/SCS). If your project is located in the Community Type of “Lands Not identified for Development” or there is insufficient information in the 2012 MTP/SCS Appendix E-3 for your project plan area, please describe the project’s development context using the applicable local land use plan.
The MTP/SCS identified Rancho Cordova as a "Developing Community" in Figure 3.2 (provided in Appendix I), and a "Major Employment Center" in Figure 3.9 (provided in Appendix I). The Stone Creek Community is in the heart of the Rancho Cordova Developing Communities and adjacent to major retail and employment opportunities. The Stone Creek Community offers a variety of residential densities, a commercial/employment center, and dedicated pedestrian and bicycle trails: Stone Creek Community Bike Trail. Transit service is also provided to the community with 15 minute headways during the AM and PM peaks aimed at serving residents and business commuters with access to regional transit services and light rail. Mid day transit service is not provided for the Stone Creek Community. Although much of the community is built there are still over 64 acres of developable land including plans for a new elementary school in the future.

2. Describe how the project, in this Community Type, will support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips. (e.g. the project connects a multifamily housing development to a school or shopping center where no such connection previously existed.)

The Stone Creek Community Bike Trail already exists, however the Trail has gaps creted by Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive with no formal or safe crossing. The proposed improvements will close those gaps by providing safe crossings and 4 miles of continuous trial. Removing the barriers to mobility and creating a more attractive continuous non-auto network that connects residential to commercial/employment will promote residents to walk and bike more often, or use the trail to connect to the nearby transit stops. The Stone Creek Community is in a prime location where residents are less than a 1 mile via the trail from everything they need from shopping, to work, to play, to school, and connections to other residential areas, transit, and regional trails. The proposed safety improvements will attract residents to make the choice not to use their vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant exceptionally describes the project’s Community Type (or development context) and supportive development efforts, and the ability of those efforts to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately describes the project’s Community Type (or development context) and supportive development efforts, and the ability of those efforts to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>2-4 points</td>
<td>2-4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally describes the project’s Community Type (or development context) and supportive development efforts, and the ability of those efforts to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant does not describe the project’s Community Type (or development context) or supportive development, nor the ability to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Placemaking

Describe/explain the project’s role in a placemaking strategy for the future land use and transportation vision for the area it is located, as described in the MTP/SCS and/or the local general/specific plan.

*Placemaking is defined as a combination of strategies (e.g. 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. (BPFP:0- 5 points)*

Part B Screening Criteria #2, pages 3-5, of the statewide ATP application describes the various regional and local plan areas where the proposed improvements will help to achieve placemaking.
goals and promote safer more attractive biking and walking for the Stone Creek Community and surrounding Rancho Cordova area. As Rancho Cordova is considered a Developing Community and Major Employment Center anticipated to have substantial growth in the future, improving bike, pedestrian, ADA access and transit connectivity in the project area is key to supporting those projections. The proposed improvements will address major safety issues for an existing facility that once completed will improve non-auto use and connectivity for the surrounding developed and undeveloped land uses. Capital Village was envisioned to allow unique zoning requirements, emphasizing mixed-use sites and diversity of housing type, design and densities. This unique development provides special park and open space options and encourages non-auto access. The trail that will be served by this project is on the southern border of Capital Village. Rancho Cordova’s complete streets policy was formalized in 2007. The plan was developed in concert with the Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative (Final Report, December 2005) that created best practices for complete streets, bike & ped master planning and public transportation. As a member of The Collaborative, Rancho Cordova created street standards that minimize pavement widths and maximize bicycle and pedestrian amenities for all roadway types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant exceptionally described the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4-5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately described the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2-3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally described the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not describe the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Reducing or shortening vehicle trips

Building on your responses in sections A and B, describe the project’s potential to reduce the number (i.e. replace) of or shorten vehicle miles traveled (VMT), particularly trips serving utilitarian purposes (e.g. trips to school, work, services, shopping). The resource map “2012 MTP/SCS Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita” (available on http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm) illustrates average VMT per capita throughout the region by 2035 and may be used to support a description of your project’s potential to achieve VMT reductions in your community; alternatively, you may use information from approved local plans or other applicable documents to support a description of how your project will support reduced VMT. 

(AP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

The 2012 MTP/SCS VMT resource map shows Rancho Cordova in the 11-17 VMT per Capita range by 2035. Future growth projections, Rancho Cordova considered a Major Employment Center, and the large amount and diversity of residential density are the perfect combination to push Rancho Cordova into the 1-10 VMT per Capita range. Continued implementation of the bike, pedestrian, and transit connectivity projects proposed in the Rancho Cordova Area Plan and SACOG MTP/SCS will be important to making the shift. Projects such as the proposed improvements make the existing Active Transportation network more attractive now and also influence future development to continue to aid in the further connectivity of the non-auto infrastructure. The Stone Creek Community Trail provides a great opportunity now for residents living in the over 2,800 homes to utilize the trail network to get around Rancho Cordova; however barriers that exist for crossing Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive make the full trail network have an unsafe and unattractive appeal as noted in the public outreach process that was conducted. Those responses are provided in Part B Question #3 section C, page 20, of the statewide ATP application. Removing barriers and making the existing network safe now is essential for shifting residents from their cars to Active Transportation modes, and reducing
VMT. Part B Question #1, section A, pages 6-8 of the statewide ATP application provides estimates of current and projected use numbers displaying the potential to gain more non-auto users in return reducing VMT. Part B Questions #1 section B and C, pages 9-11 describe how the specific proposed crossing improvements will improve the Alternative Transportation network, which will ultimately help make Rancho Cordova a much more bike and pedestrian friendly place to live and work helping to reduce VMT. Based on the calculations of the cost-benefit tool, the VMT reduction per year for both walking and biking would be 23,625.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates significant potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>4-5 points</td>
<td>8-11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates moderate potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>2-3 points</td>
<td>4-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates minimal potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1-3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates no potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Cost effectiveness
(Total ATP: 0-10 points, BPFP: 0-4 points + Other Considerations)
Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP emphasizes cost-effectiveness as a way of determining the appropriate facility improvement or project given the needs of the intended users, how well it is expected to perform, what other financial support (i.e. match) is pledged, and how it minimizes construction or operating costs. The suballocation of points further establishes areas of emphasis for the Regional BPFP.

A. Context Sensitive Design
Describe how the project design is appropriate for the community and surrounding environment.
(ATP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-4 points)

Currently Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive create a barrier in connectivity for the Stone Creek Community Bike Trail leaving bicyclist and pedestrians stranded at the edge of both streets to find a 1/4 mile detour to avoid running across several lanes of traffic, hop over a median, and figure out where the trail picks back up. The proposed improvements will safely continue the trail across both Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drives providing curb cuts in the median and at the sidewalk for ADA access, striping to delineate the crossing, and a pedestrian actuated signal that provides a red light for oncoming traffic for safe crossing of all users. These improvements will allow for full connectivity of the trail network for the surrounding community including neighborhoods and commercial areas. The improvements will be designed with materials that blend in with the existing area and match the context of similar improvements already constructed within the project area, and give the trail users a feeling of security for crossing the 6 and 4 lane roads. The crossing itself will promote trail use for the surrounding community.

B. Describe Alternatives
The Regional ATP asks the same question as the State ATP application to discuss alternatives considered. The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application to determine points earned for this part of the question.
(ATP: 0-3 points; BPFP: Part of Other Considerations)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant considers alternatives and exceptionally justifies the project nominated.</th>
<th>7 to 8 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant considers alternatives and adequately justifies the project nominated.</td>
<td>3 to 4 points</td>
<td>2 to 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant considers alternatives and minimally justifies the project nominated.</td>
<td>1 to 2 points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not consider alternatives or justify the project nominated.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Calculation

The Regional ATP asks the same question as the State ATP application to calculate cost effectiveness. The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application to determine points earned for this part of the question.

(ATP: 0-2 points; BPFP: Part of Other Considerations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant demonstrated that the values inputted into the B/C Tool are appropriate, provided documentation of the output B/C value calculated by the Tool, and provided constructive feedback for CTC’s and Caltrans’ consideration.</td>
<td>1-2 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not use the B/C Tool appropriately, provide documentation of the output B/C value calculated by the Tool, or provide constructive feedback for CTC’s and Caltrans’ consideration.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Improved Public Health  
(ATP: 0-10 points)

Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP emphasizes the same performance outcomes and asks the same questions to determine improved public health. **The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application to determine points earned for this question.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant exceptionally described the targeted users and how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>7 to 10 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately described the targeted users and how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>4 to 6 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally described the targeted users and how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>1 to 3 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not describe the targeted users or how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities  
(ATP: 0-10 points)

Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP emphasizes the same performance outcomes and asks the same questions to determine benefit to disadvantaged communities. **The Active Transportation Working Group will consult your State ATP application to determine points earned for this question.**

If your State ATP application does not include a map demonstrating your project’s location in or near a Disadvantaged Community, please include one in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% to 100% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 79% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 59% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% to 39% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 19% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project clearly and significantly addresses health, safety, and/or infrastructure challenges in the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project adequately addresses health, safety, and/or infrastructure challenges in the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project minimally addresses health, safety, and/or infrastructure challenges in the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Other Considerations
2 pages maximum, 12 point font
(ATP:0-10 points BPFP: 0-12 points)

A. Applicant’s Performance on Past Grants

1. Describe how your agency intends to deliver this project on time and within budget. If your agency has had difficulty delivering past grant or federal aid projects during the past five years, then also describe what changes your agency will take in order to deliver this project.
   Part B Question #9 Page 30 of the statewide ATP application provides some background on the City of Rancho Cordova’s experience delivering grant funded projects both statewide and federal. Our agency has demonstrated the ability to deliver projects to meet both state and federal requirements. We are aware that projects that need a CTC allocation require longer processing times and have shorter deadlines for expenditures of funds than projects with only federal funds.

   Our agency received an ATP grant for $2.2 million during the first cycle of ATP funding for the Mather Rails to Trails Project. Since award we have successfully executed an agreement with Caltrans, Union Pacific Rail Road, SPTC Joint Powers Authority, and have 60% design completed with final design scheduled to be completed early 2016 in preparation for construction in spring 2016 that is consistent with the schedule proposed in the ATP Grant Application.

B. Project Readiness

To demonstrate project readiness and ability to move forward on a timely schedule (i.e. clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project), please fill out the Cost and Schedule Summary & the Project Programming Request, both in Excel, available at:

http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm

C. Community and Stakeholder Support

1. Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal or plan, such as noticed meetings/public hearings, consultation with stakeholders, etc.
   Part B Question #3 pages 19-20 of the statewide ATP application provides information on the public participation process that has been conducted to date and plans for future public participation.

2. Describe the local participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the project.
   Part B Question #3 section C page 20 of the statewide ATP application specifically describes feedback received during the public participation process that identify the project
area as a top concern, which is one reason the proposed improvements are a top priority for the City of Rancho Cordova.

3. Attach any relevant notices and materials associated with the public outreach identifying support for this project.

D. Cost Effectiveness

Refer to Narrative Question 4 for consideration of Regional BPFP points awarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant demonstrated complete adherence with identified criteria: excellent prior grant performance, immediate project readiness and a timely schedule, and strong stakeholder support</td>
<td>7 to 10 points</td>
<td>9 to 12 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately demonstrated adherence with identified criteria: adequate prior grant performance, good project readiness and a timely schedule, and some stakeholder support</td>
<td>4 to 6 points</td>
<td>5 to 8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally met the criteria of this section: poor prior grant performance, poor project readiness, and weak or no stakeholder support</td>
<td>1 to 3 points</td>
<td>1 to 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not describe how the project met the criteria of this section</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Project Application Checklist

- **Eligibility:** Potential applicants may check with the contacts identified for SACOG, EDCTC (for project sponsors in El Dorado County), or PCTPA (for projects in Placer County) regarding the eligibility of their project or their eligibility as an applicant (project sponsor) for federal transportation funding.

