What is the significance of each map layer?

Please note: many of these map layers are data-intensive and will take some time to load—your patience will be rewarded with a full map layer!

Active Transportation Program Mapping website: http://arcg.is/1TenyJR

Table of Contents

Please contact Victoria Cacciatore if you notice any inconsistencies or experience any difficulties with the mapping site. VCacciatore@sacog.org, 916.340.6214

Resources for Question 1—Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities

CalEnviroScreen 2.0 Top 25%

Areas identified as among the top 25% most disadvantaged in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 2.0 (CalEnviroScreen 2.0) scores (score must be greater than or equal to 36.62). This list can be found at the following link under SB 535 List of Disadvantaged Communities: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/

Disadvantaged Schools 2014

Public schools where at least 75% of students are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits students attending these schools within the project area. Data is available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp.asp.

Disadvantaged Schools with 2-mile Buffer

A two-mile buffer around a public school where at least 75% of students are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Applicants using this measure to demonstrate benefits to a disadvantaged community must indicate how the project benefits the students attending these schools within the project area.

Disadvantaged Census Tracts

Areas with a Median Household Income (Table ID B19013) less than 80% of the statewide median income of $61,489 (<$49,191), defined as low-income by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Data is from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey.

Regional Disadvantaged Community—Low Income High Minority

Geographic areas with concentrations of low income and/or minority populations in the six-county region. This geography was used for the environmental justice analysis for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and may be used as a definition for “disadvantaged community” through the State ATP and Regional ATP.

Please contact Victoria Cacciatore if you notice any inconsistencies or experience any difficulties with the mapping site. VCacciatore@sacog.org, 916.340.6214

Resources for Question 2—Increasing Biking and Walking

Existing bicycle network

Locations of existing bicycle infrastructure in the six-county region. This data set was updated in 2015 as part of the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan. Applicants may use this layer to help demonstrate how the project fills gaps in the existing bicycle network. Comparable regional data for sidewalks is not available at this time.

Transit (bus and rail)

Location of transit routes throughout the region for the 2012 base year from the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Applicants will need to follow up with their area's transit agency to learn more about service along the corridor (e.g., frequency of service, location of stops, destinations accessed from that transit stop, future plans to increase/decrease/alter service in the area and to/from nearby stops, upcoming investments affecting that transit service, etc).

Civic Amenities

Locations of service amenities (e.g., hospitals, community centers, and schools) in the region. Applicants can illustrate important areas for public access to support the argument for new facilities or improvements to existing conditions.

2012 Mixed Density

Parcel level land use density for the 2012 base year in the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy showing residential, employment, and mixed use densities. Applicants can use a higher land use density in the base year to illustrate the current potential and demand for active transportation modes and/or to justify additional investment in those modes if facilities are missing or inadequate.

2012 VMT per capita

Parcel level vehicle miles traveled per capita for the 2012 base year from the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Applicants can use a lower VMT per capita in the base year to illustrate the current potential and demand for active transportation modes and/or to justify additional investment in those modes if facilities are missing or inadequate.

CycleSac 2015 Comfort of Ride—Excellent

CycleSac data was collected from April 2015 through March 2016—9,000 trips were recorded by 670 unique bike riders across the region. The comfort ratings by frequency reflect the "level of comfort" (similar to "stress") reported by the bike rider at the end of his or her route, i.e. excellent, good, fair, poor, or terrible. Thick lines represent routes where more people rated the route positively; identifying high comfort (i.e. low-to-no stress routes) can be used to support the identification of a recommended bicycle network, or non-infrastructure programs to encourage more bikeriding on that route.

CycleSac 2015 Comfort of Ride—Fair/Terrible

CycleSac data was collected from April 2015 through March 2016—9,000 trips were recorded by 670 unique bike riders across the region. The comfort ratings by frequency reflect the "level of comfort" (similar to "stress") reported by the bike rider at the end of his or her route, i.e. excellent, good, fair, poor, or terrible.

