August 1, 2017

Susan Bransen, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Mail Station 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: ATP Augmentation Authorization
   3-Yuba City-2
   Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

Dear Ms. Susan Bransen:

The City of Yuba City confirms that Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure project can be delivered in the time frame proposed in the attached updated Project Programming Request and that the project is still fully funded. The environmental design will start in 2018 with construction completion by 2021. This letter authorizes the project to be submitted for consideration in the 2017 ATP Augmentation Program.

The Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure project will provide multiple benefits to the community, including providing safe travel routes for students attending River Valley High School and Tierra Buena Elementary School, ADA accessibility near a major retail center, and connectivity to an existing 4.5-mile-long bike path. Thank you for considering this project.

Sincerely,

Steven C. Kroeger
City Manager
City of Yuba City
Project Title
Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work
The project is located in Yuba City, Sutter County, from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway on the north side of Jefferson Avenue and on Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to Spirit Way. The project will extend the existing 4.6-mile-long Sutter Bicycle Path from Hoper Road to Harter Parkway and build a Class I shared use path on Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to State Route 20.

Purpose and Need
The existing Sutter Bike Path ends abruptly at Hooper Road, a residential area, with no direct route to Harter Parkway which serves as an economic center, with local transit stops for the City of Yuba City as well as a direct route to the River Valley High School. Without the bike path extension, bicyclists must make a detour of over 1 mile to reach Harter Parkway. Harter Parkway lacks any pedestrian or bicycle facilities for the area within the project limits (over 3,000 ft long). The project would connect the existing bike path to a local activity center and improve accessibility along a common bicycle and pedestrian route for students and commuters.

Project Benefits
The project would provide safe active transportation routes for pedestrians and bicyclist to the River Valley High School, the local shopping center, local residences, and connect everything to the town of Sutter.
### Proposed Total Project Cost ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,972</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>269</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

**Fund No. 1:** ATP Augmentation Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,972</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>1,972</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Agency
- Caltrans

**Fund No. 2:** Local Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269</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>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Agency
- City of Yuba City

**Fund No. 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</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>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</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>
## Project Programming Request

**District:** 03  
**County:** SUT  
**Project Title:** Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure  
**Date:** 8/2/17

### Fund No. 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</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>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</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>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</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>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</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>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Project Programming Request

**District:** 03  
**County:** SUT 
**Project Title:** Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

| Fund No. 8: |  
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Proposed Funding ($1,000s)** |
| | **Program Code** | **Funding Agency** |
| | | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | |
| PS&E | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | |
| R/W | | |
| CON | | |
| **TOTAL** | | |

| Fund No. 9: |  
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Proposed Funding ($1,000s)** |
| | **Program Code** | **Funding Agency** |
| | | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | |
| PS&E | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | |
| R/W | | |
| CON | | |
| **TOTAL** | | |

| Fund No. 10: |  
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Proposed Funding ($1,000s)** |
| | **Program Code** | **Funding Agency** |
| | | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | |
| PS&E | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | |
| R/W | | |
| CON | | |
| **TOTAL** | | |
July 1, 2016

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

Dear Ms. Cacciatore:

The City of Yuba City is pleased to submit an application to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments for the Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure under the Regional Active Transportation Program. The proposed improvement project will close critical pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure gaps along Harter Parkway and Hooper Road to create a safe path of travel connecting the City of Yuba City with the Town of Sutter through the completion of the Sutter Bike Path.

We feel that this project is in line with the goals of the Active Transportation Program and conforms to the guidance provided by the City’s General Plan, the City’s Bicycle Master Plan, and the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan. Funding for this project will ensure realization of the City’s goal to provide a safe and effective travel route for local students, commuters, and residents to area businesses and schools.

The enclosed application includes the SACOG Supplemental application, the State ATP application, and relevant attachments (one original, three copies, and one electronic copy), in accordance with the program guidelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this application. Feel free to contact me should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Benjamin K. Moody, PE, PLS  
Deputy Public Works Director - Engineering

1201 Civic Center Boulevard • Yuba City, CA 95993 • yubacity.net
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This Supplemental Application complements the State ATP application; all Regional ATP applicants must fill out the entire State ATP application and Regional ATP supplemental application regardless of whether they elected to compete through the State ATP.

All application materials are available online at:

http://www.sacog.org/active-transportation-program
## REGIONAL ATP CYCLE 3 CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP Policy Framework Approved by SACOG Board</td>
<td>May 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance release of Regional ATP Application materials</td>
<td>May 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC adoption of Regional Policy Framework; Regional ATP Call for projects</td>
<td>June 29-30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP applications due</td>
<td>July 8, 2016; 1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of the preliminary ranked draft Regional ATP project list</td>
<td>September 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of State ATP funding recommendations</td>
<td>October 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Regional ATP funding recommendations</td>
<td>November 16, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC adoption of State ATP funding recommendations</td>
<td>December 7-8, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Board approval of Regional ATP funding recommendations</td>
<td>December 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC adoption of Regional ATP funding recommendations</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. PROJECT SPONSOR INFORMATION

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 Yuba City

PROJECT SPONSOR’S ADDRESS:  
1201 Civic Center Boulevard

PROJECT SPONSOR’S CONTACT PERSON:  
Manu Dhaliwal

CONTACT PERSON’S PHONE NUMBER:  
(530) 822-7685

CONTACT PERSON’S EMAIL ADDRESS:  
mdhaliwal@yubacity.net

CONTACT PERSON’S TITLE:  
Assistant Engineer
II. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Are you applying for a reduced version of the scope identified in your State ATP application?
   
   Yes ☐ No ☒

   If yes, include revised versions of Parts 3-6 of the State ATP application and append to your Regional ATP application. This information is necessary for Caltrans to process your project if awarded funding.

   Note: The project status and expected delivery schedule in Parts 3-6 of the State ATP application must assume use of federal funding.

2. Project Description/Scope:

   a. What is the full project description and scope for the project applying for funds?

   The project will construct Class IV and Class I paths on Jefferson Avenue and Harter Parkway to close a major gap in the City’s existing pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure. The proposed construction will link the existing Sutter Bike Path, River Valley High School, Yuba City Marketplace, Feather River Academy, the proposed Tierra Buena Park, and bus transit stops to the City’s bicycle and pedestrian network.

   The project will construct the following improvements:
   
   • Class IV shared use path on the north side of Jefferson Avenue from Hooper Avenue, where the existing Sutter Bike Path ends, to Ruth Avenue.
   
   • Class I shared use path from Ruth Avenue to Harter Parkway, through unimproved dirt field (no existing roadway, pedestrian, or bicycle improvements).
   
   • Class I shared use path on the west side of Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to State Route 20.
   
   • Class II bicycle lanes on Harter Parkway from State Route 20 to Spirit Way.

   b. Is there a usable partial scope of the project that differs from what you identified above? Describe the scope and cost estimate.

   Yes. The partial scope for the project would be the construction of the Sutter Bicycle path extension ON Jefferson Avenue without the inclusion of the Harter Parkway Class I shared use path.

   The Sutter Bike path extension would include class IV path from Hooper Road to Ruth Avenue and a Class I shared use path from Ruth Avenue to Harter Parkway. The path extension would benefit all of the same
communities and multiple users while closing a gap, creating a new route and meeting the needs of multiple types of users.

Partial Construction & CE Estimate: $850,000  
PE & Enviro: $127,500  
Total Project Cost: $977,500  
Requested Funds: $850,000  
Local Match: $127,500

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

   - Project funding request: $1,972,000  
   - Project matching funds: $269,000  
   - TOTAL PROJECT COST: $2,241,000

4. Current state of the project area:
   For infrastructure projects:
   
   a. Are there existing bike/ped facilities?

   There are no existing bicycle facilities in the project area. There are a few areas with some pedestrian infrastructure but none of it is continuous or extensive. There are existing sidewalks on Harter Parkway south of Highway 20; the project intends to install Class II bicycle facilities at this location. There are pedestrian facilities on the east side of Harter Parkway, adjacent to Yuba City Marketplace (listed as Activity Center on maps) but the pedestrian facilities end at the north edge of the shopping center and do not connect to any infrastructure to the north.

   b. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what is the posted speed limit?  
   If the posted speed varies for different road segments, please identify the segments and applicable speeds.

   Harter Parkway has a speed limit of 35 MPH; Jefferson Avenue has a speed limit of 25 MPH.

   c. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what are the daily traffic volumes? Peak hour traffic volumes?  
   Harter Parkway has a daily traffic volume of 10,693 vehicles with a peak hour traffic volume of 703 vehicles.
d. Are there any projects near the project area anticipated for construction in the immediate future (next four years)?
No.

For non-infrastructure projects:

a. What other plans or programs are currently in place within the project area, or recently concluded?

The City constructed Class II bicycle lanes on Lassen Avenue and Harter Parkway (from Lassen Avenue to Spirit Way, directly south of the proposed project) in 2013/2014.

b. Are there any plans or programs in or near the project area anticipated to begin in the immediate future (next four years)?

The City plans to build the Tierra Buena Park directly adjacent to the proposed project area, pending the receipt of funding. The park will include bicycle parking facilities, vehicle parking, large open spaces, and space for other recreational activities (basketball courts, etc.).

For projects connecting to transit:

a. What are the destinations accessed by transit within the project area?

The transit stops located on Harter Parkway are the westernmost stops in Yuba City. The stop adjacent to the Yuba City Marketplace has two routes that serve the location, Route 1 and Route 5. Route 1 runs from Harter Parkway on the west to Yuba College east of Marysville, with stops throughout Yuba City and Marysville. Some of the locations of note that Route 1 connects include: Feather River Academy, Walmart, Yuba City Marketplace, Lowe’s, Sam’s Club, Bel Air Market, City Hall, Sutter County Courthouse & Sutter County Health, Yuba Sutter Mall, the post office, Yuba-Sutter Transit bus terminal, Yuba County offices, and Rideout Hospital. Route 5 runs primarily north-south in Yuba City and provides access to the following locations of note: Department of Motor Vehicles, Feather River Academy, Walmart, Yuba City Marketplace, Lowe’s, Sam’s Club, SunSweet Growers, Cinemark, Raley’s, Winco Foods, Andros Karperos School, Lincoln School, Happy Park, and Grace Christian School.

b. How frequently does existing transit service the project location?

Route 1 makes stops at the project location once every thirty (30) minutes between 6 AM and 6 PM. Route 5 makes stops at the project location once every hour between 6:30 AM and 5:30 PM.

c. What is the usage (e.g. daily boardings) of this transit stop relative to other transit stops served by your transit provider on the impacted transit routes, or relative to other service provided by the transit operator?
Yuba-Sutter Transit takes daily boarding surveys every 6 months. Per the March 2015 survey, Route 1 & Route 5 had a total of 103 daily users at the bus stop on Harter Parkway, adjacent to the Yuba City Marketplace (weekday count). During the same month, Route 1 had a total of 30,519 weekday users and Route 5 had a total of 5,427 weekday users. This means that the transit stop located adjacent to the proposed project constitutes approximately 8.6% of the total users on both routes.
III. Screening Criteria

Please fill out Part III in its entirety.

1. Project is one of the eligible types of non-infrastructure, infrastructure, or a combination of infrastructure and non-infrastructure.
   Yes ☒ No ☐

2. 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.

   
   The project is listed on page 146 of SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan 2015. The proposed project is a portion of the Rails to Trails: Abandoned Railroad Right-of-Way from Hooper Road to Bridge Street, project ID 40005, Sutter County, Yuba City. The proposed project will construct the first segment of the proposed project from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway. The proposed project would also complete the Harter Parkway bicycle lane project, project ID 40026, Sutter County, Yuba City, from Lassen Boulevard to Butte House Road.

   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.

   N/A

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

   1) Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, training, and awareness,

   N/A

   or

   2) Perform studies and develop plans that support one or more of the project performance outcomes of the program.

   N/A

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:
Yuba City: Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to Spirit Way and Jefferson Avenue from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway; construct Class I, II, and IV paths for pedestrian and bicycle use to fill gaps in infrastructure

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

4. **Project is eligible for Active Transportation Program funding.** *(consult with RTPA and/or Caltrans staff to discuss funding eligibility.)*
   - 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 ☐ N/A ☑

6. Project proposal culminated from a community-based public participation process with demonstrated stakeholder support.
   - Yes ☑ No ☐

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 project description, detailed estimate, project schedule, project map, and preliminary plans to the CCC and CALCC prior to application submittal to SACOG:

   The corps agencies can be contacted at:
   
   [http://www.ccc.ca.gov/work/programs/ATP/Pages/ATP%20home.aspx](http://www.ccc.ca.gov/work/programs/ATP/Pages/ATP%20home.aspx)
   [http://calocalcorps.org/active-transportation-program/](http://calocalcorps.org/active-transportation-program/)

   - A. The applicant has coordinated with the CCC to identify how a state conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes ☑ No ☐

   - 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 ☐

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

   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).
IV. ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION

1 page maximum, 12 point font

Please describe the need and context for your project, including any additional information specific to the Regional ATP criteria not discussed in your State ATP application or your below responses that will help the Active Transportation Working Group accurately assess and score your project.