- **Program Schedule:** Review the program schedule *(Section 1: Reference Information)* in the Guidelines for important dates.

- **Application contents:** Review pages for all needed elements. Review the section of the Guidelines on Project Evaluation *(Part G)* and check that the application contains all information necessary. Page limits are listed in Part I.
  - **Cover letter with a wet signature**
  - **Completed Application—Part O**
    - Project Sponsor Information—Section I
    - Project Information—Section II
    - Screening Criteria—Section III
    - Other Considerations—Section V
    - Narrative Questions—Section IV
  - **Complete Appendix—in order**
    a. Copy of Statement of Intent to Apply correspondence (due June 5, 2015)—Part K
    b. Cost & Schedule Summary (Excel)—Part L
    c. Project Programming Request (Excel)—Part M
    d. Engineer’s Estimate (Excel)—Part N
    e. Emissions Benefit Calculations for CMAQ (BPFP Applicants)—Part P
    f. Map(s) of project location—**or included in Narrative**
    g. Photographs of project location—**or included in Narrative**
h. Copy of CCC & CALCC Correspondence
i. Any additional exhibits
j. Partner Support Letters (if project is co-sponsored)
k. Miscellaneous – Any other information in support of your project

☑️ Implementation Requirements: Review the Implementation section in the Guidelines (Part J) and evaluate your ability to meet all federal and SACOG requirements, including providing local matching funds of at least 11.47 percent of the total project cost and following SACOG’s “Use it or Lose It” policy.

☑️ Submittal Deadline: Please submit one (1) signed original, five (5) color copies of the complete grant application no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015, to:
   Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Active Transportation Team Manager
   Sacramento Area Council of Governments
   1415 L Street, Suite 300
   Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mailed applications are not acceptable. This deadline will be strictly enforced. Please refer to Part I and Part J for additional information. Failure to submit all required parts of the application may result in the application being screened out of the competition.

☑️ Electronic File Submittal: Submit one (1) USB or compact disc with a PDF file of all the application contents no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015.

Include electronic versions of your Engineer’s Estimate, Cost & Schedule Summary, and PPR (in Excel) in the electronic submittal. The additional materials may be scanned into a PDF file, such as maps, graphics, etc. If a Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent is complete, please submit a PDF of the PSR on the USB or compact disc. Please do not include a complete Master Plan or other local planning document.
Hello Ms. Siren—thank you for submitting Rancho Cordova’s Statement of Intent to Apply.

Warm regards,

Lacey Symons-Holtzen, PMP
SACOG
1415 L Street STE 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
Log your miles at MavisBikeMonth.com

Ms. Symons-Holtzen:

The City of Rancho Cordova intends to submit 3 projects to the Active Transportation Program and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program. The titles of the projects are listed below:

1. Cordova Park Sidewalk Project
2. Stone Creek Trail Pedestrian Signals at Kilgore Rd and Zinfandel Dr
3. Class IV Bike Routes – Routier & Rod Beaudry

Please contact me at 916-851-8892 with any further questions on these projects identified in our Statement of Intent to Apply. I acknowledge that identifying a project in the Statement of Intent to Apply does not commit my agency to submitting an application for funding for this project.

Thanks,

Megan Siren
City of Rancho Cordova
Public Works Department
Phone: (916) 851-8892
msiren@cityofranchocordova.org
Basic Tool: Cost and Schedule Summary
For use with Community Design, Regional ATP and Regional BPFP applicants only
Fill in BLUE SECTIONS where appropriate. Edit the formula cells at your own risk

Project Sponsor
City of Rancho Cordova

Project Title
Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Project

Project Description (scope and limits)
The Project will install new bicycle/pedestrian actuated signals, striping and signage, and curb cuts with ADA ramps at two locations where the existing Stone Creek Community Bike Trail intersects Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital Activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Design</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Jun-16</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td>Sep-16</td>
<td>$ 415,000</td>
<td>$ 367,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | Jan-16| Sep-16| $ 500,000 | $ 442,000 | 88.40%

**TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-CAPITAL ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization to Proceed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Studies</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital staff activities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital materials</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL & DESIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization to Proceed</th>
<th>Jan-16</th>
<th>Jan-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Environmental Document Type | CE | Cat Ex |
| Environmental Decision Type | CE | Cat Ex |

| Environmental Clearance | Jan-16| Mar-16 |
| Final Design (Plans, Specs, & Est) | Apr-16| Jun-16 |

**RIGHT-OF-WAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization to Proceed</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need ROW Acquisition?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need Utilities Relocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization to Proceed</th>
<th>Jul-16</th>
<th>Sep-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Totals | Jul-16| Sep-16 | $ 415,000 | $ 367,000 |
### Project Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPNO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Information:

**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATP Funds

#### Infrastructure Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Infrastructure Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Plan Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATP Funds

#### Previous Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Future Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Information:

**Project Title:** Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Project  
**District:** 3  
**County:** Sacramento  
**Route:**  
**EA:**  
**Project ID:**  
**PPNO:**

### Funding Information:

**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS**

| Fund No. 2 | Future Source for Matching | Program Code | Local | Total | Funding Agency | Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Prior 14/15 15/16 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund No. 3 | Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s) | Program Code | Funding Agency | Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Prior 14/15 15/16 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund No. 4 | Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s) | Program Code | Funding Agency | Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Prior 14/15 15/16 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund No. 5 | Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s) | Program Code | Funding Agency | Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Prior 14/15 15/16 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund No. 6 | Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s) | Program Code | Funding Agency | Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Prior 14/15 15/16 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund No. 7 | Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s) | Program Code | Funding Agency | Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Prior 14/15 15/16 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment B
## ATTACHMENT G

**RANCHO CORDOVA 2015 ATP - STONE CREEK PEDESTRIAN/BIKE CROSSING SIGNAL CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY (FT)</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>DEPTH</th>
<th>SPACING</th>
<th>TOTAL QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Water Pollution and Erosion Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bike Path Excavation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,074.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aggregate Base (Class II)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,386.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PCC Median Curb</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PCC Sidewalk</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asphalt Concrete Rubberized</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ton</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,668.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sawcut Pavement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Curb Ramp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Detectable Warning Surface 3' x 10'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cape Seal</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Traffic Stripe Removal</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Traffic Stripe (4' Solid White)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Traffic Stripe (4' Solid Yellow)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Traffic Stripe (6' Solid White)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pavement Markers (Retractive)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pavement Markings-Crosswalk,Legends,Arrows</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Object Markers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Traffic Signage-Furnish, Reset, Relocate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike Crossing Signal (2 Locations)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Remove Street Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Landscaping (Median)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,440.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Subtotal**
- Contingency (10%): $31,914.46
- CM & Inspection Cost (10%): $34,303.00
- PM & Staff Cost (10%): $31,184.56
- Environmental Documentation (1.5%): $5,145.45
- Mapping & Survey: $40,000.00
- Utility Coordination: $10,000.00
- Design Engineering: $39,303.00

**TOTAL PROJECT COSTS:**
$497,968.01

---

Attachment G
BICYCLE FACILITIES

County: Sacramento
Federal Number: 
Approval Date: 
Caltrans DIST-EA: 3
Short Description: Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Proje
Project Scope: The project will install new bicycle/pedestrian actuated signals, striping and signage, and curb cuts with ADA ramps at two locations where the existing Stone Creek Community Bike Trail intersects Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive.
Project Sponsor: City of Rancho Cordova  Private Agency: No

CMAQ Funding: $442,000  Annual Auto Trips Reduced: 45,124
Local Match: $58,000  Annual Auto VMT Reduced: 90,248
Capital Recovery Factor: 0.07
Project Analysis Period: 20 years
Days (D): 250 days of use/year
Average Daily Traffic (ADT): 13,992 trips per day
Adjustment (A) on ADT: 0.0109
Credit (C) for Activity Centers near project: 0.0020

EMISSION FACTORS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auto Trip End Factor</th>
<th>Auto VMT Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>0.488 grams per trip</td>
<td>0.180 grams per mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMISSION REDUCTIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pounds per Year</th>
<th>Kilograms per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF:

CMAQ Funds: $154.16 per pound $308,313 per ton
All Funding Sources: $174.39 per pound $348,770 per ton
Stone Creek Trail intersection with Zinfandel Drive. Looking east across Zinfandel Drive

Stone Creek Trail terminus on the east side of Zinfandel Drive
Looking north on Zinfandel Drive

Looking west at the Stone Creek Trail terminus with Prospect Park Drive

Attachment F
Looking across Prospect Park Drive at the Stone Creek Trail terminus
Stone Creek Trail intersection with Prospect Park Drive. Looking west across Prospect Park Drive

Looking north on Prospect Park Drive
Chris Boyer

From: Luke Fuson <lfuson@WoodRodgers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 2:11 PM
To: Derek Kirkland; Chris Boyer
Cc: Mark Rayback
Subject: FW: Rancho Cordova - Stone Creek Trail pedestrian crossings - ATP

Chris,

We'll be sending you a draft of the application tomorrow.

Please see below from CCC regarding participation.

Thanks,

Luke Fuson
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
916.326.5426 Direct
916.997.2453 Mobile

From: Hsieh, Wei@CCC [mailto:Wei.Hsieh@CCC.CA.GOV] On Behalf Of ATP@CCC
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 1:56 PM
To: Luke Fuson
Cc: ATP@CCC; Hsieh, Wei@CCC; Monroe, Carie@CCC; Thornhill, Rod@CCC; 'inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org'
Subject: RE: Rancho Cordova - Stone Creek Trail pedestrian crossings - ATP

Hi Luke,

Thank you for contacting the CCC. Unfortunately, we are unable to participate in this project. Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the CCC.

Thank you,

Wei Hsieh, Manager
Programs & Operations Division
California Conservation Corps
1719 24th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 341-3154
Wei.Hsieh@ccc.ca.gov

From: Luke Fuson [mailto:lfuson@WoodRodgers.com]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 3:07 PM
To: Clark, Virginia@CCC

Attachment K
C: Chris Boyer; Mark Rayback; Derek Kirkland
Subject: Rancho Cordova - Stone Creek Trail pedestrian crossings - ATP

Hello Virginia,

The City of Rancho Cordova is seeking ATP grant funding to construct two pedestrian traffic signals. The signal would be located along Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive where the existing Stone Creek trail intersects those roads.

I have attached the project description, map, schedule, cost estimate, and preliminary plans.

Will you please consider this project and let me know if this is a project the CCC would like to participate on?

Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Thank you,

Luke Fuson - P.E.
Associate - Transportation
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
3301 C Street, Bldg. 100-B
Sacramento, CA 95816
916.341.7760 Tel
916.341.7767 Fax
916.326.5426 Direct
916.997.2453 Mobile
lfuson@woodrodgers.com
www.woodrodgers.com
Figure 3.9
Major Employment Centers
SACOG 2011
- Employment Center
- 4 Mile Buffer
- County Boundaries
- Rivers/Lakes

[Map showing major employment centers with labels like Yuba City, Downtown Marysville, Sunset Industrial Area, etc., with a marked Project Area.]
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM - CYCLE 2

Application Form for Part A

*Parts B & C must be completed using a separate document*

**PROJECT unique APPLICATION NO.:**

03-Rancho Cordova-1

Auto populated

**Total ATP Funds Requested:**

$ 442 (in 1000s)

Auto populated

**Important:** Applicants must follow the CTC Guidelines and Chapter 22 of the Local Assistance Program Guidelines, and include attachments and signatures as required in those documents. Ineligible project elements may result in a lower score/ranking or a lower level of ATP funding. Incomplete applications may be disqualified.

Applicants are expected to use the corresponding “step-by-step” Application Instructions and Guidance to complete the application (3 Parts):

- Part A: General Project Information
- Part B: Narrative Questions
- Part C: Application Attachments

**Application Part A: General Project Information**

**Implementing Agency:** This agency must enter into a Master Agreement with Caltrans and will be financially and contractually responsible for the delivery of the project within all pertinent Federal and State funding requirements, including being responsible and accountable for the use and expenditure of program funds. This agency is responsible for the accuracy of the technical information provided in the application and is required to sign the application.

