

San Diego Association of Governments
CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 5, 2014

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

Action Requested: DISCUSSION

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND
TransNet/TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ACTIVE
TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS
FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING

File Numbers 3300300/3300100

Introduction

The *TransNet* Extension ordinance provides funding for two of the SANDAG land use and transportation competitive grant programs – the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and the Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). To date, SANDAG has issued two cycles of funding for each of these programs, and traditionally, the call for projects for the two programs have been issued individually. Due to the similar timeframes and program elements, staff is conducting the third cycle of call for projects for these two grant programs simultaneously.

The criteria for both programs underwent significant updates during the last cycle to ensure consistency with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) and *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*. As a result, no changes are proposed to the criteria, and only minor changes are proposed to the program guidelines for both programs for this next cycle. As a point of clarification, it should be noted that the State of California is currently conducting a statewide Active Transportation Program (ATP) consisting of both statewide and regional competitions, being administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). In an effort to facilitate the application process for the *TransNet*/Transportation Development Act (TDA) ATGP, staff is proposing accepting the submission of unfunded regional ATP applications, described in more detail below.

Funding from FY 2014, FY 2015, and FY 2016 is anticipated, for an approximate total of \$12 million for the SGIP and \$3 million for the ATGP. (When the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Regional Bike Early Action Program [EAP] in September 2013, it limited the *TransNet*/TDA ATGP to \$1 million per year.) Funding amounts for both programs will be finalized this fall. The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to issue the call for projects for both programs this October, and approve the project awards next summer. Work to fulfill the grant agreements would begin in fall 2015.

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) is asked to review and discuss the proposed changes to the program guidelines in anticipation of the call for projects.

Background Information

Funding and Eligibility

The SGIP and ATGP were established through the half-cent sales tax *TransNet* Extension Ordinance, approved by the region’s voters in 2004. The ordinance sets aside two percent of the measure’s annual sales tax revenues for smart growth incentives and two percent for active transportation projects, and the ATGP is supplemented with TDA revenues. Only local cities and the County of San Diego are eligible recipients of the grant funds. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may collaborate with the cities or the County, but cannot directly apply for the funds.

Goals, Program Objectives, and Grant Types

The following table provides a summary of goals, program objectives, and grant types for each program, from the last cycle of funding.

	SGIP	ATGP
Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage comprehensive public infrastructure projects and planning activities that facilitate compact, mixed-use development focused around public transit, and that aim to increase housing and transportation choices. Fund projects that can serve as models around the region and attract private development. Create great places in the San Diego region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the planning and development of Complete Streets, and provide multiple travel choices for the region’s residents. Fund bicycle and pedestrian-oriented transportation facility improvements, planning efforts, encouragement and education programs, and bicycle parking. Support the goals and objectives of <i>Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan</i>.
Program Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve as catalysts for further smart growth development. Influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private projects that create great places. Serve as model examples for smart growth in a variety of settings. Contribute to the reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by encouraging travel means other than single-occupant vehicle. Support future housing development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage a cohesive network of complete streets, improve bike/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other gathering places, and support smart growth place-making. Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians. Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income. Increase community support for bicycling and walking and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes. Support reductions in GHG emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of walking and bicycling in the region by providing supportive facilities, amenities, and programs.
Grant Types and Percentage Allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital (80%) (\$2 million cap) Planning (20% plus any rollover from Capital) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital (75%) (\$500,000 threshold for large projects; 60% maximum toward large projects; \$1.5 million cap) Non-Capital (25%, plus any rollover from Capital) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning (15%) Education/Encouragement/Awareness (5%) Bicycle parking (5%)

Summary of Previous Funding Cycles

The following table provides information for the first two funding cycles of both grant programs, and provides estimated dates and funding amounts for the third funding cycle.

SGIP	Release of Call for Projects:	Projects Awarded:	Funding From:	Available Funding:	Number of Projects Funded:
First Cycle	December 2008	May 2009	FY 2009, FY 2010	\$9.4 million	13 projects
Second Cycle	September 2012	June 2013	FY 2011, FY 2012, FY 2013	\$9.6 million	13 projects
Third Cycle	Est: Oct 2014	Est: June 2015	FY 2014, FY 2015, FY 2016	Est. \$12 million	TBD
ATGP	Release of Call for Projects:	Projects Awarded:	Funding From:	Available Funding:	Number of Projects Funded:
First Cycle	April 2009	June 2009	FY 2010	\$7.8 million	29 projects
Second Cycle	April 2012	Sept 2012	FY 2011, FY 2012	\$8.8 million	26 projects
Third Cycle	Est: Oct 2014	Est: June 2015	FY 2014, FY 2015, FY 2016	Est. \$3 million	TBD

Proposed Changes to Program Guidelines

Staff is proposing only one modification to the program guidelines for both the SGIP and ATGP, and one modification to the ATGP, as described below. Information related to eligible projects and scoring criteria for both programs is provided in Attachments 1 and 2. In addition, while not a specific change to the criteria or the criteria weighting, the references to reductions of GHG emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the program objectives and other sections of the program guidelines will be strengthened in an effort to continue to incentivize local jurisdictions to plan or build projects that reduce VMT and GHG emissions, implement local and regional climate action plans, and continue to promote active transportation projects that enhance public health, as consistent with the 2050 RTP/SCS.