Harter Parkway is a critical location in the City which offers a shopping and employment center and provides a direct path to River Valley High School, Feather River Academy, and bus transit stops. The construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on Jefferson Avenue and Harter Parkway would bridge a gap in the City’s existing infrastructure, providing a path of travel to the many points of interest on Harter Parkway for a significant portion of the City.

As regards public transit, the bus stops located on Harter Parkway are the westernmost Yuba-Sutter Transit stops in the County, which provide a direct link to Yuba College, Yuba-Sutter Transit Hub, and the City of Marysville by running east-west through Yuba City. The construction of the Sutter Bike Path extension would provide residents of the Town of Sutter and the City of Yuba City near the Sutter Bike Path with a direct route to the area’s transit, facilitating uninhibited travel throughout the region.

Currently, residents who wish to utilize the City’s bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure to access the Yuba City Marketplace (Walmart, Home Depot, restaurants, entertainment stores, etc.) or one of the schools will inevitably find a portion of their trip without safe infrastructure. The possible routes for accessing Harter Parkway from the west are to travel on Butte House Road, which has no pedestrian facilities and limited bicycle facilities, or to travel on the Colusa Frontage Road/Highway 20, which has neither pedestrian nor bicycle facilities. The construction of the proposed project would provide pedestrians and bicyclists with a dedicated, direct path of travel which links to existing infrastructure both north and south of the project area and provides a gateway for travel into other areas of Yuba City.
V. PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3 pages maximum, 12 point font
0-80 points total

Do not provide additional responses for questions 1-4A unless you are providing a clarification regarding a reduction of scope—evaluators will use your State ATP application response and information provided in Parts II-IV of this Regional Supplement to the State ATP Application.

1. Increasing Biking and Walking
   (0-35 points)

2. Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians
   (0-25 points)

3. Improved Public Health
   (0-10 points)

4. Cost Effectiveness
   (0-10 points)

   A. ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES
      (0-5 points)

   B. CONTEXT SENSITIVE DESIGN
      (0-5 points)

       1. Describe how the project design is appropriate for the community and surrounding environment.

          The project does not run through any protected areas, habitats, or property features of local community residents. The project will maintain or improve the existing community aesthetics while optimizing safety for all of the users of the facilities, primarily by providing a physical separation from vehicle traffic. A majority of the project will be constructed in the City’s existing, unimproved right-of-way.

5. Supporting greenhouse gas reduction goals
   (0-10 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 2016 MTP/SCS.

   If you already completed a project-specific GHG analysis for this project, please describe the methodology used and the results of the analysis.
The City performed a GHG analysis for the project (see attachments) using the CMAQ Trip Reductions from Ridesharing, Walking, Other, database calculator. Based on the calculated reductions, the project would reduce GHG emissions by the following:

- ROG: 125 Pounds Per Year
- NOx: 77 Pounds Per Year
- PM10: 24 Pounds Per Year
- Total: 226 Pounds Per Year

A. **Supportive Development Efforts That Implement the 2016 MTP/SCS**

(0-5 points)

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. Also discuss 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.

Please describe the density and mixture of land uses in the project area to illustrate the current potential of the project area to support an increase in biking and/or walking trips. Describe the future potential for increased biking and/or walking trips, including the amount of development (housing, jobs, and population) and type of uses that are expected to be built over the next 5 to 20 years for your project area (See 2016 MTP/SCS discussion of Community Types—Chapter 3 Summary of Growth and Land Use Types).

Consider using data on land uses and density (resource maps listed below), information from approved local plans, or other applicable documents to support a description of how your project will support development efforts to support biking and walking trips by implementing the 2016 MTP/SCS.

**Resource maps:**

- “2012 Land Use Density” (available on http://arcg.is/1TeNyJR) illustrates the density of land uses by type—residential, employment, and mixed—at the parcel level from the base year of 2012 to help describe your project’s current potential for short trips between employment and housing areas.
- “2012 ATP Accessibility Map” (available on http://arcg.is/1TeNyJR) to help describe your project’s current potential to connect households to jobs and schools.
- “Growth Projections and Travel Metrics - Interactive Map Viewer” (http://mapping.sacog.org/datacenter/) can be used to summarize residential and employment growth from 2012 to 2020 to 2036 for a user-defined geography to help describe the future land use context for you project and the projected bike and pedestrian trips for the area.

---

1 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.
The density and land use of the area directly adjacent to the project is primarily low density with an approximate distribution of half residential and half employment. The future build-out adjacent to Harter Parkway includes medium-high density residential, commercial, and recreational uses (Tierra Buena Park). The proposed project will support the growth of these future land uses by providing residents with in-place active transportation routes to the proposed developments, reducing the need for vehicle trips as density increases.

The place-making strategy for the project area is to make activity centers of note accessible by multiple modes of transportation, with an emphasis on safety, connectivity and the utilization of planned zoning.

B. REDUCING OR SHORTENING VEHICLE TRIPS  
(0-5 points)
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://arcg.is/1TenyJR) illustrates average VMT per capita at the parcel level from the base year of 2012 to help describe your project’s current potential to achieve VMT reductions in your community; you may also use information from approved local plans or other applicable documents to support a description of how your project will support reduced VMT. Additionally, the resource map “2036 MTP/SCS Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita” (available on sacog.org/active-transportation-program) and the Interactive Map Viewer referenced above can help illustrate future potential to support reduced VMT.

According to the ArcGIS ATP mapping resources, the area of direct benefit for the project primarily has an average VMT of approximately 9-15 miles. However, the project provides a direct bicycling route into Yuba City from the Town of Sutter, which has an average VMT of above 20 miles. The project allows for the use of the new facilities as a commuter route into the City, leading directly to major employment centers and other viable bicycle routes.

Within the area directly adjacent to the project, commuter vehicle trips to the Yuba City Marketplace (corner of Harter Parkway and Highway 20) have the potential to be reduced by 5 or more miles per day and bicycle/walking trip lengths can be reduced by 2-4 miles by using the proposed project facilities instead of existing facilities.

VI. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
1 page maximum, 12 point font  
(10 points; up to 20 points if DAC points are applied)

1. APPLICANT’S PERFORMANCE ON PAST GRANTS  
Describe how your agency intends to deliver this project through the CTC process 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.
The City of Yuba City has historically submitted and constructed past grant or federal aid projects on time and within budget. The City has multiple engineers with a depth and breadth of experience in managing and completing federal aid projects. The City's goal is to continue this trend in the future, and it has the staffing and resources to support this goal.

2. **PROJECT READINESS**
Discuss the partnerships your agency has in place in order to deliver the project on time and within budget.

The City already has an existing master agreement with Caltrans which allows the receipt of State and Federal funding. The City maintains a good working relationship with the Caltrans District 3 Local Assistance Engineer to ensure that any complications that arise during the course of the project can be addressed as quickly as possible.

3. **BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES**
*Do not provide a response for question 3 unless you are providing a clarification regarding a reduction of scope—evaluators will use your State ATP Response and information provided in Parts II-IV of this Regional Supplement to the State ATP Application.*
VII. 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 and compliance with page limits and formatting requirements.

- Cover letter with a wet signature
- Completed Application
  - Project Sponsor Information—Section I
  - Project Information—Section II
  - Screening Criteria—Section III
  - Additional Project Information—Section IV
  - Project Performance—Section V
  - Other Considerations—Section VI
- Complete Appendix—in order
  a. State ATP Application (required of all applicants)
  b. Any additional exhibits not included in your State ATP application
  c. Partner Support Letters not included in your State ATP application (if project is co-sponsored)
  d. Miscellaneous — Any other information in support of your project not included in your State ATP application

☒ Implementation Requirements: Review the Screening Criteria in Part III 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.

☒ Mapping your project: Map your project on the SACOG ATP Mapping site: http://arcg.is/1TenyJR (a step-by-step tutorial can be found in the Mapping Site presentation on http://www.sacog.org/post/state-atp-funding-cycle-3)

☒ Submittal Deadline: Please submit one (1) signed original, three (3) color copies of the complete grant application no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, July 8, 2016 to:

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

E-mailed applications are not acceptable. The grant submittal deadline will be strictly enforced. 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, July 8, 2016. Electronic applications must be saved as one PDF with all applicable attachments in order.

Please do not include a complete Master Plan or other local planning document with your application.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Yuba City

PROJECT APPLICATION NO.: 3-Yuba City-2

PROJECT NAME: Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Extension of the existing Sutter Bicycle Path which connects the Town of Sutter to Yuba City and the construction of a shared path on Harter Parkway, closing a major infrastructure gap. The project will primarily construct Class I and Class IV shared use paths to local activity centers and schools.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project is located in Yuba City, Sutter County, from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway on the north side of Jefferson Avenue and on Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to Spirit Way.

ATP FUNDED COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Non-Infrastructure</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT FUNDING INFORMATION (1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project</th>
<th>Total ATP</th>
<th>Total Non-ATP</th>
<th>Past ATP</th>
<th>Leveraging</th>
<th>Matching</th>
<th>Non-Participating</th>
<th>Future Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Application Part 1: Applicant 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:**

Yuba City

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY'S ADDRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1201 Civic Center Boulevard</td>
<td>Yuba City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY'S CONTACT PERSON:**

Manu Dhaliwal

**CONTACT PERSON'S TITLE:** Assistant Engineer

**CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER:**

530-822-7685

**CONTACT PERSON'S EMAIL ADDRESS:**

mdhaliwal@yubacity.net

Applicants have the opportunity to insert a project picture, agency seal, or other image on the cover page. If you would like to do this, attach the image (*.jpg, *.bmp, *.png, etc) by clicking in the box.

**MASTER AGREEMENTS (MAs):**

Does the Implementing Agency currently have a MA with Caltrans?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

Implementing Agency's Federal Caltrans MA number

09-044

Implementing Agency's State Caltrans MA number

09-044

* 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 meeting the CTC Allocation timeline requirements and the loss of ATP funding.

**Project Partnering Agency:**

The "Project Partnering Agency" is defined as an agency, other than Implementing Agency, that will assume the responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the improved facility. The Implementing Agency must: 1) ensure the Partnering Agency agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the improved facility, 2) provide documentation of the agreement (e.g., letter of intent) as part of the project application, and 3) ensure a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties is submitted with the first request for allocation. For these projects, the Project Partnering Agency's information shall be provided below.

Based on the definition above, does this project have a partnering agency?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No
Application Part 2: General Project Information

PROJECT NAME: (Max of 10 Words) (To be used in the CTC project list)  
Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure  
Words Remaining: 3

SUMMARY OF PROJECT SCOPE: (Max of 200 Words)  
(Summary of the Existing Condition, Project Scope, the Expected Benefits)  
Words Remaining: 1

The existing Sutter Bicycle Path runs approximately 4.6 miles from the Town of Sutter to the City of Yuba City, ending at Hooper Road. Jefferson Ave from Hooper Road to Ruth Avenue is a 22-foot wide roadway with unimproved shoulders, residential on the south side, and a fenced drainage channel on the north side of the road. Between Ruth Avenue and Harter Parkway no roadway, pedestrian, or bicycle improvements exist. The Sutter Bicycle Path is a major biking route in and around Yuba City which is utilized by pedestrians and bicyclists daily.

Harter Parkway is a collector connected to River Valley High School, Feather River Academy, and a large commercial center. Harter Parkway has no pedestrian or bicycle infrastructure on the west side of the road and limited pedestrian facilities on the east side of the road.

The project will construct a Class IV shared use facility on Jefferson Road from Hooper Road to Ruth Avenue, a Class I shared use facility from Ruth Avenue to Harter Parkway, a Class I shared use facility on Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to State Route 20, and Class II bicycle lanes form State Route 20 to Spirit Way.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Max of 50 Words)  
Words Remaining: 0

Extension of the existing Sutter Bicycle Path which connects the Town of Sutter to Yuba City and the construction of a shared path on Harter Parkway, closing a major infrastructure gap. The project will primarily construct Class I and Class IV shared use paths to local activity centers and schools.

PROJECT LOCATION: (Max of 50 Words)  
Words Remaining: 17

The project is located in Yuba City, Sutter County, from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway on the north side of Jefferson Avenue and on Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to Spirit Way.

In addition to the Location Description provided, attach a location map to the application. The location needs to show the project boundaries in relation to the Implementing Agency's boundaries.

Project Area Map - Sutter.pdf

Project Coordinates: (latitude/longitude in decimal format)  
Lat. 39.148370  
N /long. 121.662683  
W

Congressional District(s): 03  
State Senate District(s): 04  
State Assembly District(s): 03

Caltrans District: 3  
County: Sutter  
MPO: SACOG  
RTPA: None  
Urbanized Zone Area (UZA) Population: Project is located within one of the nine large MPOs

Past Projects: Within the last 10 years, has there been any previous State or Federal ATP, SRTS, SR2S, BTA or other ped/bike funding awards for a project(s) that are adjacent to or overlap the limits of project scope of this application?  
□ Yes  X No
Application Part 3: Project Type

PROJECT TYPE: (Use the drop down menu to select Combination (I/NI), Infrastructure (I), Non-Infrastructure (NI), or 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
- Pedestrian Transportation
- Safe Routes to School (Also fill out Bicycle and Pedestrian Sub-Type information above)

For a project to qualify for Safe Routes to School designation, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure projects must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop and the students must be the intended beneficiaries of the project. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.