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY'S NAME:**

Rancho Cordova

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY'S ADDRESS**

2729 Prospect Park Drive

**CITY**

Rancho Cordova

**ZIP CODE**

CA 95670

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY'S CONTACT PERSON:**

Chris Boyer

**CONTACT PERSON'S TITLE:**

Associate Engineer

**CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER:**

916-851-8907

**CONTACT PERSON'S EMAIL ADDRESS:**

cboyer@cityofranchocordova.org
**Project Partnering Agency:** Entities that are unable to apply for Active Transportation Program funds or that are unable to enter into a Master Agreement with the State must partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. **In addition,** entities that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project may partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project.

If another entity (Partnering Agency) agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement (e.g., letter of intent) must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Intergency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the first request for allocation. For these projects, the Project Partnering Agency's information shall be provided below.

*(The Grant Writer's or Preparer's information should not be provided)*

**PROJECT PARTNERING AGENCY'S NAME:**

**PROJECT PARTNERING AGENCY'S ADDRESS**

**CITY**

**ZIP CODE**

CA

**PROJECT PARTNERING AGENCY'S CONTACT PERSON:**

**CONTACT PERSON'S TITLE:**

**CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER:**

**CONTACT PERSON'S EMAIL ADDRESS:**

**MASTER AGREEMENTS (MAs):**

Does the Implementing Agency currently have a MA with Caltrans? **Yes**

Implementing Agency's Federal Caltrans MA number 03-5482R

Implementing Agency's State Caltrans MA number 00266S

* Implementing Agencies that do not currently have a MA with Caltrans, must be able to meet the requirements and enter into an MA with Caltrans prior to funds allocation. The MA approval process can take 6 to 12 months to complete and there is no guarantee the agency will meet the requirements necessary for the State to enter into a MA with the agency. Delays could also result in a failure to meet the CTC Allocation timeline requirements and the loss of ATP funding.

**PROJECT NAME:** (To be used in the CTC project list)

Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Pedestrian Signal Safety Project

**Application Number:** 1 out of 3 Applications

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** (Max of 250 Characters)

The project will install new bicycle/pedestrian actuated signals, striping and signage, and curb cuts with ADA ramps at two locations where the existing Stone Creek Community Bike Trail intersects Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** (Max of 250 Characters)

This project is located within the City of Rancho Cordova's Stone Creek neighborhood. The project is located where the Stone Creek bike loop intersects with Zinfandel Dr. and Prospect Park Dr.
Will any infrastructure-improvements permanently or temporarily encroach on the State right-of-way?  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

If yes, see the application instructions for more details on the required coordination and documentation.

Project Coordinates: (latitude/longitude in decimal format)  
Lat. 38.580257  /long. -121.283305

Congressional District(s):  
☐ 7  ☐ 8  ☐ 9

State Senate District(s):  
☐ 4  ☐ 8  ☐ 9

State Assembly District(s):  
☐ 8  ☐ 9  ☐ 10

Caltrans District(s):  
03

County:  
Sacramento County

MPO:  
SACOG

RTPA:  

MPO UZA Population:  
Within a Large MPO (Pop > 200,000)

ADDITIONAL PROJECT GENERAL DETAILS: (Must be consistent with Part B of Application)

ESTIMATION OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION USERS

Existing Counts:  
Pedestrians 180  Bicyclists 180

One Year Projection:  
Pedestrians 300  Bicyclists 300

Five Year Projection:  
Pedestrians 450  Bicyclists 450

BICYCLE AND/OR PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE (Check all that apply)

Bicycle:  
Class I ☐  Class II ☐  Class III ☐  Other  Crossing

Pedestrian:  
Sidewalk ☐  Crossing ☒  Other

Multiuse Trails/Paths:  
Meets "Class I" Design Standards ☐  Other

DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

Project contributes toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement: the project must clearly demonstrate a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

If yes, which criterion does the project meet in regards to the Disadvantaged Community (mark all that apply):

Household Income  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  CalEnvioScreen  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Student Meals  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  Local Criteria  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Is the majority of the project physically located within the limits of a Disadvantaged Community:  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

CORPS

Does the agency intend to utilize the Corps:  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

Form Date:  March 25, 2015  Page 3 of 6
PROJECT TYPE (Check only one: I, NI or I/NI)

Infrastructure (I)  ❑ OR Non-Infrastructure (NI)  ❑ OR Combination (N/NI)  ❑

"Plan" applications to show as NI only

Development of a Plan in a Disadvantaged Community:  ❑ Yes  ❑ No

If Yes, check all Plan types that apply:

❑ Bicycle Plan
❑ Pedestrian Plan
❑ Safe Routes to School Plan
❑ Active Transportation Plan

Indicate any of the following plans that your agency currently has: (Check all that apply)

Bicycle Plan  ❑ Pedestrian Plan  ❑ Safe Routes to School Plan  ❑ Active Transportation Plan  ❑

PROJECT SUB-TYPE (check all Project Sub-Types that apply):

❑ Bicycle Transportation  % of Project  50.0 % (ped + bike must = 100%)
❑ Pedestrian Transportation  % of Project  50.0 %
❑ Safe Routes to School (Also fill out Bicycle and Pedestrian Sub-Type information above)

How many schools does the project impact/serve:  0

If the project involves more than one school: 1) Insert “Multiple Schools” in the School Name, School Address, and distance from school; 2) Fill in the student information based on the total project; and 3) Include an attachment to the application which clearly summarizes the following school information and the school official signature and person to contact for each school.

School name:

School address:

District name:

District address:

Co-Dist.-School Code:

School type (K-8 or 9-12 or Both)  ❑ Project improvements maximum distance from school  mile

Total student enrollment:

% of students that currently walk or bike to school%  ❑

Approx. # of students living along route proposed for improvement:

Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced meal programs **  ❑

**Refer to the California Department of Education website:  http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/cw/filesaefc.asp

A map must be attached to the application which clearly shows the limits of: 1) the student enrollment area, 2) the students considered to be along the walking route being improved, 3) the project improvements.
☐ Trails (Multi-use and Recreational): (Also fill out Bicycle and Pedestrian Sub-Type information above)

Trails Projects constructing multi-purpose trails and are generally eligible in the Active Transportation Program. If the applicant believes all or part of their project meets the federal requirements of the Recreational Trails Program they are encouraged to seek a determination from the California Department of Parks and Recreation on the eligibility of their project to complete for this funding. This is optional but recommended because some trails projects may compete well under this funding program.

For all trails projects:

Do you feel a portion of your project is eligible for federal Recreational Trail funding? □ Yes □ No

If yes, estimate the total projects costs that are eligible for the Recreational Trail funding:

If yes, estimate the % of the total project costs that serve “transportation” uses?

Applicants intending to pursue “Recreational Trails Program funding” must submit the required information to the California Department of Parks and Recreation prior to the ATP application submissions deadline. (See the Application Instructions for details)

PROJECT STATUS and EXPECTED DELIVERY SCHEDULE

Applicants need to enter either the date the milestone was completed (for all milestones already complete prior to submitting the application) or the date the applicant anticipates completing the milestone. Applicants should enter "N/A" for all CTC Allocations that will not be requested as part of the project. Per CTC Guidelines, all project applications must be submitted with the expectation of receiving partially federally funded and therefore the schedule below must account for the extra time needed for federal project delivery requirements and approvals. See the application instructions for more details.

The agency is responsible for meeting all CTC delivery requirements or their ATP funding will be forfeited.

For projects consisting of entirely non-infrastructure elements are not required to complete all standard infrastructure project milestones listed below. Non-infrastructure projects only have to provide dates for the milestones identified with a "*" and can provide "N/A" for the rest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE:</th>
<th>DATE COMPLETED</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>EXPECTED DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTC - PA&amp;ED Allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CEQA Environmental Clearance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* NEPA Environmental Clearance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC - PS&amp;E Allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC - Right of Way Allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Right of Way Clearance &amp; Permits;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final/Stamped PS&amp;E package:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CTC - Construction Allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Construction Complete:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Submittal of &quot;Final Report&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/31/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form Date: March 25, 2015
**PROJECT FUNDING (in 1000s)**

Per CTC Guidelines, Local Matching funds are not required for any ATP projects, but Local Leveraging funds are strongly encouraged.

See the Application instructions for more details and requirements relating to ATP funding.

ATP funds being requested for this application/project by project delivery phase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP funds for PA&amp;D</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP funds for PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP funds for Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP funds for Construction</td>
<td>$367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP funds for Non-Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(All NI funding is allocated in a project's Construction Phase)*

Total ATP funds being requested for this application/project: $442

Local funds leveraging or matching the ATP funds: $58

For local funding to be considered Leveraging/Matching it must be for ATP eligible activities and costs.

Per CTC Guidelines, Local Matching funds are not required for any ATP projects, but Local Leveraging funds are strongly encouraged. See the Application instructions for more details and requirements relating to ATP funding.

Additional Local funds that are 'non-participating' for ATP:

These are local funds required for the overall project, but not for ATP eligible activities and costs. They are not considered leverage/match.

TOTAL PROJECT FUNDS: $500

**ATP - FUNDING TYPE REQUESTED:**

Per the CTC Guidelines, All ATP projects must be eligible to receive federal funding. Most ATP projects will receive federal funding, however some projects may be granted State only funding (SOF) for all or part of the project.

**Do you believe your project warrants receiving state-only funding?** □ Yes  □ No

If “Yes”, provide a brief explanation. (Max of 250 characters) Applicants requesting SOF must also attach an “Exhibit 22-f”

**ATP PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST (PPR):** In addition to the project funding information provided in Part A of the application, all applicants must complete the ATP Project Programming Request form and include it as Attachment B. More information and guidance on the completion and submittal of this form is located in the Application Instructions Document under Part C - Attachment B.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM - CYCLE 2

Part B: Narrative Questions
(Application Screening/Scoring)

Project unique application No.: 1

Implementing Agency’s Name: City of Rancho Cordova

Important:
- Applicants must ensure all data in Part B of the application is fully consistent with Part A and C.
- Applicants must follow all instructions and guidance to have a chance at receiving full points for the narrative question and to avoid flaws in the application which could result in disqualification.
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Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Screening Criteria

The following Screening Criteria are requirements for applications to be considered for ATP funding. Failure to demonstrate a project meets these criteria will result in the disqualification of the application.

1. Demonstrated fiscal needs of the applicant:
The City of Rancho Cordova, part of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), is a continually growing City anticipated to be a population over 170,000. The City has adopted goals and visions that promote livability and embraces Active Transportation, utilizing many of the City’s resources to increase the connectivity, safety, and attractiveness of alternative transportation facilities. As the City continues to implement new trails and complete streets projects, maintenance of existing trails, as well as ensuring safety for all users resulting in financial resources becoming spread thin. The City is committed to seeking additional resources such as the Active Transportation Program (ATP) to augment the funding the City is using in order to implement as many Active Transportation priorities as possible.

As safety and connectivity are among the City’s top priorities, the City is requesting $442,000 from ATP to offset a shortfall in order to implement two key safety projects for Active Transportation users that will also close gaps in connectivity of an existing trail, and remove ADA access barriers. The City has $58,000 in local funding to help leverage the ATP funding. These key safety improvements include ADA compliant bicycle and pedestrian crossing signals, striping, signage, and necessary curb/median improvements at both Zinfandel Drive (6 lane arterial) and Prospect Park Drive (4 lane arterial) where the existing 4 miles of Stone Creek Community Bike Trail intersections. These improvements are depicted in the attached proposed project maps (Attachment E).
2. Consistency with Regional Plan.