Please contact Victoria Cacciatore if you notice any inconsistencies or experience any difficulties with the mapping site. VCacciatore@sacog.org, 916.340.6214

Thick lines represent routes where more people rated the route negatively; identifying low comfort (i.e. stressful) routes can illustrate a need for improved facilities to preserve/increase bike ridership.

2012 ATP Accessibility Map

Accessibility of walking- and biking-mode trip generators (e.g. housing, retail, medical and educational sectors, etc.) within .75 miles from each parcel, assuming travel on the existing road network. All other components of a project held equal, a project located in an area of high accessibility is likely to serve more active mode trips than a project located in an area of low accessibility, and thus could make a stronger argument for increasing biking and walking in the project area.

A technical discussion of how the Accessibility Map was developed is available at http://www.sacog.org/post/state-atp-funding-cycle-3

Please contact Victoria Cacciatore if you notice any inconsistencies or experience any difficulties with the mapping site. VCacciatore@sacog.org, 916.340.6214

Resources for Question 3—Decreasing Collisions

CycleSac 2015 Comfort of Ride—Fair/Terrible

CycleSac data was collected from April 2015 through March 2016—9,000 trips were recorded by 670 unique bike riders across the region. The comfort ratings by frequency reflect the "level of comfort" (similar to "stress") reported by the bike rider at the end of his or her route, i.e. excellent, good, fair, poor, or terrible. Thick lines represent routes where more people rated the route negatively; identifying low comfort (i.e. stressful) routes can align with countermeasures to address known safety issues, e.g. inadequate biking facilities, poor facility condition. More information about what bike riders said made the route high or low stress may be available in the CycleSac dataset shared with your city or county.

Please contact Victoria Cacciatore if you notice any inconsistencies or experience any difficulties with the mapping site. VCacciatore@sacog.org, 916.340.6214

Additional Data Layers Available—not represented on mapping site

Disadvantaged Census Block Group and CDP Data (for rural areas)

Census block groups and Census Designated Places with a Median Household Income less than 80% of the statewide median income of $61,489 (<$49,191), defined as low-income by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Data is from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey. This data layer may only be used in areas with fewer than 15,000 residents; all other areas should rely on census tract data from Table ID B19013.

A PDF of this map is available on http://www.sacog.org/post/state-atp-funding-cycle-3.

2036 VMT per capita

Parcel level vehicle miles traveled per capita for the 2036 end year from the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Similar to a lower VMT per capita in the base year, applicants can use a lower VMT per capita in the end year to illustrate future potential and demand for active transportation modes and/or to justify additional investment in those modes if facilities are missing or inadequate. Additionally, a decrease in VMT per capita from the base year of 2012 to the end year of 2036 may indicate an elimination or shortening of vehicle trips, which applicants can use to point to an increase in active transportation modes.

In addition to supporting the argument for increased future need for active transportation facilities, this information can help support the applicant's discussion on the project's ability to contribute to a regional GHG emissions reduction strategy.

A PDF of this map is available on http://www.sacog.org/post/regional-atp-funding-program-cycle-3.

2036 Mixed Density

Parcel level land use density for the 2036 end year in the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy showing residential, employment, and mixed use densities. Similar to a higher land use density in the base year, applicants can use a higher land use density in the end year to illustrate the likely future potential and demand for active transportation modes and/or to justify additional investment in those modes if facilities are missing or inadequate. Additionally, an increase in land use density from the base year of 2012 to the end year of 2036 may indicate an increase in the number of people in a given area. Applicants can use this growth to illustrate the greater need for transportation facilities and alternatives to road expansion.

In addition to supporting the argument for increased future need for active transportation facilities, this information can help support the applicant's discussion on the project's ability to contribute to a regional GHG emissions reduction strategy.

A PDF of this map is available on http://www.sacog.org/post/regional-atp-funding-program-cycle-3.

Please contact Victoria Cacciatore if you notice any inconsistencies or experience any difficulties with the mapping site. VCacciatore@sacog.org, 916.340.6214