Projects with Safe Routes to School elements must fill out "School and Student Details" later in this application.

As a condition of receiving funding, projects with Safe Routes to School Elements must commit to completing additional before and after student surveys as defined in the Caltrans Active Transportation Guidelines (LAPG Chapter 22).

- Trails (Multi-use and Recreational): (Also fill out Bicycle and Pedestrian Sub-Type information above)
Application Part 4: Project Details

INFRASTRUCTURE TYPE (Only Intended for Infrastructure Projects)

Note: When quantifying the amount of Active Transportation improvements proposed by the project, do not double-count the improvements that benefit both Bicyclists and Pedestrians (i.e. new RRFB/Signal should only show as a Pedestrian or Bicycle Improvement).

☒ Bicycle Improvements

What % of the BICYCLE related project cost are going towards closing a "Gap" in infrastructure? 100 %

(As opposed to cost going towards "improving" existing bicycle infrastructure: i.e. Class 2 to Class 4)

New Bike Lanes/Routes:
- Class 1: 5,145 Linear Feet
- Class 2: 700 Linear Feet
- Class 3: Linear Feet
- Class 4: 1,900 Linear Feet

Signalized Intersections:
- New Bike Boxes: Number
- New RRFB/Signal: Number
- New Traffic Signal: Number

Un-Signalized Intersections:
- New Bike Boxes: Number
- New RRFB/Signal: Number

Mid-Block Crossing:
- New Bike Boxes: Number
- New RRFB/Signal: Number

Lighting:
- Intersection: Number
- New Crosswalk: Number

Bike Share Program:
- New Station: Number

Bike Racks/Lockers:
- New Racks: Number
- New Secured Lockers: Number

Other Bicycle Improvements:
- #1: #
- #2: #

☒ Pedestrian Improvements

What % of the PEDESTRIAN related project cost are going towards closing a "Gap" in infrastructure? 90 %

(As opposed to cost going towards "improving" existing pedestrian infrastructure.)

Sidewalks:
- New (4' to 8' wide): Linear Feet
- New (over 8' wide): Linear Feet
- Widen Existing: Linear Feet
- New Barrier Protected (Barrier, parking, functional-planter, etc.): Linear Feet

ADA Ramp Improvements:
- New Ramp (none exist): Number
- New Roundabout: Number

Signalized Intersections:
- New Crosswalk: Number
- New RRFB/Signal: Number

Un-Signalized Intersections:
- New Traffic Signal: Number
- New RRFB/Signal: Number

Mid-Block Crossing:
- New RRFB/Signal: Number
- New Traffic Signal: Number

Lighting:
- New RRFB/Signal: Number
- New Traffic Signal: Number

Pedestrian Amenities:
- Benches: Number
- Shade Trees: Number

Other Ped Improvements:
- #1: #
- #2: #

☐ Multi-use Trail Improvements

☐ Vehicular-Roadway Traffic-Calming Improvements
Right of Way (R/W) Impacts (Check all that apply)

☐ Project is 100% within the Implementing Agency's R/W (or within their control at the time of this application submittal).

☒ Project will likely require R/W and/or easements from private owners or will require utility relocations from 'non-public' utility companies.

*The federal R/W process involving private property acquisitions and/or private utility relocations can often take 18 to 24 months. The project schedule in the application for R/W needs to reflect the necessary time to complete the federal R/W process.*

☐ Project will likely require R/W, Easements, encroachment and/or approval involving Governmental, Environmental, or Railroad owner's property.
Application Part 5: Project Schedule

NOTES: 1) Per CTC Guidelines, all project applications must be submitted with the expectation of receiving federal funding and therefore the schedule below must account for the extra time needed for federal project delivery requirements and approvals, including a NEPA environmental clearance and for each CTC allocation there must also be a Notice to Proceed with Federally Reimbursable work. 2) Prior to estimating the durations of the project delivery tasks (below), applicants are highly encouraged to review the appropriate chapters of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual and work closely with District Local Assistance Staff. 3) The proposed CTC allocation dates must be between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2021 to be consistent with the available ATP funds for Cycle 3.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Delivery Phase</th>
<th>Will ATP funds be used in this phase of the project?</th>
<th>Expected or Past Start Date for activities:</th>
<th>Time to complete the separate CEQA &amp; NEPA studies/approvals:</th>
<th>Expected or Past Completion Date for the phase:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED Project Delivery Phase</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
<td>9/3/2018</td>
<td>12 months (See note #2, above)</td>
<td>8/29/2019</td>
<td>Applications showing the PA&amp;ED phase as complete, must include/attach the signature pages for the CEQA and NEPA documents, which include project descriptions covering the full scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Project Delivery Phase</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
<td>8/5/2019</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>7/30/2020</td>
<td>PS&amp;E and Right of Way phases can be allocated at the same CTC meeting. Applications showing the R/W phase as complete, must include/attach the Caltrans approved R/W Certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Project Delivery Phase</td>
<td>☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>8/3/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/28/2021</td>
<td>Proposed Dates for &quot;Before&quot; and &quot;After&quot; Counts (As required by the CTC and Caltrans guidelines): Expected Date for &quot;Before&quot; counts (Ideally, within 12 months of the beginning of the Construction Activities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Application Part 6: Project Funding**

(1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Total ATP Funding</th>
<th>ATP Allocation Year **</th>
<th>Total Non-ATP Funding **</th>
<th>Non-Participating Funding</th>
<th>&quot;Prior&quot; ATP Funding</th>
<th>Leveraging Funding</th>
<th>Matching Funding *** (for federal $)</th>
<th>Future Local Identified Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI-CON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The CTC Allocation-Year is calculated based on the information entered into the "Project Schedule" section.

** Applicants must ensure that the "Total Non-ATP Funding" values show in this table match the overall Non-ATP Funding values they enter into Page 2 of the PPR (later in this form)

*** For programming purposes, applicants, are asked to identify the portion of the Leveraging Funding that meets the requirements to be used as match for new Federal ATP funding.

** 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, it is the intent of the Commission to consolidate the allocation of federal funds to as few projects as practicable. Therefore, the smallest projects may be granted State Funding from the State Highway Account (SHA) for all or part of the project. Agencies with projects under $1M, especially ones being implemented by agencies who are not familiar with the federal funding process, are encouraged to request State funding.

Do you believe your project warrants receiving state-only funding?  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

** ATP PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST (PPR):**

Using the Project Schedule, Project Funding, and General Project information provided, this electronic form has automatically prepared the following PPR pages. Applicants must review the information in the PPR to confirm it matches their expectations.
### Project Information:

**Project Title:** Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure  
**District:** 3  
**County:** Sutter  
**Route:**  
**EA:**  
**Project ID:**  
**PPNO:**

### Funding Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATP Funds

#### Infrastructure Cycle 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Infrastructure Cycle 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Plan Cycle 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Previous Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 22-G Project Programming Request (PPR)

**Project Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Harter Parkway &amp; Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></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>

**Date:** 6/14/2016

**Summary of Non-ATP Funding**

The Non-ATP funding shown on this page must match the values in the Project Funding table.

### Fund No. 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Local Agency Funds</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20 20/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Local Agency Funds</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20 20/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Local Agency Funds</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20 20/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Local Agency Funds</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20 20/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Local Agency Funds</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20 20/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Local Agency Funds</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20 20/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application Part 7: Application Questions

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:
   - Is all or part of the project currently (or has it ever been) formally programmed in an RTPA, MPO and/or Caltrans funding program? □ Yes □ No
   - Are any elements of the proposed project directly or indirectly related to the intended improvements of a past or future development or capital improvement project? □ Yes □ No
   - Are adjacent properties undeveloped or under-developed where standard “conditions of development” could be placed on future adjacent redevelopment to construct the proposed project improvements? □ Yes □ No

2. Consistency with an adopted regional transportation plan:
   - Is the project consistent with the relevant adopted regional transportation plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080? □ Yes □ No

If “Yes”, the applicant must provide that portion of Regional Transportation Plan showing that the proposed project is consistent. Attach a copy of ONLY the following elements of the plan: cover page and pages linking the proposed project to the plan. Highlighted and/or mark the attachment to clearly identify the connection.

SACOG Bike Trails Master Plan Yuba City Harter & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure.pdf

Note: Projects not providing proof will be disqualified and not be evaluated.
## Appendix B -- Regional Project List and Maps of Bicycle Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Existing Plan</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40004</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Multi-use Path (Class II)</td>
<td>Sutter to Trials: Abandoned Railroad at trackside</td>
<td>Hooper Road to Bridge Street</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40005</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Multi-use Path (Class II)</td>
<td>Feather River West Levee Path</td>
<td>8 Street to Second Street</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$231,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40016</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Multi-use Path (Class II)</td>
<td>Sutter Drive Levee Access</td>
<td>Sutter Drive to Feather River West Levee</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40017</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Multi-use Path (Class II)</td>
<td>Feather River West Levee North Extension</td>
<td>Montezuma Drive to City Limits</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40006</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Clark Avenue</td>
<td>Peace Road to Remington Way</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40007</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Butte House Road</td>
<td>Township Road to Tharp Road</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40008</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Lincoln Road</td>
<td>State Route 89 to E Avenue Drive</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40009</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Thay Road</td>
<td>Sutter Boulevard to Butte House Road</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$324,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40011</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Franklin Road</td>
<td>Rancho Road to Wallace Avenue</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40012</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Tangerine Avenue</td>
<td>Plass Street to Second Street</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40013</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Minn Road</td>
<td>Butte Yoke School to Butte Yoke Road</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40014</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Burne Road</td>
<td>Richland Road to Lincoln Road</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40015</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Wallace Avenue to Second Street</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40016</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>El Margaretta Road</td>
<td>Spill Drive &amp; Imperial Way</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40017</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>George Washington Boulevard</td>
<td>State Route 20 &amp; 1000' N/Franklin Road</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40018</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Marine Parkway</td>
<td>Sutter Boulevard &amp; South House Road</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40019</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>North Colusa Frontage Road</td>
<td>Westminster Park &amp; Hanger Parkway</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40020</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Richland Road</td>
<td>Sutter Road &amp; W Avenue</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40022</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>South Colusa Frontage Road</td>
<td>George Washington Boulevard &amp; El Margarita Road</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40023</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Sutter Street</td>
<td>Market Street &amp; Bridge Street</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40024</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Wallace Avenue</td>
<td>Augusta Lane &amp; Boggs Road</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40025</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Franklin Avenue</td>
<td>Percy Avenue to Willow Avenue</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40026</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Clark Avenue</td>
<td>Washington Avenue to Spils Avenue</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$437,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40027</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>North Colusa Frontage Road</td>
<td>Butte Ranch Road to Harbor Parkway</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40028</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Richland Road</td>
<td>Walnut Avenue to South Barrett Road</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40029</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Richland Road</td>
<td>Bunke Road to Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40030</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>South Barrett Road</td>
<td>Franklin Avenue to Richland Road</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40031</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Bike Lanes (Class II)</td>
<td>Various Lanes</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40032</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Education/Promotion</td>
<td>Bike Safety Education Program for Schools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40033</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Education/Promotion</td>
<td>Bike Safety Education Program for Adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40034</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>36 Signal Benefits for Bicycle Detection</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40035</td>
<td>City of Yuba City</td>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Destination Signage (Wayfinding)</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>Yuba City Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B: Narrative Questions

Detailed Instructions for Question #1

QUESTION #1
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (0-10 POINTS)

☐ This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community.

A. Map of Project Boundaries, Access and Destination (0 points): Required

Provide a scaled map showing the boundaries of the proposed project/program/plan, the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community, and disadvantaged community access point(s) and destinations that the project/program/plan is benefiting.

B. Identification of Disadvantaged Community: (0 points)

Select one of the following 4 options. Must provide information for all Census Tract/Block Group/Place # that the project affects.

- Median Household Income
- CalEnviroScreen
- Free or Reduced Priced School Meals - Applications using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.
- Other

Select Option: Median Household Income

The Median Household Income (Table ID B19013) is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current Census Tract (ID 140) level data from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS) (<$49,191). Communities with a population less than 15,000 may use data at the Census Block Group (ID 150) level. Unincorporated communities may use data at the Census Place (ID 160) level. Data is available at: http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract/Block Group/Place #</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>MHI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06101050501</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>46,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06101050601</td>
<td>5,322</td>
<td>66,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06101050603</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>77,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowest median household income from above (autofill): $46,774 (to be used for qualifying as benefiting a DAC only)

Median household income by census tract for the community(ies) benefited by the project: $62,079.82

(to be used for severity calculation only)

Must attach a copy of FactFinder ACS page for each census tract listed above. Attach all pages as one pdf.