The proposed Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Safety Project is specifically identified in the City of Rancho Cordova’s Bicycle Master Plan. The Project is consistent with the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan under Sacramento County-City of Rancho Cordova ADA Transition Plan (Page 55-attached), Pedestrian Facilities and Sidewalk Gap Program (Page 58-attached), and Road Rehabilitation (Page 60-attached). The Project improvements meet the regional priorities to improve safety and mobility for bicyclists, pedestrians, and ADA users through complete streets and Active Transportation network enhancements. Specifically, the Project is guided by and will help meet the goals of the following regional plans:

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan April 2015: “...envisions a complete transportation system that supports healthy living and active communities where bicycling and walking are viable and popular travel choices in a comprehensive, safe, and convenient network.”

Specific Plan Elements Addressed: GOAL 1.B Improve access from residential areas to activity centers, particularly schools, transit, and employment centers. GOAL 2.A Remove physical barriers to walking and biking. GOAL 2.C Apply technological improvements (e.g., flashing lights, crosswalk buttons, and bike detection). GOAL 3.A Create a safe environment for bicycle and pedestrian travel at intersections and street crossings. GOAL 3.B Promote complete streets ... including constructing and retrofitting ... existing facilities and networks to increase bicyclist and pedestrian safety, and separating motorist, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities from each other to reduce conflicts ... GOAL 3.C Increase support of bicycling and walking as travel modes through treatments such as street signage, median refuge islands, dynamic lighting, traffic calming devices ... GOAL 4.D Improve convenience of bicycle and pedestrian travel through innovative projects
The proposed Project will close a gap for the existing Stone Creek Community class 1 bike path system by creating two (2) safe mid-block bike trail crossings of two major streets, totaling 10 travel lanes, including removing a physical barrier with ADA improvements to a raised median. Improvements will also help connect Rancho Cordovan Transit stops on both sides of the street to the Community Bike Path improving overall regional non-auto connectivity.

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan: “Bikeways and trails will be integrated throughout the community connecting residents, jobs, services, activities, and open spaces.”

“... where they intersect a major street, special treatments will be provided to help reduce the potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.”

Specific Plan Elements Addressed: Goal C.2 Establish an extensive, complete, smooth, interconnected, and continuous pedestrian and bicycle network that is a safe and attractive option for local or regional trips or recreation and that connects to the City’s neighborhoods, parks and schools, employment areas, and retail centers. Goal C.6 Provide a circulation system that is properly maintained and maximizes safety for all users. Goal OSPT.3 Create a system of pedestrian and bicycle trails that maximize usage while providing places for walking and bicycling without conflicts with motor vehicles.

The proposed Project will complete a gap between existing trail segments by formalizing a safe crossing eliminating a misused conflict point between bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles.

City of Rancho Cordova ADA Transition Plan: “The goal is to optimize the pedestrian experience, to provide safe and usable pedestrian facilities for all pedestrians, and to assure compliance with all federal, state and local regulations and standards.”

Key issues Addressed: 34% of pedestrians surveyed in Rancho Cordova regarding accessibility as identified in the ADA Transition Plan have concerns about Street Crossing Constraints and 28% have concerns about Disabled Accessibility Constraints.
The proposed Project will remove an ADA barrier and improve continuous safe pedestrian connectivity to the Stone Creek Community Path network. These improvements will provide improved connectivity for all users between the residential areas, transit stops, employment centers, and retail/commercial. For ADA users having the safe accessible crossing will improve their overall mobility and quality of life.

**City of Rancho Cordova Bike and Pedestrian Master Plans:** "The City is improving existing standards to promote bicycle and pedestrian safety."

**Specific Plan Elements Addressed:**

Improve at-grade trail/street crossings on the perimeter of the Stone Creek neighborhood. This Project identified both the Zinfandel Dr. and Prospect Park Dr. locations as proposed pedestrian crossings.

The proposed Project (See Attachment D for Project Location Map) will complete two implementation priorities identified in the Bike/Ped Master Plans. Specifically, the Project will construct a pedestrian signal at the Stone Creek Trail “N” Connection at Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #1

QUESTION #1
POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING AND BICYCLING, ESPECIALLY AMONG STUDENTS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF WALKING AND BICYCLING 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. (0-30 POINTS)

A. Describe the following:
   - Current and projected types and numbers/rates of users. (12 points max.)

Current type and use numbers: The Stone Creek trail system that was built in the early 2000's was designed as a local convenience for residents that wanted to take a walk or a short ride. The 4-mile long system was built in a piecemeal fashion with internal gaps and no connectivity to area trail systems. During the 2011 Bicycle Master Plan process, residents requested several protected arterial crossings and connections to the area and regional trail systems. The City has connected the Stone Creek trail system to the Folsom South Canal as part of the International Bridge project, and has connected southward to the Mather Boulevard Trail System along the edge of Mather Airport. Lastly, a Class II connection was built with the Femooyer Boulevard/Air Park Drive Project. We are also developing a trail connection at the northwest corner of the Stone Creek Trail at Quality Drive.
With these area trail connections in place, the city is prioritizing quality crossings along the north side trail of the Stone Creek development. Our first two priorities are Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive. These are both locations where residents will be able to make better non-auto connections to our business park area, Capital Village shops are restaurants and to civic activities in Village Green Park in Capital Village, such as International Fest and summer Movies in the Park. The existing 4 mile class 1 Stone Creek Community Bike Trail encircles multiple residential subdivisions; approximately 2,865 homes with an assumed 2.5 people/home that bike or walk equating to approximately 7,160 potential users adjacent to and within 1 mile of 288 parcels of retail/commercial/health facilities/employment. It is assumed that 5% of the potential users are on the trail each day (50% bike/50%Ped), which equates to 360 total users per day or 130,000 annual community trail users. At the center of the community between the residential and retail/employment center, Stone Creek Trail places those bicyclists and pedestrians out at Zinfandel Drive, which is a busy six-lane corridor, and then again at Prospect Park Drive, a four-lane corridor, with no convenient crossing at either location.

Projected type and use numbers: The City of Rancho Cordova is within the SACOG MPO boundary and is projected to grow from a city of 67,000 to over 170,000. Currently, within 1 mile of the project area, there are 64 acres of developable land creating the potential for an estimated 762 new homes, and an additional 1900 potential users. If everything were built out in the next 5 years, there would be 3,627 homes at 2.5 people per home increasing the potential users to 9,070. With these projections, assuming the proposed improvements increase user percentage from 5% to 10%, the projected daily use 5 years after completion of the project would be 907 (50% bike/50%ped) with an annual use of over 300,000 users. This number will only increase the risk of injury or fatalities at the misused crossings. The project will improve the crossing at both Zinfandel and Prospect Park with a
crosswalk, and a signal actuated by bike and pedestrians that will turn the light red stopping vehicular traffic, providing bicyclists and pedestrians a much safer and convenient crossing. We anticipate more users will utilize the trail for daily trips to and from their home for nearby activities including employment, health centers, shopping, and dining, as well as for recreational use. Residential and commercial/retail development is still ongoing for much of the Stone Creek Community. It is essential to be proactive and install safe crossings before more fatalities and injuries occur at this location as demand continues to increase. This Bicycle/Pedestrian safety project meets a number of the needs of the current and future community that fulfill the criteria that support the overall Regional Transportation Plan.
B. Describe how the project links or connects, or encourages use of existing routes (for non-infrastructure applications) to transportation-related and community identified destinations where an increase in active transportation modes can be realized, including but not limited to: schools, school facilities, transit facilities, community, social service or medical centers, employment centers, high density or affordable housing, regional, State or national trail system, recreational and visitor destinations or other community identified destinations via:

a. creation of new routes
b. removal of barrier to mobility
c. closure of gaps
d. other improvements to routes
e. educates or encourages use of existing routes

The proposed crosswalk, ADA median refuge and bike/ped actuated signal and safety improvements for the existing Stone Creek Bike Trail crossings at Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive will accomplish: b) remove a barrier to mobility, c) close a gap in the existing network, and e) will encourage use of this existing route to improve livability for the community.

The Stone Creek Bike Trail is approximately 4 miles providing connectivity for a large community including over 10 different residential developments, a large employment center around Zinfandel and International Drive, commercial/retail, and Kaiser Permanente and UC Davis medical facilities. The trail has gaps at Zinfandel Drive (6 lanes) and Prospect Park Drive (4 lanes) that create barriers to the users. Without a safe crossing at Zinfandel and Prospect Park, bicyclists and pedestrians including ADA users are faced with a gap in connectivity and forced to divert to a traffic signal that is 860 feet out of their way. ADA users cannot cross Zinfandel or Prospect Park because there is a raised median that divides street, forcing them to travel to the nearest traffic signal crossing with ADA accommodations. With a conservative estimate of over 200 users per day and a potential for over 4,000 trail users per day, closing the gaps created by the unsafe busy street crossings will be essential for improving connectivity between the residential areas, employment centers, and retail/commercial nearby. Improving the crossings will provide a safe and connected
trail system, increasing use of the active transportation system, and encouraging non-auto use for the surrounding communities.

C. Referencing the answers to A and B above, describe how the proposed project represents one of the Implementing Agencies (and/or project Partnering Agency’s) highest unfunded non-motorized active transportation priorities. (6 points max.)

The proposed Project will complete two implementation priorities identified in the City of Rancho Cordova Bike/Ped Master Plans. Specifically, the priorities are a pedestrian signal for Stone Creek Trail N Connection at Zinfandel Drive and Ramp & Crosswalk for Stone Creek Trail N connection at Prospect Park Drive.

These improvements are among the City’s highest Active Transportation priorities as these projects will implement several goals for the City as well as for regional bike and pedestrian connectivity and safety, and provide essential ADA access improvements. Below is an outline of the importance of completing these priorities:

- **Prevent future fatalities.** In 2014, a vehicle on Zinfandel Drive struck and killed a pedestrian. The pedestrian was attempting to cross Zinfandel at the project location. The pedestrian walked into traffic assuming there was a crosswalk according to the police report. It is difficult to increase the demand for Active Transportation, in an area with misused crossings that have proven to be fatal. Providing a safe crossing at two
arterial streets will close gaps in the trail connectivity and ensure pedestrians, bicyclists and ADA users are not at risk when choosing Active Transportation.

- **Promote Safe Active Transportation.** As the City continues efforts to promote Active Transportation, closing gaps in safety for bike and pedestrian traffic will be essential for increasing use numbers, without increasing crash rates and or fatalities. This project is a great example of taking a proactive stance on improving safety to ensure that as the population continues to grow Active Transportation will become more of a viable option. Safety will give the users a level of comfort and confidence that they can ride or walk to their destinations without fear of vehicular conflicts, encouraging them to continue to use alternative modes of transportation.

- **Increase connectivity.** 4 miles of an existing community multi use path surrounded by existing and future residential development on one side, and hundreds of commercial/retail/employment on the other create the perfect opportunity for thousands of Active Transportation users.

Gaps in connectivity at Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive in the middle discourage use of the existing path. Not having formal crossings for a combined 10 lanes of arterial streets is definitely not safe, but also creates a barrier for overall connectivity for the community. Removing the barriers will improve safety, and attract users to take Active Transportation as their mode of choice for work, shopping, dining, and play. The City’s General Plan calls for an interconnected, and continuous pedestrian and bicycle network that is a safe and attractive option for local or regional trips providing places for walking and bicycling without conflicts with motor vehicles. This project will fill two gaps in connectivity and
safety, helping to fulfill the vision of the general plan and providing immense benefits to the surrounding community.

**Part B: Narrative Questions**

**Detailed Instructions for: Question #2**

**QUESTION #2**

**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.** *(0-25 POINTS)*

A. Describe the plan/program influence area or project location's history of collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users and the source(s) of data used (e.g. collision reports, community observation, surveys, audits). *(10 points max.)*

**The bottom line:** The project area is the perfect example of a barrier in non-motorized connectivity between residential and commercial (live, work, and play). Residential on the south side of the existing trail system and commercial to the north, communities on either side of the two major roadways of Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive, have no connectivity due to six lanes of traffic on Zinfandel Drive and four lanes of traffic on Prospect Park Drive.

No crosswalk, no warning signs, no ped/bike actuated signals, only a median that adds additional barriers. Imagine mom and dad headed to work 5 days a week playing frogger with 10 lanes of traffic. Parents take the kids to get ice cream, or do some shopping in the Capital Village Park, or go to the International Fest all while pulling the bike trailer across 10 lanes of traffic. Maybe the kids want to go to their friends on the other side of Zinfandel, across 6 lanes of traffic. Many residents walk or ride to the many dining opportunities such as Rubio’s and Chicken Teriyaki in the Capital Village Park. Most would not put their lives at risk and choose not to use the existing non-motorized infrastructure. For those that have, in one case ended in a fatality. Implementing safe mid street crossings are essential to provide connectivity for the existing trail system and allow for bicyclists, pedestrians, and ADA users to
safely cross arterial streets opposed to risking their lives crossing traffic moving at speeds over 45 mph.

**The area of influence:**

- **Stone Creek Community:** 2,865 existing residential units, 288 commercial parcels within a 1 mile radius. Currently, within 1 mile of the project area, there are 64 acres of developable land creating the potential for an estimated 762 new homes, and an additional 1900 potential users. If everything were built out in the next 5 years, there would be a total of 3,627 homes at 2.5 people per home the potential users would be 9,070.

- **Stone Creek Community Bike Trail:** Existing Approximate 4 mile shared use path encircling the Stone Creek Community and providing non-motorized connectivity between where people live, work, and play. The trail system has breaks in connectivity at Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive, with no crossing at all.

- **Zinfandel Drive:** 6 lane arterial with 13,992 ADT. The Stone Creek Bike Path ends at the sidewalk with no formal crossing to pick up the path on either side. There is a center median that creates a physical barrier for crossing as well. Users are forced to take a 1/4 mile detour to connect back to the path. The 20 year...
projection by SACOG for Zinfandel is 40,000 ADT.

- **Prospect Park Drive:** 4 lane arterial (ADT is currently not available for Prospect Park and Stone Creek Bike Path intersection). The Stone Creek Bike Path ends at the sidewalk with no formal crossing to pick up the path on either side. Users that don’t wish to run across the street are forced to take a 1/4 mile detour to connect back to the path.

- **Employment Center:**
  To the North of the path is over 288 commercial parcels including large retail centers, health care facilities, business parks, shopping and dining. Currently, Blue Shield of California is constructing an office complex adjacent to the Stone Creek Trail. Many residents who work for Blue Shield will utilize the trail to get to work as well as those who will just want to walk during their breaks. The Stone Creek Trail is the direct non-motorized connection for the residential areas to the south and the employment to the North. In the middle of the connectivity is the barrier of no safe crossing of two major streets.

- **Schools:** Although the project is not a direct safe routes to school project, there are schools within the Stone Creek Community where kids use the path from their home to school. When not in school those same kids...
use the trail system to access nearby parks and recreation, and may walk or ride to the retail centers as well requiring them to use the unsafe crossing.
History of collisions:

The following is a City of Rancho Cordova Traffic Engineering Collision Summary Report for the past 5 years:

- **Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Zinfandel Drive crossing:**
  - Total collisions – 125 (33 Injury, 1 fatal)
  - Collisions involving Bike/Peds - 6 (3Injury, 1 fatal – vehicle vs pedestrian)

- **Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Prospect Park Drive crossing:**
  - Total collisions – 6 (3 with injury)
  - Collisions involving Bike/Peds – 0

B. Describe how the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities; including but not limited to the following possible areas: (15 points max.)
  - Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users.
  - Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users.
  - Eliminates potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including creating physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users.
  - Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users.
  - Addresses inadequate traffic control devices.
  - Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users.
  - Addresses inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks.

**Stone Creek Trail Crossing Safety Improvements:**

- Pedestrian traffic signal at Zinfandel Drive (See Attachment E – Location 1)

**Project elements:**

1) Realign

approximately 100 feet of trail on the west side of Zinfandel Drive and

150 feet of trail on the east side of Zinfandel Drive to correct the existing
offset. 2) Construct a pedestrian traffic signal with push-buttons that will actuate the signal to provide a red light to vehicles travelling on Zinfandel Drive. 3) ADA compliant curb ramps will be constructed on both sides of Zinfandel Drive, and an ADA complaint pedestrian refuge area would be constructed at the median to provide a safe place to stop. The pedestrian refuge area would have a push-button to allow pedestrians and cyclists to actuate the signal from the median/pedestrian refuge area.

- Safety Hazards to be addressed: The primary benefits of these improvements are pedestrian/bicycle safety and continuity of the Class 1 trail system. In the existing condition, pedestrians and cyclist have to exit the Class 1 system when they arrive at Zinfandel Drive. They have to use the sidewalk to get to the nearest traffic signal with a cross walk, cross the busy intersection, and travel along the sidewalk or Class 2 on-street bike lane to get back to the trail. This circuitous route adds approximately 1,200 feet of distance to the bike route. This added distance may discourage trail users from using the path, and could tempt users to try to cross Zinfandel Drive mid-block where no legal crossing exists and where there is currently a raised and planted median. In fact, in one instance a cyclist attempted the mid-block crossing and was struck by a car and killed.

- Pedestrian Traffic Signal at Prospect Park Drive (See Attachment E – Location 2)

Project elements: 1) Construct a pedestrian traffic signal with push-buttons that will actuate the signal to provide a red light to vehicles travelling on Prospect Park Drive. 2) ADA compliant curb ramps and sidewalk will be constructed on both sides of Prospect Park Drive. 3) A raised concrete median will be constructed in the center of Prospect Park Drive with a left-turn lane striped for vehicles travelling southbound on Prospect Park Drive.
to make a left-turn onto Flore Drive.

- **Safety Hazards to be addressed:** The primary benefits of these improvements are pedestrian/bicycle safety and continuity of the Class 1 trail system. There is currently no legal means to cross Prospect Park Drive where the trail intersects the street. A pedestrian or bicyclist would have to find the nearest crossing 430 feet away at Zinfandel Drive and Baroque Drive and then again at Prospect Park Drive and Fiore Drive. Both intersections are stop-controlled but do not provide pedestrian-push buttons or other associated electronic signal equipment to aid disabled users to safely cross the street. This route adds approximately 860 feet of on-street or sidewalk travel that could be avoided with project implementation. The proposed project would be ADA compliant and would accommodate those with disabilities.

In summary, the two signals are separated by approximately 2,200 feet of Class 1 trail. The construction of both signals would provide a desirable condition for all trails users and would encourage people to use the path, which in-turn promotes healthy lifestyles, air quality improvements, and the usage of alternative modes of transportation.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #3

QUESTION #3
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION and PLANNING (0-15 POINTS)

Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project/program proposal or will be utilized as part of the development of a plan.

A. Who: Describe who was engaged in the identification and development of this project/program/plan (for plans: who will be engaged). (5 points max)

On April 28, 2014, City Staff held a public meeting to discuss the Stone Creek Bike Trail Project. The public meeting included residents in the neighborhood, Folsom Cordova Unified School District leaders, Rancho Cordova Parks and Recreational leaders and several bicycle organizations.

City staff also held 16 public Town Hall Meetings in Rancho Cordova neighborhoods from February to April 2015 that included approximately 300 residents, many of whom were within the proposed project area. At the Town Hall meetings, bike and pedestrian improvements were discussed including the proposed crossings at Zinfandel and Prospect Park Drive.

B. How: Describe how stakeholders were engaged (or will be for a plan). (4 points max)

At the public meeting on April 28, 2014, City Staff presented preliminary designs to the community with visual representations and a question and answer session. During the 16 Town Hall meetings, City staff provided a presentation of the various bike and pedestrian improvements being proposed for the City of Rancho Cordova. After the presentation, City staff took questions and engaged in discussions on the specific improvements being proposed.
C. What: Describe the feedback received during the stakeholder engagement process and describe how the public participation and planning process has improved the project’s overall effectiveness at meeting the purpose and goals of the ATP. (5 points max)

Meeting participants expressed interest in adding more bicycle detection at the most challenging intersections in the City. Participants particularly expressed concern about the intersections of Zinfandel Drive and White Rock Road, Prospect Park Drive and White Rock Road, and Coloma Road and Bridlewood Drive. The public’s interest in improving the Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Stone Creek Community Bike Trail crossing has been heard at meetings, and is a major reason these two crossing improvements have been moved up the priority list for the City.

**Barriers to Cycling in Rancho Cordova**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What prevents you from riding more often?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough safe routes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t get to my destination on a bicycle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bike rack and lockers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of signage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of showers and lockers at my destination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Rancho Cordova 2011 Bike Master Plan*

D. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan. (1 points max)

The City will hold public meetings for residents and property owners adjacent to the project area during design and prior to implementation.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for:  Question #4

IMPROVED PUBLIC HEALTH (0-10 points)

- NOTE: Applicants applying for the disadvantaged community set aside must respond to the below questions with health data specific to the disadvantaged communities. Failure to do so will result in lost points.

  A. Describe the health status of the targeted users of the project/program/plan. (3 points max)

Based on the AskCHIS (www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu) Neighborhood Edition, the project area zip code of 95670 revealed the following:

- 30.1% of respondents ages 18+ had a body mass index greater than or equal to 30, which is higher than the CA state wide average of 24.8%.
- 6.5% of respondents age 18+ have been diagnosed with heart disease by a doctor, slightly higher than the state average of 6.3%.
- Only 30% of respondents 18+ walked for transportation or leisure for at least 150 minutes per week, which is less than the state average of 33%.
- Less than 15% of those aged 5-17 engaged in 60+ minutes of physical activity in a week.
- 16.5% of respondents 18+ have been diagnosed with Asthma, which is higher than the state average of 13.7%.
Looking at the data provided for the project area, three of the more important factors are 1) 30.1% Body Mass Index 30+ indicating over weight 2) 16.5% 18+ having asthma 3) Less than 15% aged 5-17 engaging in physical activity more than 60 minutes per day per week. These indicators show a population within the project area that tends to be overweight, and are not very active with a high average of asthma rates.

B. Describe how you expect your project/proposal/plan to enhance public health. (7 points max.)

The Stone Creek Bike Trail has gaps in connectivity at Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive. These are critical gaps as this portion of the trail is the connectivity of the residential areas to employment, commercial, dining and recreational use of the trail in general. If users don’t feel safe crossing two arterial streets with a combined 10 lanes of traffic, majority of users will not use this Active Transportation option. This is evident in the estimated 215 users per day when the potential is over 4,000.

Closing the gaps in connectivity and improving safety at the trail crossings is essential to increasing the amount of users of the trail and promoting this great Active Transportation option. Increasing the users of the trail and getting people out of their cars will promote a healthier life style for the community. The safety improvements will also give families traveling with younger children the ability to cross the streets safely encouraging them to get outside and use the trail for family recreation as well as getting to and from the commercial/retail districts. As this area continues to grow, creating safe walking and biking alternatives to the auto mobile will help improve the health statistics mentioned above and hopefully reduce many of those to below the state averages and improve the lifestyles of the surrounding community.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #5

**QUESTION #5** – N/A PROJECT DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY POINTS
BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (0-10 points)

**A. Identification of disadvantaged communities:** (0 points – SCREENING ONLY)

To receive disadvantaged communities points, projects/programs/plans must be located within a disadvantaged community (as defined by one of the four options below) AND/OR provide a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to individuals from a disadvantaged community.

1. The median household income of the census tract(s) is 80% of the statewide median household income
2. Census tract(s) is in the top 25% of overall scores from CalEnviroScreen 2.0
3. At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible for the Free or Reduced Priced Meals Program under the National School Lunch Program
4. Alternative criteria for identifying disadvantage communities (see below)

Provide a map showing the boundaries of the proposed project/program/plan and the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community that the project/program/plan is located within and/or benefiting.