C. Direct Benefit: (0 - 4 points)

1. Explain how the project/program/plan closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need. (Max of 50 Words) Words Remaining: 0

The project closes a gap between the disadvantaged community and both the Sutter Bike Path and the commercial, shopping, and employment center located on Harter Parkway, north of State Route 20. Currently there are no bicycle routes running north-south on Tharp Road or Harter Parkway to the activity centers.

2. Explain how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project/program/plan. (Max of 50 Words) Words Remaining: 14

The disadvantaged community will have access to the proposed facilities by using the existing infrastructure on Lassen Boulevard to reach Harter Parkway and through Spirit Way from El Margarita Road on existing Class II bicycle lanes.

3. Illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. (Max of 50 Words) Words Remaining: 22

The project is supported by the local school district for providing students and their families with a safe, no-cost transportation route to local schools and economic opportunities.
HARTER PARKWAY & SUTTER BIKE PATH GAP CLOSURE

- Current Path to/from Activity Center (no ped/bike facilities)
- Proposed Shared Path

Disadvantaged Census Tract (#6101050501)

Butte House Road

Transit Stop

Hooper Road

Existing Bikepath

Transit Stop

Future Park

Proposed Path

Current Path to/from Activity Center (no ped facilities)

Spirit Dr

River Valley High School

Feather River Academy

State Route 20
### MEDIAN INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2014 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)

#### 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Data and Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Census Tract 506.01, Sutter County, California</th>
<th>Census Tract 506.01, Sutter County, California</th>
<th>Census Tract 506.03, Sutter County, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (Margin of Error)</td>
<td>Total (Margin of Error)</td>
<td>Total (Margin of Error)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 years</td>
<td>4.8% (+/-2.5)</td>
<td>45,673 (+/-8,675)</td>
<td>2.0% (+/-3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years</td>
<td>31.9% (+/-5.9)</td>
<td>51,842 (+/-8,825)</td>
<td>32.3% (+/-5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>41.7% (+/-6.5)</td>
<td>41,771 (+/-12,720)</td>
<td>33.9% (+/-6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>21.6% (+/-4.5)</td>
<td>39,727 (+/-19,304)</td>
<td>31.9% (+/-4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>1,503 (+/-144)</td>
<td>54,205 (+/-6,808)</td>
<td>1,586 (+/-141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>47.3% (+/-6.8)</td>
<td>58,795 (+/-8,675)</td>
<td>45.1% (+/-5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With no own children under 18 years</td>
<td>57.7% (+/-6.9)</td>
<td>58,015 (+/-12,531)</td>
<td>45.3% (+/-6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple families</td>
<td>75.1% (+/-7.9)</td>
<td>58,015 (+/-12,531)</td>
<td>83.2% (+/-6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>14.9% (+/-5.6)</td>
<td>24,015 (+/-13,427)</td>
<td>9.7% (+/-4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>10.0% (+/-5.1)</td>
<td>70,081 (+/-7,000)</td>
<td>7.1% (+/-5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households</td>
<td>525 (+/-129)</td>
<td>22,244 (+/-8,862)</td>
<td>427 (+/-131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>44.0% (+/-12.8)</td>
<td>23,934 (+/-7,119)</td>
<td>46.6% (+/-20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>38.3% (+/-12.8)</td>
<td>23,640 (+/-4,048)</td>
<td>48.6% (+/-20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>57.7% (+/-5.1)</td>
<td>96,000 (+/-68,173)</td>
<td>0.0% (+/-7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>66.0% (+/-12.8)</td>
<td>15,189 (+/-23,457)</td>
<td>53.2% (+/-20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>44.0% (+/-12.8)</td>
<td>15,698 (+/-23,457)</td>
<td>47.1% (+/-20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>57.7% (+/-5.1)</td>
<td>96,000 (+/-68,173)</td>
<td>0.0% (+/-7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT IMPUTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.5% (X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>15.3% (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.2% (X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>16.3% (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily income in the past 12 months</td>
<td>17.9% (X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>11.7% (X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:
- An "X" entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error is estimated to be stabilized at 50%.
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TOTAL POPULATION
Universe: Total population
2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Data and Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Versions of this table are available for the following years:</th>
<th>1 of 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 505.01, Sutter County, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,547 +/-439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 506.01, Sutter County, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,322 +/-402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 506.03, Sutter County, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,022 +/-268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:
An "***" entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
An "**" entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
An "*" following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
An "+" following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
An "****" entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
An "*****" entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

While the 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the February 2013 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural population, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2010 data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing
D. Project Location: (0 - 2 points)
   1. Is your project located within a disadvantaged community? Partially

E. Severity: (0 - 4 points)
   a. Auto calculated
Part B: Narrative Questions

Question #2

QUESTION #2
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. (0-35 POINTS)

Please provide the following information: (This must be completed to be considered for funding for infrastructure projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Users</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Date of Counts</th>
<th>Mark here if N/A to project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5/19/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>10/5/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safe Routes to School projects and programs: The following information related to the Safe Routes to School Projects data was already entered in part 3 of the application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Approx. # of Students Living Along School Route Proposed</th>
<th># of Students Currently Walking/Biking to School</th>
<th>Projected # of Students that will walk/bike after project</th>
<th>Net projected Change in Students walking/biking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document the methodologies used to establish the current count data. (Max of 200 Words)

The current count data was obtained by taking AM and PM peak hour counts and extrapolating the hours between. Note that counts for the Sutter Bike Path were taken one block west of project location on the existing bike path, currently few pedestrians or bicyclists travel on the project location due to it being unimproved.

AM Peak - Sutter Bike Path: 26 Peds, 4 Bikes
PM Peak - Sutter Bike Path: 16 Peds, 8 Bikes (90+ degree temperature)
AM Peak - Harter Parkway: 9 Peds, 8 Bikes
PM Peak - Harter Parkway: 29 Peds, 6 Bikes

A. Describe the specific active transportation need that the proposed project/plan/program will address. (0-15 points) (Max of 500 Words)

The City of Yuba City's greatest active transportation need is the creation of continuous, safe, and direct pathways for pedestrians and bicyclists from population centers to activity centers. Such pathways will promote active modes of transportation by both recreational users and commuters.

Extending the Sutter Bike Path and constructing the shared path on Harter Parkway provides a safe, direct, stress-free travel corridor linked to multiple activity centers while closing a major gap in the City's existing active transportation network.

The Sutter Bike Path is one of the primary bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the region but currently ends abruptly at Hooper Road, requiring a detour either north or south to continue travel through the City. By closing the gap between Harter Parkway and Hooper Road to the Sutter Bike Path, the project would eliminate a 1.5 mile detour with inadequate infrastructure which has been a barrier to promoting active modes of transportation. The Class II shared path on Harter Parkway will close an existing gap in infrastructure between the Class II bicycle lanes on Butte House Road and the existing Class II bicycle lanes on Harter Parkway, south of Spirit Way, while providing a link to the proposed improvements extending the Sutter Bike Path.

Both of the commonly-used existing routes from Harter Parkway to/from the bike path have unimproved shoulders and no pedestrian infrastructure, while only the Butte House Road detour to the bike path has Class II bicycle facilities. Additionally, there are no existing bicycle routes that run north-south across State Route 20 that serve the communities adjacent to the project other than Walton Ave/Stabler Lane located 3/4 of a mile east of Harter Parkway. At this time, in the City of Yuba City, there are no good alternative routes for accessing the Sutter Bike Path for both pedestrians and bicyclists.

The proposed improvements will also link the Town of Sutter and all communities adjacent to the Sutter Bike Path to the rest of Yuba City by connecting to the Yuba Sutter Transit Stop located on Harter Parkway. The transit stop is the westernmost stop for the Yuba-Sutter Transit and serves two routes that allow for access to most of Yuba City and Marysville. The Town of Sutter is a small community of 3,400 people which lacks many services that are available in Yuba City, and the closure of the existing gap in infrastructure would provide a direct bicycle/pedestrian link between the...
two communities.

Some activity centers of note include:
- Walmart
- Home Depot
- Bus Transit Stop
- River Valley High School
- Feather River Academy
- Tierra Buena Elementary School
- Various commercial facilities

The City is also proceeding with plans to develop the Tierra Buena Park on a parcel north of Sutter Bike Path Extension on Harter Parkway in the near future, which would be a major recreational activity center and will include bicycle and vehicle parking, creating a perfect spot for residents to meet and start a bike ride.

B. Describe how the proposed project/plan/program will address the active transportation need: (0-20 points)

1. Close a gap?  
   - Yes [X]  
   - No [ ]
   
   No. of gaps: 2  
   Total length of gap(s) (feet): 8,445

   Gap closure = Construction of a missing segment of an existing facility in order to make that facility continuous.
   
   a. Must provide a map of each gap closure identifying gap and connections.
   
   [Bridge Street Shared Use Path Gap Closure.pdf]
   
   b. Describe how the project links or connects, or encourages use of existing routes 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. Specific destination must be identified. (Max of 100 Words)

   The project would connect the Sutter Bike Path, which runs more than 4.5 miles through Yuba City and Sutter County, to a major commercial, shopping, and employment center, a local bus transit stop, River Valley High School, and Feather River Academy. The proposed gap closure would provide a safe, fast route to the local activity centers listed above for the residents of Yuba City and the Town of Sutter by connecting to existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure north and south of the project.

   Words Remaining: 16

2. Creation of new routes?  
   - Yes [X]  
   - No [ ]
   
   New route = Construction of a new facility that did not previously exist for non-motorized users that provides a course or way to get from one place to another.
   
   a. Must provide a map of the new route location.
   
   [Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure - Activity Centers photos.pdf]
   
   b. Describe the existing route(s) that currently connect the affected transportation related and community identified destinations and why the route(s) are not adequate. (Max of 100 Words)

   When travelling east in Yuba City toward Harter Marketplace, located on the corner of Harter Parkway and State Route 20, a pedestrian does not have any route option with adequate pedestrian facilities. A pedestrian has four possible routes to walk: along the unimproved shoulder of State Route 20 or Colusa Frontage; along the unimproved shoulder of Butte House Road; or on the unimproved dirt path where Jefferson ends at Ruth Avenue. Among the three options, the safest is the dirt path since it is not adjacent to a motorized vehicle travel path. Similarly, bicyclists lack adequate facilities on these routes.

   Words Remaining: 38

   c. Describe how the project links or connects, or encourages use of existing routes 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. Specific destination must be identified. (Max of 100 Words)

   The project will link the southern half of Yuba City to the northern half of Yuba City, connecting the project to existing Class II bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities on both sides. Additionally, the project provides a direct route to a large shopping center with groceries, hardware, dining, and other essential facilities which is also a major employment center for the City.

   Words Remaining: 0

3. Removal of barrier to mobility?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [X]

4. Other improvements to routes?  
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [X]
5. Plan for increasing biking and walking in the community?  □ Yes  □ No
6. Encourages and/or educates with the goal of increasing walking or biking in the community?  □ Yes  □ No

a. Describe how the program encourages walking or biking 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. (Max of 100 Words)

As part of the project, the city will install signs indicating proper etiquette on the shared use paths to help inform and educate our users and avoid conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists. The inclusion of on-site education was a major point of concern that was brought up while discussing potential projects with the local bicycling community.
Part B: Narrative Questions

Detailed Instructions for Question #3

**QUESTION #3**
**POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OR THE RISK 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)

1. The following reported crashes must have all occurred within the project's influence area within the last 5 years (only crashes that the project has a chance to mitigate):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Crashes</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Applicant can provide bicycle and pedestrian (only) crash rates in addition to the information required above. (Max of 200 Words)

   The crash data provided is for Butte House Road between Harter Parkway and Hooper Road and Highway 20 between Harter Parkway and Hooper Road. This stretch of Butte House Road is a typical route that is taken by bicyclists and pedestrians to get onto the existing Sutter Bike Path. The crossing at Highway 20 and Harter Parkway currently has no bicycle facilities.

3. Discuss specific accident data. (Max of 200 Words)

   The seven collisions in the project's influence area are summarized below:
   - Pedestrian and bicycle collision due to unsafe conditions while crossing Highway 20
   - Pedestrian collision with motorized vehicle due to a pedestrian crossing mid-block
   - Intoxicated bicyclist on Harter Parkway who collided with a motorcyclist, no bicycle facilities adjacent to collision area
   - Pedestrian collision with motorized vehicle due to mid-block crossing
   - Pedestrian walking on wrong side of road, no pedestrian facilities on Butte House Road
   - Bicyclist collided with a fixed object while riding on the wrong side of the road
   - Bicyclist in collision with motorized vehicle due to a right-of-way conflict

   Of the six collisions in the past five years of available data, two can be directly remedied through the construction of the proposed project.