**Option 1:** Median household income, by census tract for the community(ies) benefited by the project: $________
- Provide all census tract numbers
- Provide the median income for each census tract listed
- Provide the population for each census tract listed

**Option 2:** California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 2.0 (CalEnviroScreen) score for the community benefited by the project: ________
- Provide all census tract numbers
- Provide the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score for each census tract listed
- Provide the population for each census tract listed

**Option 3:** Percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Programs: ________%
- Provide percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Meals Program for each and all schools included in the proposal

**Option 4:** Alternative criteria for identifying disadvantaged communities:
- Provide median household income (option 1), the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score (option 2), and if applicable, the percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced Meal Programs (option 3)
- Provide ADDITIONAL data that demonstrates that the community benefiting from the project/program/plan is disadvantaged
- Provide an explanation for why this additional data demonstrates that the community is disadvantaged
B. For proposals located within disadvantage community: (5 points max)
   What percent of the funds requested will be expended in the disadvantaged community? ___% 
   Explain how this percent was calculated.

C. Describe how the project/program/plan provides (for plans: will provide) a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to members of the disadvantaged community. (5 points max)
   Define what direct, meaningful, and assured benefit means for your proposed project/program/plan, 
   how this benefit will be achieved, and who will receive this benefit.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #6

COST EFFECTIVENESS (0-5 POINTS)

A. Describe the alternatives that were considered and how the ATP-related benefits vs. project-costs varied between them. Explain why the final proposed alternative is considered to have the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose of “increased use of active modes of transportation”. (3 points max.)

Utilizing the B/C tool provided the results of the Project equated to a benefit cost ratio of 47.36. The Zinfandel 6 lane arterial and the Prospect Park Drive 4 lane arterial create two gaps in an existing 4 mile continuous community bike trail. They create gaps due to a lack of formal crossing where the trail intersects the arterial streets. Without a formal crossing bicyclists and pedestrians have no way to safely connect to the trail on either side of the street without taking a ¼ mile detour to the nearest signalized intersections. The perception of the trail user is the trail ends at that point, as most will not travel the extra distance, which forces them to either cross the road at their own risk (lead to 1 fatality on Zinfandel) or take the car.

In determining the scope of the project, cost and overall safety were considered two of the more important elements. Safely moving the bicyclists and pedestrians including ADA users across the multi-lane arterials with the ability to eliminate vehicle conflict points were the main goal for developing the proposed improvements. When looking at a variety of options for safe crossing it was determined that the safest most cost effective approach would be to add both a crosswalk with median cuts to create a pedestrian refuge and adding a pedestrian actuated signal. Considering the potential amount of users, speed, and traffic volumes, putting in a crosswalk alone, although cheaper, would fail and in the end would require additional improvements that would come at a higher cost.
B. Use the ATP Benefit/Cost Tool, provided by Caltrans Planning Division, to calculate the ratio of the benefits of the project relative to both the total project cost and ATP funds requested. The Tool is located on the CTC’s website at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/eab/iatp.html. After calculating the B/C ratios for the project, provide constructive feedback on the tool (2 points max.)

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Benefit}}{\text{Total Project Cost}} \right) \text{ and } \frac{\text{Benefit}}{\text{Funds Requested}}.
\]

The following page depicts the results of the ATP Benefit/Cost tool. The tool is straightforward and easy to use. Entering the use numbers for bikes and peds in the infrastructure can be difficult depending on the level of data collected and an agency’s ability to forecast. Training on data collection, and forecasting may need to be provided in the future. Would it be possible to add a modeling tool that helps with projecting use numbers? It would be great if the State of CA provided assistance through ATP for agencies to obtain use numbers and create a database for the entire state.
B/C Tool for the Project:

**Project Name:** Stone Creek Community Bike Trail Ped Signal Safety Improvements  
**Project Location:** City of Rancho Cordova

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike Projects (Daily Person Trips for All Users) (Box 1A)</th>
<th>With Project</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast (1 Yr after completion)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW Daily Trips (estimate) (1 Yr after completion) (actual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Trips</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Daily Trips</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information - Non SR2S Infrastructure</th>
<th>Bike Class Type</th>
<th>Traffic (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Class 1</td>
<td>13,992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Projects (Daily Person Trips for All Users) (Box 1B)</th>
<th>With Project</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast (1 YR after project completion)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing step counts (500 steps = 90 Yrs = 1000)</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>Without Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing miles walked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Projects (Daily Person Trips for All Users) (Box 1B)</th>
<th>With Project</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast (1 YR after project completion)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing step counts (500 steps = 90 Yrs = 1000)</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>Without Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing miles walked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Routes to School (SR2S) (Box 1C)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate no. of students living along school route proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students that currently walk or bike to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected percentage of students that will walk or bike to school after the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20 Year Invest Summary Analysis

- **Total Costs:** $500,000.00  
- **Net Present Cost:** $480,769.23  
- **Total Benefits:** $30,391,168.16  
- **Net Present Benefit:** $20,127,448.11  
- **Benefit-Cost Ratio:** 41.87

### 20 Year Itemized Savings

- **Mobility:** $5,129,714.04  
- **Health:** $533,402.30  
- **Recreational:** $5,424,211.65  
- **Gas & Emissions:** $105,046.64  
- **Safety:** $19,188,793.52

| Funds Requested | $442,000.00  
|-----------------|-------------|
| Net Present Cost of Funds Requested | $425,000.00  
| Benefit Cost Ratio | 47.36 |
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #7

QUESTION #7
LEVERAGING OF NON-ATP FUNDS (0-5 points)

A. The application funding plan will show all federal, state and local funding for the project: (5 points max.)

The City of Rancho Cordova will be committing $58,000 to the construction phase of the project. Below is a table with the funding breakdown of the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage of total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP Request</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #8

QUESTION #8
USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (CCC) OR A CERTIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS (0 or -5 points)

Step 1: Is this an application requesting funds for a Plan (Bike, Pedestrian, SRTS, or ATP Plan)?
☐ Yes (If this application is for a Plan, there is no need to submit information to the corps and there will be no penalty to applicant: 0 points)
☒ No (If this application is NOT for a Plan, proceed to Step #2)

Step 2: The applicant must submit the following information via email concurrently to both the CCC AND certified community conservation corps prior to application submittal to Caltrans. The CCC and certified community conservation corps will respond within five (5) business days from receipt of the information.

- Project Title
- Project Description
- Detailed Estimate
- Project Schedule
- Project Map
- Preliminary Plan

California Conservation Corps representative:
Name: Wei Hsieh
Email: atp@ccc.ca.gov
Phone: (916) 341-3154

Community Conservation Corps representative:
Name: Danielle Lynch
Email: inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org
Phone: (916) 426-9170

Step 3: The applicant has coordinated with Wei Hsieh with the CCC AND Danielle Lynch with the certified community conservation corps and determined the following (check appropriate box):

☒ Neither corps can participate in the project (0 points)

☐ Applicant intends to utilize the CCC or a certified community conservation corps on the following items listed below (0 points).

☐ Applicant has contacted the corps but intends not to use the corps on a project in which either corps has indicated it can participate (-5 points)

☐ Applicant has not coordinated with both corps (-5 points)

The CCC and certified community conservation corps will provide a list to Caltrans of all projects submitted to them and indicating which projects they are available to participate on. The applicant must also attach any email correspondence from the CCC and certified community conservation corps to the application verifying communication/participation.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for: Question #9

QUESTION #9
APPLICANT’S PERFORMANCE ON PAST GRANTS AND DELIVERABILITY OF PROJECTS
(0 to-10 points OR disqualification)

A. Applicant: Provide short explanation of the Implementing Agency’s project delivery history for all projects that include project funding through Caltrans Local Assistance administered programs (ATP, Safe Routes to School, BTA, HSIP, etc.) for the last five (5) years.

The City of Rancho Cordova has extensive experience delivering grant funded projects. We have delivered all of our grants without having any finding or losing any funding. We have delivered over $45 million in grants of various types including but not limited to HSIP, ARRA, Demo/HPP, RSTP, CMAQ, SR2S, and SRTS. We have a great relationship with SACOG and CalTrans and will continue to work collaboratively to deliver our grant funded projects.

B. Caltrans response only:

Caltrans to recommend score for deliverability of scope, cost, and schedule based on the overall application.
Part C: Application Attachments

Applicants must ensure all data in this part of the application is fully consistent with the other parts of the application. See the Application Instructions and Guidance document for more information and requirements related to Part C.

List of Application Attachments

The following attachment names and order must be maintained for all applications. Depending on the Project Type (I, NI or Plans) some attachments will be intentionally left blank. All non-blank attachments must be identified in hard-copy applications using “tabs” with appropriate letter designations.

Application Signature Page
   Required for all applications

ATP - PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST (ATP-PPR)
   Required for all applications

Engineer’s Checklist
   Required for Infrastructure Projects

Project Location Map
   Required for all applications

Project Map/Plans showing existing and proposed conditions
   Required for Infrastructure Projects (optional for ‘Non-Infrastructure’ and ‘Plan’ Projects)

Photos of Existing Conditions
   Required for all applications

Project Estimate
   Required for Infrastructure Projects

Non-Infrastructure Work Plan (Form 22-R)
   Required for all projects with Non-Infrastructure Elements

Narrative Questions backup information
   Required for all applications
   Label attachments separately with “H-#” based on the # of the Narrative Question

Letters of Support
   Required or Recommended for all projects (as designated in the instructions)

Additional Attachments
   Additional attachments may be included. They should be organized in a way that allows application reviews easy identification and review of the information.

Attachment A
Attachment B
Attachment C
Attachment D
Attachment E
Attachment F
Attachment G
Attachment H
Attachment I
Attachment J
Attachment K
Part C: Attachments
Attachment A: Signature Page

IMPORTANT: Applications will not be accepted without all required signatures.

Implementing Agency: Chief Executive Officer, Public Works Director, or other officer authorized by the governing board
The undersigned affirms that their agency will be the “Implementing Agency” for the project if funded with ATP funds and they are the Chief Executive Officer, Public Works Director or other officer authorized by their governing board with the authority to commit the agency’s resources and funds. They are also affirming that the statements contained in this application package are true and complete to the best of their knowledge. For infrastructure projects, the undersigned affirms that they are the manager of the public right-of-way facilities (responsible for their maintenance and operation) or they have authority over this position.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: 5-29-2015
Name: Cyrus Abhar
Phone: (916) 851-8700
Title: Public Works Director
E-mail: cabhar@cityofranchocordova.org

For projects with a Partnering Agency: Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the governing board
(For use only when appropriate)
The undersigned affirms that their agency is committed to partner with the “Implementing Agency” and agrees to assume the responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility upon completion by the implementing agency and they intend to document such agreement per the CTC guidelines. The undersigned also affirms that they are the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by their governing board with the authority to commit the agency’s resources and funds. They are also affirming that the statements contained in this application package are true and complete to the best of their knowledge.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _________________
Name: __________________________________ Phone: _________________
Title: ___________________________________ E-mail: _________________

For Safe Routes to School projects and/or projects presented as benefiting a school: School or School District Official
(For use only when appropriate)
The undersigned affirms that the school(s) benefited by this application is not on a school closure list.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _________________
Name: __________________________________ Phone: _________________
Title: ___________________________________ E-mail: _________________

For projects with encroachments on the State right-of-way: Caltrans District Traffic Operations Office Approval*
(For use only when appropriate)
If the application’s project proposes improvements within a freeway or state highway right-of-way, whether it affects the safety or operations of the facility or not, it is required that the proposed improvements be reviewed by the district traffic operations office and either a letter of support/acknowledgement from the traffic operations office be attached or the signature of the traffic manager be secured in the application. The Caltrans letter and/or signature does not imply approval of the project, but instead is only an acknowledgement that Caltrans District staff is aware of the proposed project; and upon initial review, the project appears to be reasonable and acceptable.