   Attach a scaled-map which shows that all documented bicycle and pedestrian collisions/incidents (only) are within the area of influence of the proposed plan, program, or project safety improvements. This data and map should demonstrate how the data illustrates a non-motorized (not vehicular) safety issue.

4. Attach a SWITRS or equivalent (i.e. UC Berkeley's TIMS tool) listing of all bicycle and pedestrian crashes (only) shown in the map above and in this application.

   SWITRS - Collision Map Harter Parkway & Bike Path.pdf

   TIMS - Collision Details Harter & Sutter Bike Path.pdf

*Applications that do not have the crash data above OR that prefer to provide additional crash data and/or safety data in a different format can provide this data below. The corresponding methodology used must also be included. Input Data and methodologies here and/or include them via a separate attachment in the field below. (Max of 200 Words)
**COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 6276157**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Coordinate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUTTER</td>
<td>UNINCORPORATED</td>
<td>39.1530686842, -121.661873393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date (Y-M-D)** 2013-11-03  
**Time** 07:20  
**Nearby Intersection** BUTTE HOUSE RD & REDDING AV  
**Injured Victims** 1  
**Alcohol** NO  
**Primary Collision Factor** Pedestrian Violation  
**Fatilities** 0  
**Weather** Clear  

**STREET VIEW**

http://tims.berkeley.edu/tools/query/collision_details.php?no=6276157
**Collision Details: Case ID 5302122**

- **County**: Sutter
- **City**: Yuba City
- **Date (Y-M-D)**: 2011-08-24
- **Time**: 07:11
- **Nearby Intersection**: Harter PKWY & RT 20
- **Coordinate Location**: 39.1414153668, -121.655501371
- **State Highway Route**: 20E
- **Postmile**: 14.47
- **Injured Victims**: 1
- **Fatalities**: 0
- **Alcohol**: No
- **Weather**: Clear
- **Primary Collision Factor**: Wrong Side of Road
- **Involved with Object**: Fixed

**Street View**

- [View on Google Maps](http://tims.berkeley.edu/tools/query/collision_details.php?no=5302122)
COSTA VIDA FRESH MEXICAN GRILL

COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 6040650

- County: SUTTER
- City: YUBA CITY
- Date (Y-M-D): 2013-04-13
- Time: 11:53
- Nearby Intersection: RT 20 & HARTER PKWY
- Coordinate Location: 39.141417128, -121.655316516
- State Highway: Y Route 20E Postmile: 14.48
- Injured Victims: 2
- Fatalities: 0
- Alcohol: NO
- Weather: Clear
- Primary Collision Factor: Pedestrian Violation
- Pedestrian Involved with: Pedestrian

STREET VIEW

State Hwy 20
Yuba City, California
View on Google Maps

Google
COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 5836847

County: SUTTER  
City: YUBA CITY

Date (Y-M-D): 2012-09-18  
Time: 09:38

Nearby Intersection: HARTE PKWY & BUTTE HOUSE RD

Coordinate Location: 39.1496475676, -121.655480169

State Highway  
Route  
Postmile

Injured Victims: 2  
Fatalities: 0

Alcohol: YES  
Weather: Clear

Primary Collision Factor: Improper Turning with Vehicle

STREET VIEW

Harter Pkwy
Yuba City, California
View on Google Maps

### COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 4418565

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>SUTTER</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>YUBA CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (Y-M-D)</td>
<td>2009-10-03</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>07:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Intersecion</td>
<td>BUTTE HOUSE RD &amp; HOOPER RD</td>
<td>Coordinate Location</td>
<td>39.15492243, -121.6685817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Highway</th>
<th>N Route</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Injured Victims</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Weather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Collision Factor</th>
<th>Pedestrian Violation</th>
<th>Involved with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STREET VIEW

[Image of street view with a map and a Google street view image of the location.]
**COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 4318542**

- **County**: SUTTER
- **City**: YUBA CITY
- **Date (Y-M-D)**: 2009-06-27
- **Time**: 22:33
- **Nearby Intersection**: BUTTE HOUSE RD & VILLA AV
- **Coordinate Location**: 39.15383638, -121.6646034
- **Injured Victims**: 1
- **Fatalities**: 0
- **Alcohol**: NO
- **Weather**: Clear
- **Primary Collision Factor**: Wrong Side of Road with Pedestrian

**STREET VIEW**

![Google Street View](https://example.com/street-view)
COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 4403829

- **County**: SUTTER
- **City**: YUBA CITY
- **Date (Y-M-D)**: 2009-09-21
- **Time**: 18:37
- **Nearby Intersection**: BUTTE HOUSE RD & HARTER PKWY
- **Coordinate Location**: 39.15129, -121.65544
- **Injured Victims**: 1
- **Fatalities**: 0
- **Alcohol**: NO
- **Weather**: Clear
- **Primary Collision Involved Factor**: Automobile Right of Way with Bicycle

STREET VIEW

The street view shows the location of the collision near the intersection of BUTTE HOUSE RD & HARTER PKWY in Yuba City, Sutter County.

Google
B. Safety Countermeasures (15 points max)
Describe how the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities (only); Countermeasures must directly address the underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence of pedestrian and/or bicyclist collisions.

1. Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users?  
   □ Yes   □ No

2. Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users?  
   □ Yes   □ No

3. Eliminates potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including creating physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users?  
   □ Yes   □ No

   a. Current conflict point description:  
      | Current conflict point description: (Max of 100 Words) | Words Remaining: 6 |
      | Currently, bicycles and pedestrians conflict with vehicle traffic on Harter Parkway due to the lack of facilities. Bicyclists who wish to travel west on the Sutter Bike Path coming from nearby activity centers often travel up Harter Parkway, west on Butte House Road, then south on Hooper Road to get to the existing bike path. There are currently no bicycle facilities on Harter Parkway; Butte House Road has four intersections (each a potential conflict point between pedestrians/bicyclists and vehicles) while travelling west and five while travelling east between Harter Parkway and Hooper Road. |

   b. Improvement that addresses conflict point:  
      | Improvement that addresses conflict point: (Max of 100 Words) | Words Remaining: 5 |
      | The construction of Class I and Class IV shared paths would reduce the distance needed to enter the existing bike path, while being separated from the travel lane, providing a safer, shorter trip for users. Most users will go from crossing five intersections while riding or walking adjacent to traffic on busy roads to riding/walking on a dedicated path with no intersections and separated from vehicle traffic. The construction of a Class I shared path on Harter would reduce the conflicts that active transportation users face by creating a separation from motorized vehicle traffic. |

4. Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users?  
   □ Yes   □ No

5. Addresses inadequate vehicular traffic control devices?  
   □ Yes   □ No

6. Addresses inadequate or unsafe bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks?  
   □ Yes   □ No

   a. List bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks that are inadequate:  
      | List bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks that are inadequate: (Max of 100 Words) | Words Remaining: 37 |
      | Currently, there is an unimproved trail at the location of the project which is used by residents who wish to take a short cut to or from either the local commercial center, River Valley High School, or to the existing Sutter Bike Path. Also, Harter Parkway has no bicycle or pedestrian facilities on the west side from Butte House Road to Highway 20. |

   b. How are they inadequate?  
      | How are they inadequate? (Max of 100 Words) | Words Remaining: 21 |
      | The path is unimproved, has multiple slopes/drops, loose gravel or rocks, and is unusable after rain events. The current path is not maintained but a number of students have been observed using it to cut across the field. Harter Parkway has no bicycle facilities on either side of the road and only portions of the east side of the road have pedestrian facilities, forcing users to walk/ride in the unimproved shoulder or in the vehicle travel path. |

   c. How does the project address the inadequacies?  
      | How does the project address the inadequacies? (Max of 100 Words) | Words Remaining: 31 |
      | The project will construct 12-foot shared paths with appropriate safety signs and sloped for drainage to allow for safe, stress-free travel, away from the vehicle path of travel on Harter Parkway and from Harter Parkway to the Sutter Bike Path. The primary factor of the project that increases safety is the separation provided by Class I paths and the increased visibility by elevating the active transportation users. |

7. Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users?  
   □ Yes   □ No

   Attach a map to show how these hazards relate to the crashes documented in sub-questions “A”. The map from sub-question “A” can be used or a new map can be created.

   | Not Applicable.doc |

Plans:
Describe how the plan will identify and plan to address hazards identified in the plan area, including the potential for mitigating safety hazards as a prioritization criterion, and/or including countermeasures that address safety hazards. (Max of 200 Words)
**Non-Infrastructure**

Describe how the program educates bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or drivers about safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists. Describe how the program encourages this safe behavior. If available, include documentation of effectiveness of similar programs in encouraging safe behavior. (Max of 200 Words)

Include, if applicable, a map identifying safety hazards and/or photos of safety hazards. Programs should address safety hazards that have been identified through police reports, collision history, field observations, and/or other verifiable source.
Part B: Narrative Questions

Detailed Instructions for Question #4

QUESTION #4
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION and PLANNING (0-10 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. What is/was the process of defining future policies, goals, investments and designs to prepare for future needs of users of this project? How did the applicant analyze the wide range of alternatives and impacts on the transportation system to influence beneficial outcomes? (3 points max) (Max of 200 words)

The Sutter Bike Path Extension and the Harter Parkway shared path were identified as a priority project in the City's Bicycle Master Plan, which was created in coordination with our Bicycle Advisory Committee. The proposed project was identified as a priority based on the lack of other viable options to provide safe and reliable active transportation infrastructure that connects all of the infrastructure east of Harter Parkway to the rest of the City. The proposed project requires little to no right-of-way acquisition while providing users with the shortest, most direct path to existing active transportation infrastructure.

The City also reached out to the Yuba City Unified School District to determine their needs in regards to the proposed project. Both the School District and the City have received multiple complaints from parents of students regarding the lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Harter Parkway and connecting to the Sutter Bike Path.

B. Who: Describe who was/will be engaged in the identification and development of this project/program/plan (for plans: who were/will be engaged) and how they were/will be engaged. Describe and provide documentation of the type, extent, and duration of outreach and engagement conducted to relevant stakeholders. (3 points max) (Max of 200 words)

The City meets with its Bicycle Advisory Committee regularly to discuss improvements that can be made to the City's infrastructure, education, or maintenance of bicycle facilities. The Bicycle Advisory Committee is made up of local residents from varying backgrounds with an interest in improving bicycling in our community. While planning the Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure, the City met with the Bicycle Advisory Committee to discuss the projects we were considering, receive feedback on the planned implementation, and discuss their concerns.

The City also reached out to the Yuba City Unified School District who voiced their support for the project on behalf of River Valley High School and Tierra Buena Elementary School, and provided the City with a letter of support for the project.

The City contacted the Sutter County Health Department to collaborate on the identification and development of the project to meet the health needs of the community.

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. (3 points max) (Max of 200 words)

Members of the Bicycle Advisory Committee provided a great deal of feedback in terms of what design features make them feel safe or more at ease for the Class IV shared path, specifically the inclusion of bollards on the proposed median that separates the Class IV path from the vehicle travel lane. They also expressed the desire to see signs for the purpose of educating and informing users of the shared path on the proper etiquette and safety measures that help keep the users safe, comfortable, and collision free.

One of the original motivators for the submission of this project to the Active Transportation Program was feedback that was received from local parents who were concerned with their children walking/biking along Harter Parkway, as children have been forced to walk along the unimproved shoulder and ride in the vehicle travel lane due to the current lack of appropriate facilities.

D. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan. (1 point max) (Max of 200 words)

The Bicycle Advisory Committee meets with the City every two to three months and will be asked to provide input on the project as project implementation progresses. The City also intends to reach out to local bicyclists through members of the Bicycle Advisory Committee at the local bicycle shops through flyers to ensure that the intended users have a say in the project implementation.

Construction of the project will be scheduled with input from the schools in order to ensure that the project construction does not interfere with students travelling to school.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for Question #5

QUESTION #5
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. All applicants must cite information specific to project location and targeted users. Failure to do so will result in lost points.

A. Describe the health status of the targeted users of the project/program/plan. Describe how you considered health benefits when developing this project or program (for plans: how will you consider health throughout the plan). (5 points max) (Max of 200 words)

Words Remaining: 0

See attachments for collaborators & tables. SCHD provided the following health data.

30.4% of Sutter County (SC) adults are overweight; 32.7% are obese. 10.7% of children ages 2-11 and 19.9% ages 12-17 are overweight; 15.0% are obese. 29.2% of SC adults have one, 10.0% two, and 5.5% 3+ chronic conditions (diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and stroke). Coronary heart disease (117/100,000 residents), diabetes (21.3/100,000 residents), cerebrovascular (40.4/100,000) deaths are also higher than California overall.

There are only 0.11 recreational facilities per 1,000 residents. Only 67% of SC residents have recreational facilities within one (urban) or three (rural) miles. 27.8% of SC residents engaged in regular walking the past week; 22% have no leisure-time physical activity. While 54.6% of children age 2-11 are physically active for 1+ hours/day, only 18.4% of those under 18 are. 37.4% of 5th graders & 49.2% of 9th graders in the project area meet all 6 California fitness test criteria.

Improving physical activity and safe walking/biking paths to access shopping, River Valley High, and Tierra Buena Elementary, drove this project.

B. Describe how you expect your project/proposal/plan to promote healthy communities and provide outreach to the targeted users. (5 points max) (Max of 200 words)

Words Remaining: 0

Yuba City’s Bike Advisory Council (Table C) discussed the project as part of the design process. Changes to design after their input included proper biking/walking etiquette and safety signage, bollards on the Sutter Bike Path extension median, and reduced bicycle/motorist conflict points on Harter Parkway.

SCHD provides physical activity outreach as part of the #LetsMoveSutter campaign, SNAP-Ed, and Healthy & Safe Neighborhoods Coalition. Outreach activities include “walk to school” and “bike to school” days at local schools, bike rodeos, bike/walking path maps and flyers, free helmets and bike safety equipment in person, on the Sutter County website, and social media. In-person nutrition and physical activity classes emphasize local and neighborhood physical activity resources (walk/bike paths, parks) and target those not typically physically active.

Yuba City maintains www.bikeyubacity.org, an online repository of all bike and walking paths in Yuba City. Information about riding events are also posted. Path maps/flyers are distributed to city bike shops and by SCHD. The Corner Bike Shop, a Yuba City walkability/bikeability partner and member of the Bike Advisory Council, conducts monthly rides for Yuba City and Sutter County residents along the Yuba City bike path network.
### QUESTION #6

**COST EFFECTIVENESS (0-5 POINTS)**

A project's cost effectiveness is considered to be the relative costs of the project in comparison to the project's benefits as defined by the purpose and goals of the ATP. This includes the consideration of the safety and mobility benefit in relation to both the total project cost and the funds provided.

Explain why the project is considered to have the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose and goals of "increased use of active modes of transportation". (5 points max.) (Max of 200 words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Remaining:</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The City used the pedbikeinfo.com demand/benefit calculator to determine the potential benefits of the Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure (see attached output & methodology).

The tool estimates an annual benefit of $8,776,338 from recreational uses, $294,829 from increased mobility, $317,259 from health benefits, and $4,087 from decreased auto usage for a total of $9,392,513 in benefits generated by the project annually. This provides the project with a benefit to cost ratio of approximately $83 of benefit per $1 cost, based on the mid estimates over a 20 year life of the project. If the high estimate is used, the total benefits generated by the project equals $14,013,276 for a benefit to cost ratio of approximately $125 of benefits per $1 of cost over the 20 year life of the project.

Mid Estimate: 83:1  
High Estimate: 125:1

The methodology calculates the mobility benefit at $4.08 per trip on a Class I facility, $128 per new bicyclist for health benefits, $10 per hour for recreation benefits, and 8 cents per mile for reduced auto trips in a suburban setting.
**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.)

Based on the project funding information provided earlier in the application, the following Leveraging and Matching amounts are designated for this project. Applicants must review and verify these values meet the following criteria:

**Leveraging Funds**

Non-ATP funds: either already expended by the applicant or funds to be programmed for use on elements within the requested ATP project. This non-ATP funding can only be considered "Leveraging" funding if it goes towards ATP eligible costs.

**Matching Funds**

The portion of the Leveraging funding that can be used as the local match if Federal ATP funding is programmed. These must be non-federal funds not yet expended and provided by the applicant in a specific project phase.

If these numbers do not match this criteria and/or the applicant's expectations, the numbers inputted earlier need to be revised.

**Funding in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Project Delivery Costs</th>
<th>Leveraging Funding</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Designate the Funding Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PA&amp;ED Phase</strong></td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Local agency funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS&amp;E Phase</strong></td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Local agency funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way Phase</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON-INFRASTRUCTURE (NI) AND "PLAN" PROJECTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leveraging Funding</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Designate the Funding Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL TOTALS FOR PROJECT/APPLICATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Leveraging Funding</th>
<th>% of Total Project Cost: 12.00%</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>% of Total Project Cost: 0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,241</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points received for "leveraging funding":** (Auto-calculated)

Optional: If desired, clarifications can be added to explain the leveraging funding and its intended use on the ATP project. (Max of 100 Words)

Words Remaining:
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)

☐ Applicant has not coordinated with both corps, or Tribal Corps (if applicable) (-5 points)

☐ Applicant contacted the corps; but does not intend to partner with any corps (-5 points)

Step 1: The applicant must submit the following information via email concurrently to both the CCC AND certified community conservation corps at least 5 days 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

Click on the following links for the California Conservation Corps and community conservation corps Representative ATP contact information:

http://callocalcorps.org/active-transportation-program/
http://www.ccc.ca.gov/work/programs/ATP/Pages/ATP%20home.aspx

The applicant must also attach any email correspondence from the CCC and certified community conservation corps or Tribal corps (if applicable) to the application verifying communication/participation. Failure to attach their email responses will result in a loss of 5 points.

Attach submittal email, response email and any attachment(s) from the CCC:

CCC Correspondence - Harter & Bike Path Gap Closure.pdf

Attach submittal email, response email and any attachment(s) from the certified community conservation corps:

CommunityCorps Bike Path & Harter Correspondence.pdf

Attach submittal email, response email and any attachment(s) from the Tribal corps (If applicable):

Step 2: The applicant has coordinated with the CCC AND with the certified community conservation corps, or the Tribal corps and determined the following: (check appropriate box)

☒ Applicant intends to utilize the CCC, certified community conservation corps, or the Tribal corps on the following items listed below. (0 points) (Max of 50 Words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Remaining: 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC - Clearing &amp; Grubbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC - Installation of Bollards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Corps - Clearing &amp; Grubbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Corps - Signage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ No corps can participate in the project. (0 points)

☐ At the time that the application was submitted, the applicant had not received a response from the following corps: (0 points)

☐ the CCC  ☐ the community conservation corps  ☐ the Tribal corps (if applicable)
Hello Manu,

The CCC may be able to participate in clearing and grubbing, and installation of bollards on this project. Please include a copy of this email with your application. Should this project receive funding, please contact Carie Monroe (carie.monroe@ccc.ca.gov), our local project manager.

Thank you,

Melanie Wallace
Chief Deputy Analyst
California Conservation Corps
1719 24th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
O (916)341-3153
M (916)508-1167
F (877)315-5085
melanie.wallace@ccc.ca.gov

Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at:

Save Our Water
SaveOurWater.com - Drought.CA.gov

---

Good Afternoon,

I think I sent the ATP application info to the wrong emails, please see below. (Application #2)

Thanks,

Manu Dhaliwal
Good Morning,

The City of Yuba City is submitting 2 ATP funding applications this year and wanted to check with the CCC & Community Corps if they are interested in participating in the project. I apologize for the delay in getting these to you, for some reason I was under the impression that the applications were due on the 17th rather than the 15th. The project info for the first project we are submitting is included below:

**Project Title:** Harter Parkway and Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure  
**Project Description:** The installation of Class I and Class IV shared use paths on Harter Parkway and extending the existing Sutter Bike Path to close major gaps in the City's existing active transportation infrastructure. The work primarily consists of asphalt and concrete construction. The project requires the piping and fill of approximately 450 ft. of an existing storm drain channel to accommodate a Class I path which connects to existing infrastructure.

**Detailed Estimate:** See Attached  
**Project Schedule:** PS&E/Environmental completed by Summer of 202  
Construction Start by Spring 2021  
Construction completion by Fall 2021

**Project Map:** See Attached  
**Preliminary Plan:** See Attached

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Regards,

Manu Dhaliwal | Assistant Engineer  
City of Yuba City | Public Works Department  
1201 Civic Center Blvd. | Yuba City, CA 95993  
Phone (530)822-7685 | Fax (530)822-4694 | mdhaliwa@yubacity.net

CITY OF YUBA CITY EMAIL DISCLAIMER: This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than the City of Yuba City or the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments thereto.
Hello Manu,

Baldeo Singh of the Sacramento Regional Conservation Corps (SRCC) has responded that they are able to assist with the Harter Parkway and Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure Project if it receives funding. Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the Local Corps.

The Corps can assist with the following items:

1. Clearing and Grubbing
2. Signage

Additionally, feel free to email Baldeo (bsingh@saccorps.org) directly if your project receives funding.

Best,
Dominique

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:23 PM, Manu Dhaliwal <mdhaliwa@yubacity.net> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

I think I sent the ATP application info to the wrong emails, please see below. (Application #2)

Thanks,

Manu Dhaliwal
Good Morning,

The City of Yuba City is submitting 2 ATP funding applications this year and wanted to check with the CCC & Community Corps if they are interested in participating in the project. I apologize for the delay in getting these to you, for some reason I was under the impression that the applications were due on the 17th rather than the 15th. The project info for the first project we are submitting is included below:

**Project Title:** Harter Parkway and Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

**Project Description:** The installation of Class I and Class IV shared use paths on Harter Parkway and extending the existing Sutter Bike Path to close major gaps in the City’s existing active transportation infrastructure. The work primarily consists of asphalt and concrete construction. The project requires the piping and fill of approximately 450 ft. of an existing storm drain channel to accommodate a Class I path which connects to existing infrastructure.

**Detailed Estimate:** See Attached

**Project Schedule:** PS&E/Environmental completed by Summer of 2021

Construction Start by Spring 2021

Construction completion by Fall 2021

**Project Map:** See Attached

**Preliminary Plan:** See Attached

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Regards,
CITY OF YUBA CITY EMAIL DISCLAIMER: This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than the City of Yuba City or the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments thereto.
Part B: Narrative Questions
Detailed Instructions for Question #9

QUESTION #9
APPLICANT’S PERFORMANCE ON PAST ATP FUNDED PROJECTS (0 - 10 points)

For Caltrans use only.
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Section</th>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Signature Page (Required for all applications)</td>
<td>Attachment A - Signature Page Harter.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Checklist (Required for Infrastructure &amp; Combo Projects)</td>
<td>Attachment B - Engineer’s Checklist Harter &amp; Bike Path.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location Map (Required for all applications)</td>
<td>Attachment C - Project Area Map - Sutter.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Map/Plans showing existing and proposed conditions (Required for all Infrastructure Projects; Optional for ‘Non-Infrastructure’ and ‘Plan’ Projects)</td>
<td>Attachment D - Harter Pkwy &amp; Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure - Preliminary Plans.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos of Existing Conditions (Required for all applications)</td>
<td>Attachment E - Photos of Existing Conditions.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Estimate (Required for all Infrastructure Projects)</td>
<td>Attachment F - Project Estimate (Form 22-R) Harter Parkway &amp; Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure.xlsm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Infrastructure Work Plan (Form 22-R) (Required for all projects with Non-Infrastructure Elements)</td>
<td>Attachment G - Non-Infrastructure Work Plan (Form 22-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Support (10 maximum) (Required or recommended for all projects as designated in the instructions) (All letters must be scanned into one document.)</td>
<td>Attachment H - Letters of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.) (All additional attachments must be scanned into one document.)</td>
<td>Attachment J - Additional Attachments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All additional attachments must be scanned into one document.
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: [Signature]
Name: Diana Langley
Title: Public Works Director
Date: 6/14/16
Phone: (530) 822-4792
e-mail: dlangley@yubacity.net

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: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________
Date: __________________________
Phone: __________________________
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: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________
Date: __________________________
Phone: __________________________
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 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 and regional ATP selection processes.

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 project’s 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 by the engineer until the final application and application attachments are complete and ready for submission to Caltrans.

1. Vicinity map /Location map
   Engineer’s Initials: [Signature]
   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:  
   Engineer’s Initials: [Signature]
   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. Scale must be shown on the plan/map
   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)  
   Engineer’s Initials: [Signature]
   a. Show and dimension: changes in lane widths, ROW lines, side slopes, etc.

4. Detailed Engineer’s Estimate
   Engineer’s Initials: [Signature]
   a. The Caltrans Project Estimate (Attachment F) must be filled out per the instructions and attached to the application, in the appropriate location.
   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. The non-participating (or ineligible) costs must be consistent with Caltrans guidelines as shown in Local Assistance Program Guidelines chapter 22.6
   d. All project elements the applicant intends to utilize the CCC, certified community conservation corps, or tribal 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:
   a. Confirmation that crash data shown is depicted accurately, is shown to scale, and occurred within influence area of proposed improvements.

6. Project Schedule and Requested programming of ATP funding
   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 federal 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 Implementing Agency’s expected project milestone dates and available matching funds.

7. Warrant studies/guidance (Check if not applicable)
   a. For new Traffic Control Signals – an engineering study that includes analysis of Signal Warrants 1-9 (CA MUTCD) must be submitted. For ATP funding, warrants 4, 5 or 7 should be met but the final decision to install a signal must be made by the engineer. The engineering study (and any additional documentation of the engineering judgment supporting the Traffic Control Signal, if needed) must include the name and license number of the responsible engineer and must be attached to the application in the “Additional Attachments” section.