Is a letter of support/acknowledgement attached? _____ If yes, no signature is required. If no, the following signature is required.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _________________
Name: __________________________________ Phone: _________________
Title: ___________________________________ E-mail: _________________

* Contact the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) for the project to get Caltrans Traffic Ops contact information. DLAE contact information can be found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/dlae.htm
### ATP Project Programming Request

**Project Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Information:**

**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATP Funds**

**Infrastructure Cycle 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATP Funds**

**Non-infrastructure Cycle 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATP Funds**

**Plan Cycle 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATP Funds**

**Previous Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATP Funds**

**Future Cycles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- ATP Funds Infrastructure Cycle 2
  - CTC Funding Agency
- ATP Funds Non-infrastructure Cycle 2
  - ATP
- ATP Funds Plan Cycle 2
  - ATP
- ATP Funds Previous Cycle
  - ATP
- ATP Funds Future Cycles
  - ATP

**Attachment B**
### Project Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Information:

**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADEd AREAS**

#### Fund No. 2: Future Source for Matching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

Funding Agency: City of Rancho Cordova

#### Fund No. 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

Funding Agency:

#### Fund No. 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

Funding Agency:

#### Fund No. 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

Funding Agency:

#### Fund No. 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

Funding Agency:

#### Fund No. 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

Attachment B
ATP Engineer’s Checklist for Infrastructure Projects

Required for “Infrastructure” applications ONLY

This application checklist is to be used by the engineer in “responsible charge” of the preparation of this ATP application to ensure all of the primary elements of the application are included as necessary to meet the CTC’s requirements for a PSR-Equivalent document (per CTC’s ATP Guidelines and CTC’s Adoption of PSR Guidelines - Resolution G-99-33) and to ensure the application is free of critical errors and omissions; allowing the application to be accurately ranked in the statewide ATP selection process.

Special Considerations for Engineers before they Sign and Stamp this document attesting to the accuracy of the application:

Chapter 7; Article 3; Section 6735 of the Professional Engineer’s Act of the State of California requires engineering calculation(s) or report(s) be either prepared by or under the responsible charge of a licensed civil engineer. Since the corresponding ATP Infrastructure-application defines the scope of work of a future civil construction project and requires complex engineering principles and calculations which are based on the best data available at the time of the application, the application must be signed and stamped by a licensed civil engineer.

By signing and stamping this document, the engineer is attesting to this application’s technical information and engineering data upon which local agency’s recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are made. This action is governed by the Professional Engineer’s Act and the corresponding Code of Professional Conduct, under Sections 6775 and 6735.

The following checklist is to be completed by the engineer in “responsible charge” of defining the projects Scope, Cost and Schedule per the expectations of the CTC’s PSR Equivalent. The checklist is expected to be used during the preparation of the documents, but not initialed and stamped until the final application and application attachments are complete and ready for submission to Caltrans.

1. Vicinity map /Location map  
   a. The project limits must be clearly depicted in relationship to the overall agency boundary

2. Project layout-plan/map showing existing and proposed conditions must:  
   a. Be to a scale which allows the visual verification of the overall project “construction” limits and limits of each primary element of the project
   b. Show the full scope of the proposed project, including any non-participating construction items
   c. Show all changes to existing motorized/non-motorized lane and shoulder widths. Label the proposed widths
   d. Show agency’s right of way (ROW) lines when permanent or temporary ROW impacts are possible. (As appropriate, also show Caltrans’, Railroad, and all other government agencies ROW lines)

3. Typical cross-section(s) showing existing and proposed conditions.  
   (Include cross-section for each controlling configuration that varies significantly from the typical)  
   a. Show and dimension: changes in lane widths, ROW lines, side slopes, etc.

4. Detailed Engineer’s Estimate  
   a. Estimate is reasonable and complete.
   b. Each of the main project elements are broken out into separate construction items. The costs for each item are based on calculated quantities and appropriate corresponding unit costs
   c. All non-participating costs in relation to the ATP funding are clearly identified and accounted for separately from the eligible costs
   d. All project elements the applicant intends to utilize the CCC (or a certified community conservation corps) on need to be clearly identified and accounted for
   e. All project development costs to be funded by the ATP need to be accounted for in the total project cost
5. Crash/Safety Data, Collision maps and Countermeasures:
   Engineer's Initials: [F]
   a. Confirmation that crash data shown occurred within influence area of proposed improvements.

6. Project Schedule and Requested programming of ATP funding
   Engineer's Initials: [F]
   a. All applicants must anticipate receiving federal ATP funding for the project and therefore the project schedules and programming included in the application must account for all applicable requirements and timeframes.
   b. "Completed Dates" for project Milestone Dates shown in the application have been reviewed and verified.
   c. "Expected Dates" for project Milestone Dates shown in the application account for all reasonable project timetables, including: Interagency MOUs, Caltrans agreements, CTC allocations, FHWA authorizations, federal environmental studies and approvals, federal right-of-way acquisitions, federal consultant selections, project permits, etc.
   d. The fiscal year and funding amounts shown in the PPR must be consistent with the values shown in the project cost estimate(s), expected project milestone dates and expected matching funds.

7. Warrant studies/guidance (Check if not applicable)
   Engineer's Initials: [F]
   □ N/A
   a. For new Signals – Warrant 4, 5 or 7 must be met (CA MUTCD): Signal warrants must be documented as having been met based on the CA MUTCD BASED ON FORECASTED GROWTH WITHIN THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT THE WARRANT WILL BE MET.

8. Additional narration and documentation:
   Engineer's Initials: [F]
   a. The text in the "Narrative Questions" in the application is consistent with and supports the engineering logic and calculations used in the development of the plans/maps and estimate.
   b. When needed to clarify non-standard ATP project elements (i.e. vehicular roadway widening necessary for the construction of the primary ATP elements); appropriate documentation is attached to the application to document the engineering decisions and calculations requiring the inclusion of these non-standard elements.

Licensed Engineer:
Name (Last, First): FUSON, LUCAS
Title: ASSOCIATE TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER
Engineer License Number: 73946
Signature: [Signature]
Date: 5/19/2015
Email: LFUSON@WOODROVES.COM
Phone: 916.326.5426

Engineer's Stamp:

Attachment C
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP)

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA

MAY 2015

ATTACHMENT E

LOCATION 1

REMODEL BIKE PATH

REMODEL AND LANDSCAPE
BIKE PATH EASEMENT

WEAKEN CEMENT

APPROVED PEDESTRIAN/BIKE
CROSSING WIDTH

CURRENT PEDESTRIAN/BIKE TRAVEL PATH MARKS

REMODEL BIKE PATH

REMOVE AND LANDSCAPE
BIKE PATH EASEMENT

REMOVE AND LANDSCAPE
BIKE PATH PAVEMENT

PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN/BIKE
CROSSING WIDTH
Stone Creek Trail intersection with Zinfandel Drive. Looking east across Zinfandel Drive

Stone Creek Trail terminus on the east side of Zinfandel Drive
Looking north on Zinfandel Drive

Looking west at the Stone Creek Trail terminus with Prospect Park Drive
Looking across Prospect Park Drive at the Stone Creek Trail terminus
03-Rancho Cordova-1

Stone Creek Trail intersection with Prospect Park Drive. Looking west across Prospect Park Drive.

Looking north on Prospect Park Drive.
## ATTACHMENT G

**RANCHO CORDOVA 2015 ATP - STONE CREEK PEDESTRIAN/BIKE CROSSING SIGNAL CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY (FT)</th>
<th>TOTAL QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Water Pollution and Erosion Control</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bike Path Excavation</td>
<td>14 LF 150 8 CY</td>
<td>52 CY 40.00</td>
<td>$2,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Aggregate Base (Class II)</td>
<td>10 LF 150 6 CY</td>
<td>28 CY 50.00</td>
<td>$1,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>PCC Median Curb</td>
<td>300 LF</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>PCC Sidewalk</td>
<td>18 CY 450.00</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Asphalt Concrete Rubberized</td>
<td>10 LF 150 2</td>
<td>59 Ton 250.00</td>
<td>$14,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sawcut Pavement</td>
<td>100 LF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Curb Ramp</td>
<td>4 EA 6,000.00</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Detectable Warning Surface 3' x 10'</td>
<td>4 EA</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Cape Seal</td>
<td>1,200 SF</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Traffic Stripe Removal</td>
<td>300 LF</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Traffic Stripe (4&quot; Solid White)</td>
<td>50 LF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Traffic Stripe (4&quot; Solid Yellow)</td>
<td>240 LF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Traffic Stripe (6&quot; Solid White)</td>
<td>50 LF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Pavement Markers (Retractable)</td>
<td>11 EA</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Pavement Markings-Crosswalk/Legends/Arrows</td>
<td>300 SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Object Markers</td>
<td>4 EA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Traffic Signage-Furnish, Reset, Relocate</td>
<td>8 EA</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike Crossing Signal (2 Locations)</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Remove Street Lighting</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Landscaping (Median)</td>
<td>12 LF 120 1,440 SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Subtotal**: $311,945.45

**Contingency (10%)**: $31,194.55

**CM & Inspection Cost (10%)**: $34,303.00

**PM & Staff Cost (10%)**: $31,194.55

**Environmental Documentation (1.5%)**: $5,145.45

**Mapping & Survey**: $40,000.00

**Utility Coordination**: $10,000.00

**Design Engineering**: $34,303.00

**TOTAL PROJECT COSTS**: $497,986.01

Attachment G
### Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy Project List

ATTACHMENT I-PARTB 2.Region Plan

/1/ Project Analysis projects are anticipated to begin early stages of development including project design, preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, and ROW acquisition by 2035. These projects remain eligible to seek federal and state funding, but under the financial constraint requirements for projecting revenues, the construction phase is not covered. If additional revenues for these projects become available, these projects will require future amendments to the MTP/SCS to reflect full construction costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (2010 DOLLARS)</th>
<th>MTP/Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</th>
<th>MTP/SCS Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Galt Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>Simmerhorn Road Overcrossing Replacement</td>
<td>In Galt: Simmerhorn Road overcrossing of SR 99. Construct realigned overcrossing.</td>
<td>$ 4,450,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Galt Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>South County Transit Bus Stop Shelters</td>
<td>Installation of bus stop shelters at 3 key locations for the SCITLink demand response service in the City of Galt.</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Galt Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>SR 99 Central Galt Interchange</td>
<td>In Galt: A &amp; C Streets. Boleslow Road at SR 99: Replace existing C Street interchange at SR 99 with new 6 lane overcrossings (4 through lanes and left-turn channelization) at C Street and A Street. Reconstruct all on/off ramps. Realign connector streets. HPP #1257</td>
<td>$ 50,641,711</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Galt Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>Twin Cities Road Widening</td>
<td>In Galt: Twin Cities Road to Bergeon Road. widen 330 linear feet of Twin Cities Rd between E. Stockton Blvd and Bergeon Rd. Construct roundabouts at ramp termini and remove existing signals.</td>
<td>$ 5,200,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Galt Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>Walnut Ave./Highway 99</td>
<td>Construct New Interchange: Project Development for eventual Hwy 98 / Walnut Ave. Includes full access freeway interchange and overcrossing.</td>
<td>$ 3,649,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Isleton</td>
<td>2nd Street Landscaping</td>
<td>Landscape 2nd St. from A St. to C St.</td>
<td>$ 12,333</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Isleton</td>
<td>Historic District Parking lot paving and landscaping</td>
<td>Pave existing parking lot, add ingress &amp; egress to Main Street &amp; add shade trees and landscaping and parking lot lighting</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Isleton</td>
<td>Main Street Landscaping &amp; Beautification</td>
<td>Street Trees, curb-gutter &amp; sidewalk repairs</td>
<td>$ 180,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Isleton</td>
<td>Main Street Solar street lights</td>
<td>Install Solar Powered Street Lights as part of City's Green Program</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Isleton</td>
<td>Street Repairs</td>
<td>Remove &amp; replace existing street surface &amp; subgrade due to degradation</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>ADA Transition Plan</td>
<td>In Rancho Cordova. Continue ADA Transition Plan project delivery including reconstructing curb ramps, repairing sidewalks, installing new curb ramps and sidewalks, sidewalk bus pad modifications, removal of walkway barriers and traffic signal retrofits.</td>
<td>$ 2,300,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Completion phased throughout plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Americanos Rd.</td>
<td>Construct New Road: 4 lanes from White Rock Rd. to the Folsom South Canal. Includes: intersection improvements at Rancho Cordova Pkwy. (Phase IV)</td>
<td>$ 15,000,000</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Americanos Rd.</td>
<td>Construct New Road: 2 lanes from Douglas Rd. to International Dr. Includes: intersection improvements at International Dr. and Villaggio (Phase III)</td>
<td>$ 1,782,734</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Americanos Rd.</td>
<td>Construct New Road: 2 lanes from Keifer Blvd. to Chrysanthi Blvd. Includes: intersection improvements at Keifer Blvd. and Chrysanthi Blvd.</td>
<td>$ 620,880</td>
<td>MTIP Project: Year of Expenditure Costs Only</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy Project List