8. Additional narration and documentation:
   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): Benjamin K. Moody
Title: Deputy Public Works Director – Engineering
Engineer License Number: 72383
Signature:
Date: June 14, 2016
Email: bmoody@yubacity.net
Phone: (530) 822-4783

Engineer’s Stamp:
Harter Parkway, South of Butte House Road –
No Bicycle or Pedestrian Facilities, narrow lanes, unimproved shoulder
Harter Parkway, North of State Route 20 –
No pedestrian or bicycle facilities on west side of road

Proposed Shared Path Gap Closure Location, West of Harter Parkway –
Dirt path used for access to City facility, often used as a pedestrian or bicycle shortcut to the Sutter Bike Path
Proposed Shared Path Location, Dirt path leading to Jefferson Avenue –
Raised section of existing unimproved path which would prove to be a barrier for mobility

Jefferson Avenue at Ruth Avenue –
Proposed transition location from Class IV separated path to Class I path
Existing Alternate Route – Ruth Avenue and Colusa Frontage Road –
No pedestrian or bicycle facilities, unimproved shoulder on south side

Existing Alternate Route – Butte House Road at Tierra Buena Road –
No pedestrian facilities, unimproved shoulders
**Engineer's Estimate and Cost Breakdown:**

### General Overhead-Related Construction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Item F, D or M</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Item Cost</th>
<th>Cost Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>100% $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>100% $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stormwater Protection Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>100% $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clearing &amp; Grabbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>100% $15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Construction Items (non-decorative only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Item F, D or M</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Item Cost</th>
<th>Cost Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minor Concrete - Sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>65079</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$976,185</td>
<td>100% $976,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Asphalt Concrete (HMA Type A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>585</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$70,200</td>
<td>100% $70,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Class II Aggregate Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>4199</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$209,950</td>
<td>100% $209,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>80’ Storm Drain Pipe</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$202,500</td>
<td>100% $202,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Import and Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>100% $33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Excavation &amp; Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$36,588</td>
<td>100% $36,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Striping - Detail 2 Centerline</td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td>100% $1,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Striping - Step Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>100% $72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Striping - Detail 39A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>$6,396</td>
<td>100% $6,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Striping - Bike Symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>100% $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>100% $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>100% $3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal of Construction Items: $1,629,470

### Decorative & Landscaping-related Items

- Label items as "F" for Functional, "D" for Decorative, or "M" for a mix of Decorative and Functional

- Subtotal of Construction Items: $1,629,470

### Construction Item Contingencies (% of Construction Items): 10.00%

Construction Item Contingencies cost: $162,947

Total (Construction Items & Contingencies) cost: $1,792,417

---

### Project Delivery Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project Cost</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
<th>ATP Eligible Costs</th>
<th>Non-participating Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (PE)</td>
<td>$89,621</td>
<td>$89,621</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies and Permits(PA&amp;E)</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PE</td>
<td>$268,863</td>
<td>$268,863</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way (RW)</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Engineering</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions and Utilities</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RW</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>$179,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Engineering (CE)</td>
<td>$448,104</td>
<td>$448,104</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Delivery</td>
<td>$1,971,659</td>
<td>$1,971,659</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Costs</td>
<td>$2,240,521</td>
<td>$2,240,521</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Documentation of Ineligible (Non-Participating) Costs:

- ATP Eligible (Non-Participating) Costs must be documented in this section of the Estimate form.

- Separate logic is required for each construction item listed above which is partly ineligible for ATP funding or is required for the construction of an ineligible item or element of the project.
### Project Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>City of Yuba City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>6/9/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Description:
- Harter Parkway and Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

#### Project Location:
- Sutter County, Yuba City, On Jefferson Avenue from Hooper

**Licensed Engineer in responsible charge of preparing or reviewing this PSR-Equivalent Cost Estimate:** Benjamin Moody

**License #:** 72383
May 26, 2016

Re: Harter Bike Path ATP Application

To Whom It may Concern:

We, the enclosed signees, fully support the City of Yuba City's efforts to install a shared use path from Butte House Road to Highway 20 and bicycle lanes from Highway 20 to Spirit Way. The construction of the proposed improvements would close a gap in existing bicycle and pedestrian pathways, improving accessibility and safety to multiple businesses and the River Valley High School.

The opportunity for grant funding to address safety and accessibility concerns in this area would be greatly recognized and appreciated.

Respectfully,

[Enclosed Signatures]
Harter Bike Path Support Signatures

[Signatures]

[Blank Lines]

[Signature]

[Blank Lines]
May 26, 2016

Re: Sutter Bike Path Extension ATP Application

To Whom It may Concern:

We, the enclosed signees, fully support the City of Yuba City’s efforts to install Class I and Class IV shared use paths from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway. The construction of the proposed improvements would extend the existing Sutter Bicycle path directly connecting the City of Sutter to multiple areas of interest on Harter Parkway.

The opportunity for grant funding to address safety and accessibility concerns in this area would be greatly recognized and appreciated.

Respectfully,

[Enclosed Signatures]
Sutter Bike Path Extension Support Signatures

Scott A. Butler

James E. Walton

Ben Deal

Hilary Swanson

Joanne Brightwell

Dean Mitchell

Dray Tunney

David Casey

Dean J.
June 8, 2016

City of Yuba City
Ms. Diana Langley
Department of Public Works
Yuba City, CA 95993

Dear Ms. Langley,

The Yuba City Unified School District (YCUSD) fully endorses Yuba City's grant application for the Active Transportation Program on behalf of the River Valley High School and the Tierra Buena Elementary School. These efforts undoubtedly will become a means to intensify safety and mobility through the installation of shared pedestrian and bicycle path, crosswalks, and signage from the Sutter Bike Path to Harter Parkway.

YCUSD holds student safety as the utmost priority. I offer the most enthusiastic endorsement in support of your efforts to pursue the Active Transportation funding. There is an extreme need for safe pedestrian and bicycle access to students for travel to and from the school.

I applaud your efforts to seek funding for these projects and reiterate the genuine backing for the YCUSD in that regard. Thank you for your continued partnership in community enhancements and student safety.

Sincerely,

Nancy Aaberg, Superintendent

Cc: Doreen Osumi, Deputy Superintendent YCUSD
    Robert Shemwell, Assistant Superintendent YCUSD
June 8, 2016

City of Yuba City
Ms. Diana Langley
Department of Public Works
Yuba City, CA 95993

Dear Ms. Langley,

The Yuba City Unified School District (YCUSD) fully endorses Yuba City’s grant application for the Active Transportation Program on behalf of the River Valley High School and the Tierra Buena Elementary School. These efforts undoubtedly will become a means to intensify safety and mobility through the installation of shared pedestrian and bicycle path, crosswalks, and signage from the Sutter Bike Path to Harter Parkway.

YCUSD holds student safety as the utmost priority. I offer the most enthusiastic endorsement in support of your efforts to pursue the Active Transportation funding. There is an extreme need for safe pedestrian and bicycle access to students for travel to and from the school.

I applaud your efforts to seek funding for these projects and reiterate the genuine backing for the YCUSD in that regard. Thank you for your continued partnership in community enhancements and student safety.

Sincerely,

Nancy Aaberg, Superintendent

Cc: Doreen Osumi, Deputy Superintendent YCUSD
    Robert Shemwell, Assistant Superintendent YCUSD

Educating Today’s Students To Succeed In Tomorrow’s World
May 26, 2016

City of Yuba City
Ms. Diana Langley
Department of Public Works
Yuba City, CA 95993

Re: Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

Dear Ms. Langley,

Almost seventy percent of our adult residents are overweight or obese; among our children, 42.1% of 5th graders, 38.1% of all 7th graders, and 34.8% of all 9th graders in Sutter County were overweight or obese. Even worse, the proportion of our citizens who are overweight is increasing rapidly. Obesity is taking a serious toll on our residents. 29.2% of Sutter County adults have one, 10.0% have two, and 5.5% have 3+ chronic conditions (diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and stroke). Sutter County currently has some of the highest prevalence of cardiovascular disease, diabetes, cerebrovascular disease and hypertension in California.

Physical activity is critical to reducing obesity, yet many of our citizens are not physically active, or lack safe recreational spaces. Only 27.8% of Sutter County residents engaged in regular walking in the past week, and 22% have no leisure-time physical activity. While 54.6% of our children age 2-11 are physically active for 1+ hours/day, only 18.4% of those under 18 are.

Sutter County Public Health Division is heavily committed to reducing obesity and obesity-related morbidity and mortality and increasing physical activity through our #LetsMoveSutter campaign, our SNAP-Ed outreach programs, the Healthy & Safe Neighborhoods Coalition and our investment in increasing the walkability of Sutter County. However, physical activity requires safe, readily accessible recreational facilities, which many of our citizens do not have access to. There are only 0.11 recreational facilities per 1,000 residents here in Sutter County, and only 67% of Sutter County residents have recreational facilities within one to three miles of their residence.

Bikepaths and walking trails are essential recreational facilities, important routes for our children to travel to and from school, and the primary means of workplace transportation for many of our citizens who lack motor vehicles or ready access to public transit. The proposed improvements would close a gap in existing bicycle and pedestrian pathways where there is regular pedestrian and bicycle traffic. This gap currently requires adults and children, to use roads with minimal or unsafe pedestrian paths, high vehicular traffic use and no provision for bicycles. They would also improve accessibility and safety to multiple businesses along Butte House Road, River Valley High School, Feather River Academy, the transit hub at Harter Parkway and Butte House Road, a large commercial, shopping, and employment center at the corner of Harter Parkway and Highway 20 and proposed recreational developments along Harter Parkway.

Therefore, the Sutter County Public Health Division fully supports the City of Yuba City’s efforts to install a shared use path on Harter Parkway from Butte House Road to Highway 20 and bicycle lanes from Highway 20 to Spirit Way and the extension of the Sutter Bike Path from Hooper Road to Harter Parkway.

Respectfully,

Amerjit K. Bhattal
Assistant Director
Human Services-Health

Lou Anne Cummings, MD, MPH
Health Officer

Michelle Baltar
Director of Public Health Nursing
Cycle 3 ATP Pedestrian & Bicycle Counts
Harter Bike Path ATP Application

Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2016
Location: Harter Parkway – Between Highway 20 and Butte House Road
Time: 6:30 AM - 8:00 AM

Counted By: Jack McDaniel

Pedestrians: 

Bicycles: 

Total Pedestrians ______

Total Bicycles ______

Additional Notes:
• 50% FROM THE BUS STOP
• 50% STUDENTS
Cycle 3 ATP Pedestrian & Bicycle Counts
Harter Bike Path ATP Application

Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2016
Location: Harter Parkway – Between Highway 20 and Butte House Road
Time: 3:00 PM - 4:00 PM

Counted By: Manu Dhaliwal

Pedestrians: IIIII IIIII IIIII IIIII IIIII III

Total Pedestrians 29

Bicycles: IIII I

Total Bicycles 6

Additional Notes:
50% to transit stop
Cycle 3 ATP Pedestrian & Bicycle Counts
Sutter Bike Path Extension ATP Application

Date: Thursday, May 19, 2016
Location: Royo Ranchero Drive - At Sutter Bike Path
Time: 6:30 AM - 8:00 AM

Counted By: Jack McDaniel

Pedestrians: 

Bicycles: 

Total Pedestrians 26

Total Bicycles 4

Additional Notes:

- Almost exclusively on bike path
Cycle 3 ATP Pedestrian & Bicycle Counts
Sutter Bike Path Extension ATP Application

Date: Thursday, May 19, 2016
Location: Royo Ranchero Drive – At Sutter Bike Path
Time: 5:00 PM - 6:00 PM

Counted By: Manu Dhaliwal

Pedestrians:

| I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |

Bicycles:

| I | I | I | I |

Total Pedestrians _____ 16 _____
Total Bicycles _____ 8 _____

Additional Notes:

90 degrees+ weather
Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure
Health Data

Table A - Public Health Agencies Contacted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUTTER COUNTY HEALTH DIVISION (SCHD)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lou Anne Cummings, MD, MPH Health Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Herrick, MS Public Health Epidemiologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericka Summers Health Program Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUBA CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Aaberg Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora Broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B - 2013-15 California Physical Fitness Report, Schools Near Project Area – Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fitness Standard</th>
<th>5th Grade Students</th>
<th>7th Grade Students</th>
<th>9th Grade Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>In HFZ N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Capacity</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Composition</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal Strength</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Extension Strength</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Body Strength</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 of 6 fitness standards</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C – Bike Advisory Council Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Kuphaldt</td>
<td>Chairman, Bike Advisory Committee, Cycling Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Riddle</td>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer, Sutter County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Walton</td>
<td>Public Works Engineer, Sutter County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Moody</td>
<td>Deputy Public Works Director, City of Yuba City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Swanson</td>
<td>4th Grade Teacher, Andros Karparos School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Mitchell</td>
<td>Corner Bikes Bike Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Berg</td>
<td>Corner Bikes Bike Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Dorsey, MD</td>
<td>Radiologist, Rideout Memorial Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demand and Benefits Results

Demand

In a one and half mile (2,400 m) radius around the proposed facility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
<th>Mid Estimate</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>42,904</td>
<td>42,904</td>
<td>42,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commuters</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Cyclists</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>11,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Cyclists</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>3,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
<th>Mid Estimate</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$767,626</td>
<td>$8,776,388</td>
<td>$13,240,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobility - Proposed Facility Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Trip</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Street bicycle trail</td>
<td>$4.08</td>
<td>$1,255</td>
<td>$294,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
<th>Mid Estimate</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$36,404</td>
<td>$317,259</td>
<td>$473,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>$6,642</td>
<td>$4,087</td>
<td>$511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translating Demand and Benefits Research into Guidelines

Demand
Our approach to estimating the use of a new facility rests on two main assumptions. First, all existing bicyclists near a new facility will shift from some other facility to the new one. Second, the new facility will induce new bicyclists as a function of the number of existing bicyclists. Research for this project uncovered that people are more likely to ride a bicycle if they live within 2,400 meters (1.5 mile) of a facility than if they live outside that distance (Midwest Regional University Transportation Center Report). The likelihood of bicycling increases even more at 1,600 and 800 meters. We therefore estimate existing and induced demand using 800, 1,600, and 2,400 meter buffers around a facility.

We base our estimates of existing bicycling demand on U.S. Census journey to work mode shares. We establish the number of residents within 800, 1,600, and 2,400 meter buffers of the facility by multiplying the area of each buffer by a user-supplied population density. To identify the number of existing daily bicycle commuters who will shift to the new facility, we multiply the number of residents in each buffer (R) by 0.4, assuming that 80 percent of residents are adults and 50 percent of adults are commuters. We then multiply this number of commuters in each buffer by the region’s bicycle commute share (C).

\[
\text{Daily existing bicycle commuters} = R \cdot C \cdot 0.4
\]

Adult commuters represent only a portion of adult bicyclists. We compared U.S. Census commute shares to National Household Transportation Survey (NHTS) data and found that the total adult bicycling rate ranges from the Census commute rate at the low end to 0.6 percent plus three times the commute rate at the high end (Appendix A of the NCHRP Report 552). This allows us to use readily-available Census commute shares to extrapolate total adult bicycling rates (T).

\[
T_{\text{high}} = 0.6 + 3C \\
T_{\text{moderate}} = 0.4 + 1.2C \\
T_{\text{low}} = C
\]

We multiply a low, moderate, and high estimate of this rate by the number of adults in each buffer to arrive at the total number of daily adult cyclists.

\[
\text{Total daily existing adult cyclists} = R \cdot T_i \cdot 0.8
\]

To obtain the number of existing daily child cyclists, we multiply the number of residents in each buffer by 0.2 to approximate the number of children, then by 0.05 to estimate the number of children who ride a bicycle on a given day (2001 NHTS shows that approximately 5% of children ride a bicycle on a given day).

\[
\text{Daily child cyclists} = R \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0.05
\]
Multiplying each of the existing cycling groups (commuters, total adults, and children) by the likelihood multipliers found in our research (L) for each buffer provides an estimated number of induced cyclists in each group.

\[
\text{New commuters} = \text{existing commuters} \cdot L \\
\text{New adult cyclists} = \text{existing adult cyclists} \cdot L \\
\text{New child cyclists} = \text{existing child cyclists} \cdot L
\]

Where:

\[
L_{800m} = 0.51 \\
L_{1600m} = 0.44 \\
L_{2400m} = 0.15
\]

\textbf{Mobility Benefit}

Our research found that bicycle commuters are willing to spend 20.38 extra minutes per trip to travel on an off-street bicycle trail when the alternative is riding on a street with parked cars (Appendix D of the NCHRP Report 552). Commuters are willing to spend 18.02 minutes (M) for an on-street bicycle lane without parking and 15.83 minutes for a lane with parking. Assuming an hourly value of time (V) of $12, the per-trip benefit is $4.08, $3.60, and $3.17, respectively. We multiply the per-trip benefit for the appropriate facility by the number of daily existing \textit{and} induced commuters, then double it to include trips both to and from work. This results in a daily mobility benefit. Multiplying the daily benefit by 47 weeks per year and 5 days per week results in an annual benefit.

\[
\text{Annual mobility benefit} = M \cdot V / 60 \cdot (\text{existing commuters} + \text{new commuters}) \cdot 47 \cdot 5 \cdot 2
\]

It should be noted that this methodology assumes that no bicycle facility previously existed nearby, aside from streets with parking.

\textbf{Health Benefit}

An annual per-capita cost savings from physical activity of $128 is determined by taking the median value of ten studies (Appendix E of the NCHRP Report 552). We multiply $128 by the total number of new bicyclists to arrive at an annual health benefit.

\[
\text{Annual health benefit} = \text{total new cyclists} \cdot 128
\]

\textbf{Recreation Benefit}

A wide variety of studies of outdoor recreational activities (non-bicycling) generated typical values of about $40 per day in 2004 dollars. If a typical day of recreation is about 4 hours, this would be about $10/hour. Note that this is an estimate of the \textit{net} benefits, above and beyond the value of the time taken by the activity itself. This estimate is also in line with a recent study of urban trails in Indianapolis, which used the travel cost method to find typical implied values per trip of about $7 - $20.

The “typical” day involves about an hour of total bicycling activity, so we value a day at $10 (D). From both NHTS and Twin Cities TBI, the average adult cycling day includes
about 40 minutes of cycling. We use this, plus some preparation and cleanup time. We multiply this by the number of new cyclists minus the number of new commuters.

Annual recreation benefit = (New bicyclists – New commuters) * D * 365

**Decreased Auto Use Benefit**
The decreased auto use benefits apply only to commuter and other utilitarian travel, as we assume that recreational riding does not replace auto travel. These include reduced congestion, reduced air pollution, and user cost savings. (The latter is not an externality, but is grouped here because it is also calculated as a function of reduced auto travel.) We multiply the total benefit per mile by the number of new commuters, multiplied by the average round trip length from NHTS (L).

We then consider two offsetting adjustments that ultimately leave the total number unchanged. First, there are utilitarian riders in addition to commuters and some of these trips will replace auto trips. Second, not all new bike commuters and utilitarian riders would have made the trip by car; evidence from NHTS suggests that something less than half of bike commuters use driving as their secondary commuting mode. For simplicity, we assume that the total amount of new bike commuter mileage is a reasonable number to use to represent the total amount of new bike riding substituting for driving.

The benefit per mile of replacing auto travel with bicycle travel is a function of location and the time of day. There will be no congestion-reduction benefits in places or at times when there is no congestion. Pollution-reduction benefits will be higher in more densely populated areas and lower elsewhere. User cost savings will be higher during peak periods when stop-and-go traffic increases the cost of driving.

Based on reasoning documented in Barnes’ Mn/DOT Report 2004-50, congestion savings will be 0-5 cents per mile, and pollution savings from 1-5 cents per mile, depending on conditions. We assume the high end of this range in central city areas, the middle range in suburban areas, and the low end in small town and rural areas. For simplicity, we assume that all commuting and utilitarian trips are during congested periods. User cost savings were determined to be 3 cents per mile during congested peak periods and 0 otherwise, thus these are scaled by location in the same way as congestion savings. We assume that bicycle commuters work 5 days a week 47 weeks a year.

Overall, the savings per mile (S) are 13 cents in urban areas, 8 cents in suburban areas, and 1 cent in small towns and rural areas.

Annual decreased auto use benefit = new commuters * L * S * 47 * 5
CITY OF YUBA CITY
STAFF REPORT

Date: May 17, 2016
To: Honorable Mayor & Members of the City Council
From: Public Works Department
Presentation by: Benjamin Moody, Deputy Public Works Director - Engineering

Summary
Subject: Active Transportation Program Grant Application Project Approval
Recommendation: Authorize the Public Works Director to submit the Sutter Bike Path Extension, the Harter Shared Path, and the Bridge Street Shared Path projects for grant funding through State Active Transportation Program, Regional Active Transportation Program, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program.
Fiscal Impact: Staff Time to develop the application packets. Additionally, funded projects require a minimum 11.47% local match.

Purpose:
To secure Active Transportation Program (ATP) grant funds for the promotion of bike and pedestrian activities and provide improvements to the City's transportation infrastructure network.

Background:
Caltrans issued the call for projects on April 18, 2016 for Cycle 3 of the ATP. Cycle 3 has approximately $240 million available Statewide for the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 fiscal year allocations.

The Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101 to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The program's goals are:
- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking
- Improve the safety and mobility of non-motorized users
- Achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals
- Enhance public health
- Benefit disadvantaged communities
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of users

Additional funding is also available regionally through the Sacramento Area Council of Government (SACOG) Regional ATP and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program (BPFP). Projects that do not receive funding from the State ATP have the opportunity to receive funding from the Regional ATP and then the BPFP.
In the previous two cycles of the ATP, the City has successfully obtained funding for the following projects:

- **Cycle 1** – Franklin Road Improvements: Regional ATP, $368,000
- **Cycle 2** – Franklin Ave. Pedestrian Improvements: BPFP, $376,200

**Analysis:**

After review of the Bicycle Master Plan and previous input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee, staff proposes to prepare the following project proposals:

**Sutter Bike Path Extension** – Connecting the existing Sutter bike path from Hooper Rd. to Harter Pkwy. (Exhibit A)
- 12' wide Class IV (separated) bike lanes with designated walking area on the north side of Jefferson Ave
- 12' wide Class I shared use pedestrian and bike path from Jefferson Ave to Harter Pkwy.
- Construction in 2020

**Harter Parkway Shared Use Path** – Connecting existing Class II bike lanes on Butte House Rd to existing Class II bike lanes on Spirit Way and Harter Parkway to the south. (Exhibit B)
- 12' wide Class I shared use pedestrian and bike path from Butte House Rd to SR20 on the West side of Harter Pkwy.
- Class II bike lanes on Harter Parkway, south of SR20 to close the gap between facilities.
- Construction in 2020

**Bridge Street Shared Use Path** – Connecting existing Class II bike lanes on Gray Avenue to the existing Class III bike route on Cooper Avenue (Exhibit C)
- 10' wide Class I shared use pedestrian and bike path on Bridge Street, North side
- 4' wide Class II bike lanes on Bridge Street, South side
- Timeline:
  - Project Design & Environmental: 2019
  - Right of Way Acquisition completion: 2021
  - Construction: 2022

Other corridors were considered including Live Oak Boulevard but the above listed projects were determined to have the highest priority.

State ATP applications are due on June 15, 2016 with the results released in winter 2016. The Regional ATP and BPFP supplemental application is due July 8, 2016.

**Fiscal Impact:**

Staff time over the next two months will be utilized to prepare the project applications. Staff is currently in the process of developing estimates for the three ATP project applications. The City is required by the Regional ATP and BPFP to provide matching funds equaling a minimum 11.47% of the project’s participating costs for any funded project.

**Alternatives:**
1. Propose an alternative project for the ATP grant, or
2. Modify the scope of the proposed projects.
**Recommendation:**

Authorize the Public Works Director to submit the Sutter Bike Path Extension, the Harter Shared Path, and the Bridge Street Shared Path projects for grant funding through State Active Transportation Program, Regional Active Transportation Program, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program.

**Prepared by:**

/s/ Manu Dhaliwal  
Manu Dhaliwal  
Assistant Engineer

**Reviewed by:**

Finance  
City Attorney

**Submitted by:**

/s/ Steven C. Kroeger  
Steven C. Kroeger  
City Manager

**Reviewed by:**

RB  
TH
Tierra Buena Park
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PUMP TRACK
RIDESHARING AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

County: Sutter
Federal Number:
Approval Date:
Caltrans DIST-EA:
Short Description: Harter Parkway & Sutter Bike Path Gap Closure

Project Scope: Construction of Class I, II, and IV facilities to close a gap in existing infrastructure on Harter Parkway and Jefferson Avenue.

Project Sponsor: City of Yuba City
Private Agency: No

CMAQ Funding: $1,972,000
Local Match: $269,000
Capital Recovery Factor: 0.07
Project Analysis Period: 20 years
Auto Trips Eliminated (T): 2,310 trips (one-way) per week
Length of auto trips eliminated (L): 1.00 miles in one direction of trip
Weeks of operation per year (W): 52 weeks
Adjustment (A) for auto access trips to transit, vanpools and carpools: 1.00 adjustment factor
Annual Auto Trips Reduced: 120,120 annual trips
Annual Auto VMT Reduced: 120,120 annual miles

EMISSION FACTORS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMISSION FACTORS:</th>
<th>Auto Trip End Factors</th>
<th>Auto VMT Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG: 0.353 grams per trip</td>
<td>0.119 grams per mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx: 0.162</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10: 0.004</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMISSION REDUCTIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMISSION FACTORS:</th>
<th>Pounds per Year</th>
<th>Kilograms per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG: 125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx: 77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10: 24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF:

CMAQ Funds: $585.94 per pound, 171,877 per ton
All Funding Sources: $665.87 per pound, 331,733 per ton