**ATTACHMENT I-PARTB_2.Region Plan**

Projects are anticipated to begin early stages of development including project design, preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, and ROW acquisition by 2035. These projects remain eligible to seek federal and state funding, but under the financial constraint requirements for projecting revenues, the construction phase is not covered. When additional revenues for these projects become available, these projects will require future amendments to the MTP/SCS to reflect full construction costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (2010 DOLLARS)</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (YEAR OF EXPENDITURE DOLLARS)</th>
<th>MTP/SCS Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>International Dr. Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway</td>
<td>International Drive, from Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway; widen and construct to 6-lanes with intersection improvements at Sunrise Blvd, and Rancho Cordova Parkway (portion of CP09-2069).</td>
<td>$2,884,350</td>
<td>$3,953,277</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Jackson Hwy, (SR 16)</td>
<td>Widen State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) to 4-lanes from Sunrise Blvd, to Grant Line Rd, including intersection improvements at Sunrise Blvd and Grant Line Rd. Interim improvements may include additional turning lanes and intersection improvements.</td>
<td>$957,827</td>
<td>$1,312,794</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Kiefer Blvd.</td>
<td>Complete frontage improvements and extend Kiefer Blvd. as a new 2 lane roadway from Sunrise Blvd. to Grant Line Rd. Includes intersection improvements at Americanos and Grant Line. (CP09-2074, CP07-2036)</td>
<td>$1,411,962</td>
<td>$1,935,228</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Kiefer Boulevard, Phase 2</td>
<td>Complete widening and extend Kiefer Blvd. as a new four lane roadway from Rancho Cordova Parkway (Jaeger Road) to Americanos Road including intersection improvements at Americanos and Grant Line. (Phase 2 - CP09-2074)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,451,000</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Kilgoore Rd.</td>
<td>Widen: 4 lanes from International Dr. to White Rock Rd.</td>
<td>$819,000</td>
<td>$1,372,773</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Landscaping US 50 at Mather Field Rd Interchange</td>
<td>Design, install, and maintain landscape improvements within the existing freeway interchange of US 50 at Mather Field Road. Includes streetscape, lighting, and other enhancements on Mather Field Rd between Folsom and Mather Commerce Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,609,192</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Mather Blvd.</td>
<td>Construct New Road: 4 lanes from Rockingham Rd. to Zinfandel Dr. Includes: widening existing roadway to 4 lanes.</td>
<td>$2,274,700</td>
<td>$3,117,694</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Mather Field Rd.</td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation: two-way couplet from Mather Blvd. to Rockingham Rd.</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
<td>$1,542,065</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Mather Field Rd.</td>
<td>Widen: 6 lanes from Rockingham Rd. to Folsom Blvd. Includes: intersection improvements at Rockingham Rd.</td>
<td>$268,149</td>
<td>$367,524</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Mather Field Rd./US 50 Interchange</td>
<td>Interchange Modification: at U.S. 50/Mather Field Rd.</td>
<td>$4,120,000</td>
<td>$5,646,854</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Old Placerville Rd.</td>
<td>Widen to 6 lanes from Bradshaw Rd. to Mather Blvd. Includes: intersection improvements at Routier Rd.</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,644,715</td>
<td>Project Analysis /I/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities and Sidewalk Gap program</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements: Throughout Rancho Cordova, construct new pedestrian facilities based on Pedestrian Master Plan. Continue Sidewalk Gap project delivery. Includes: grade separations at key locations.</td>
<td>$12,200,000</td>
<td>$16,721,266</td>
<td>Completion phased throughout plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Pedestrian Promenade</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing of U.S. 50 connecting Olsen Drive to Prospect Park Drive as defined in The Promenade: Connecting and Revitalizing Rancho Cordova Planning Study (reference SAC34157).</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy Project List

ATTACHMENT I-PARTB_2.Region Plan

Project Analysis projects are anticipated to begin early stages of development including project design, preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, and ROW acquisition by 2035. These projects remain eligible to seek federal and state funding, but under the financial constraint requirements for projecting revenues, the construction phase is not covered. If/when additional revenues for these projects become available, these projects will require future amendments to the MTP/SCS to reflect full construction costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (2010 DOLLARS)</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (YEAR OF EXPENDITURE DOLLARS)</th>
<th>MTP/SCS Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of Folsom Boulevard, Zinfandel Drive, Kilgore Road, International Drive, Horn Road and Rossmoor Drive. The project will include Class II Bikeway lanes, and will improve bicycle and pedestrian access in the area to be rehabilitated. The project will also include many ADA elements, such as enhanced striping and better delineate between modes and improved pedestrian crossings, and improved sidewalk, the construction of new sidewalks, curbs, and gutter at various sites, construction of asphalt walkways, and the installation of pedestrian signals, safety lighting facilities, warning signage, and pedestrian push buttons identified in the Plans. (GMAQ funds only for new bicycle/pedestrian facilities that reduce auto emissions.)</td>
<td>$ 3,647,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Ruter Rd.</td>
<td>Widen from Old Facerville Rd. to Folsom Blvd, including structure over U.S. Hwy. 50.</td>
<td>$ 9,421,000</td>
<td>$ 15,761,083</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Sun Center Drive</td>
<td>New two lane roadway from Folsom South Canal to White Rock Road including intersection improvements from Mercantile to White Rock Road including bridge over Folsom South Canal.</td>
<td>$ 13,670,000</td>
<td>$ 22,913,078</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Sunrise Blvd - Kiefer Blvd to SR16</td>
<td>Widen Sunrise Boulevard. 2 to 4-lanes from Kiefer Boulevard to State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) and construct partial intersection improvements at Sunrise Boulevard and State Route 16. The project includes removal and replacement of the bridge on Sunrise Boulevard over Laguna Creek,</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Sunrise Blvd.</td>
<td>Widen: 6 lanes with special treatments from White Rock Rd. to the American River/Border. Includes: intersection improvements at White Rock, Folsom Blvd., Coloma Rd., Zinfandel Dr., Gold Express, and Gold Country.</td>
<td>$ 71,000,000</td>
<td>$ 119,007,209</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Sunrise Blvd. and Jackson Hwy.</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>$ 10,355,460</td>
<td>$ 17,357,386</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Traffic Operation Center</td>
<td>Building Construction: traffic operations facility. Includes: roadside infrastructure to support operations of the center.</td>
<td>$ 7,500,000</td>
<td>$ 9,364,363</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>US 50 / Rancho Cordova Pkwy.</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>$ 100,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project complete by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Villaggio</td>
<td>Construct New Road: 2 lanes from Douglas Rd. to White Rock Rd. Includes: intersection improvements at Douglas Rd., Rancho Cordova Pkwy., International Dr., Americanos Rd., and White Rock Rd.</td>
<td>$ 11,989,081</td>
<td>$ 20,095,593</td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>White Rock Rd - Sunrise Blvd. to Grant Line Rd.</td>
<td>On existing 6-lane White Rock Rd., from Sunrise Blvd. to Luyung Dr.; construct improvements. On White Rock Rd from Luyung Dr. to Grant Line Rd.: widen and reconstruct from 2 to 4 lanes.</td>
<td>$ 15,212,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project complete by 2035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chris,

We’ll be sending you a draft of the application tomorrow.

Please see below from CCC regarding participation.

Thanks,

Luke Fuson
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
916.326.5426 Direct
916.997.2453 Mobile

Hi Luke,

Thank you for contacting the CCC. Unfortunately, we are unable to participate in this project. Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the CCC.

Thank you,

Wei Hsieh, Manager
Programs & Operations Division
California Conservation Corps
1719 24th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 341-3154
Wei.Hsieh@ccc.ca.gov
Hello Virginia,

The City of Rancho Cordova is seeking ATP grant funding to construct two pedestrian traffic signals. The signal would be located along Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive where the existing Stone Creek trail intersects those roads.

I have attached the project description, map, schedule, cost estimate, and preliminary plans.

Will you please consider this project and let me know if this is a project the CCC would like to participate on?

Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Thank you,

Luke Fuson - P.E.
Associate - Transportation
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
3301 C Street, Bldg. 100-B
Sacramento, CA 95816
916.341.7760 Tel
916.341.7767 Fax
916.326.5426 Direct
916.997.2453 Mobile
lfuson@woodrodgers.com
www.woodrodgers.com
Chris Boyer

From: Luke Fuson <lfuson@WoodRodgers.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 10:18 AM
To: Chris Boyer
Cc: Derek Kirkland; Mark Rayback
Subject: FW: Rancho Cordova - Stone Creek Trail pedestrian crossings - ATP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Chris,
The response from the Local Corps. is below.

Luke Fuson
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
916.326.5426 Direct
916.997.2453 Mobile

From: Active Transportation Program [mailto:inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 10:15 AM
To: Luke Fuson
Subject: Re: Rancho Cordova - Stone Creek Trail pedestrian crossings - ATP

Hi Luke,

Thank you for reaching out to the local conservation corps. Unfortunately, we are not able to participate in this project. Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the Local Corps.

Thank you

Monica

On Tue, May 19, 2015 at 1:56 PM, ATP@CCC <ATP@ccc.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi Luke,

Thank you for contacting the CCC. Unfortunately, we are unable to participate in this project. Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the CCC.
03-Rancho Cordova-1

Thank you,

Wei Hsieh, Manager

Programs & Operations Division

California Conservation Corps

1719 24th Street

Sacramento, CA 95816

(916) 341-3154

Wei.Hsieh@ccc.ca.gov

---

From: Luke Fuson [mailto:lfuson@WoodRodgers.com]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 3:07 PM
To: Clark, Virginia@CCC
Cc: Chris Boyer; Mark Rayback; Derek Kirkland
Subject: Rancho Cordova - Stone Creek Trail pedestrian crossings - ATP

Hello Virginia,

The City of Rancho Cordova is seeking ATP grant funding to construct two pedestrian traffic signals. The signal would be located along Zinfandel Drive and Prospect Park Drive where the existing Stone Creek trail intersects those roads.

I have attached the project description, map, schedule, cost estimate, and preliminary plans.

Will you please consider this project and let me know if this is a project the CCC would like to participate on?
Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Thank you,

Luke Fuson - P.E.
Associate - Transportation
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
3301 C Street, Bldg. 100-B
Sacramento, CA 95816
916.341.7760 Tel
916.341.7767 Fax
916.326.5426 Direct
916.997.2453 Mobile
lfuson@woodrodgers.com
www.woodrodgers.com

Monica Davalos | Legislative Policy Intern
Active Transportation Program
California Association of Local Conservation Corps
1121 L Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.426.9170 | inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org

Attachment K
Villages Service

Bus # 177 - Villages
Zinfandel Plaza
PM Schedule

3:27 PM
3:42 PM
3:57 PM
4:12 PM
4:27 PM
4:42 PM
4:57 PM
5:12 PM
5:27 PM
5:42 PM
5:57 PM
6:12 PM
6:27 PM
6:42 PM
6:57 PM