Proposed Modifications to Both Programs – Requirement of Matching Funds

Currently, neither program requires matching funds, but both programs provide points for matching funds.¹ Projects that provide higher matching proportions receive a higher number of points. The original intent of the *TransNet* extension ordinance was to leverage *TransNet* funds to the fullest extent possible. With this in mind, it was anticipated that projects that received *TransNet*

¹ In the ATGP (both the capital and non-capital grant programs), projects are scored relative to each other by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds receive the highest points (10 for the capital and 20 for non-capital), and projects with the lowest receive the fewest points. Projects without secured matching funds receive no points. In the SGIP planning grant program, points are awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to the total project cost. In the SGIP capital grant program, projects receive points based on a curve from most to least matching funds.

funding would bring an approximate match of 50 percent. Over the years, the matching percentage has come in considerably lower. In an attempt to leverage *TransNet* funds to a greater degree, it is proposed that both programs institute a new requirement for a minimum local match of 20 to 30 percent of the total cost of the project. This scenario would not change the matching funds scoring criterion. Projects that provide higher matching proportions would still receive a higher number of points. Projects failing to provide the required local match would be ineligible for funding.

Proposed Modifications to the ATGP Capital Grants Program – Removal of Over/Under \$500,000 Category Distinction

The second cycle of the ATGP Capital Grants program contained a provision that of the \$6.6 million available during that cycle, a maximum of \$4 million (or approximately 60% of capital funds) would be available to fund projects over \$500,000, and that grant requests could not exceed \$1.5 million. This \$500,000 threshold established two categories of projects: projects over \$500,000, and projects of \$500,000 or less. Staff is proposing eliminating these category distinctions as part of Cycle 3 for two reasons: (1) a smaller volume of grant applications is expected for the ATGP resulting from a redirection of funds toward the Bike EAP approved last year; and (2) the category distinction did not result in the expected outcome of evening the playing field between smaller and larger jurisdictions, as was originally anticipated. Given the smaller amount of funding available (approximately \$3 million for the third cycle versus almost \$9 million for the second cycle), dropping the distinction could help streamline and facilitate the application and review process.

Proposed Considerations for the *TransNet*/TDA ATGP in Relation to the Statewide ATP

As mentioned previously, the State of California is currently conducting a statewide ATP consisting of both statewide and regional competitions. Program funding will be awarded in two stages, beginning with a statewide competition with applications due in May 2014, followed by a regional competition with applications due in June 2014. The ATP is being administered by the CTC. SANDAG, as the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), will act as the administrator for the regional competition. More information is available at www.sandag.org on the Transportation/Bicycles and Pedestrians page.

Proposal Regarding Regional ATP Applications Not Selected for Funding

In an effort to facilitate the application process for the ATGP, staff is proposing that applications submitted by jurisdictions that are not awarded funding as part of the regional MPO-selection process be granted the ability to submit their regional ATP program application, along with the supplemental questions approved by the SANDAG Board and the CTC in May 2014. The supplemental questions address topics such as innovation; project readiness; linkages to bike, pedestrian, and transit networks; effectiveness and comprehensiveness of proposed project; and complementary programs. The *TransNet* eligibility criteria would be enforced, meaning that only local cities and the County could re-submit their applications for the ATGP. In addition, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment portion of the application, which has been eliminated from the regional portion of the statewide ATP application, would be reinstated for the ATGP.

The ATGP proposals will be due on February 3, 2015. Since the CTC will adopt the SANDAG recommended regional projects in November 2014, sufficient time would be available for jurisdictions to decide whether to resubmit unfunded regional applications to the local ATGP.

SGIP and ATGP Schedule and Next Steps

The following schedule is proposed for the third cycle of the SGIP and ATGP process, and is illustrated below in conjunction with the statewide Active Transportation Grant (ATG) program for reference purposes.

- Summer 2014 – Prepare Call for Projects (criteria, technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map, Regional Housing Needs Assessment Progress Report)
- October 2014 – SANDAG Board releases Call for Projects for both programs
- February 3, 2015 – Applications due
- Spring 2015 – Evaluations and project rankings
- June 2015 – SANDAG Board approves projects
- October 2015 – Grant agreements executed and jurisdictions begin work

2014							2015									
Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct
SGIP and ATGP																
Prepare Call for Projects				Release Call for Projects	Application Period			Apps due	Evaluation and Project Rankings			SANDAG Board approves projects	Grant Agreements executed and work begins			
State and Federal MAP-21 Active Transportation Program																
June 13: Reg apps due	Aug 20: CTC adopts Statewide Projects for funding		Sep 30: SANDAG recommends Regional Projects for funding to CTC		November: CTC adopts Regional Projects for funding		Non-funded Regional Projects could be submitted to <i>TransNet</i> ATGP*									

* Staff is proposing that applications submitted by local jurisdictions that are not awarded funding as part of the regional MPO-selection process be granted the ability to submit their regional ATP program application, along with the supplemental questions approved by the SANDAG Board and the CTC in May 2014 .

Roles and Responsibilities

CTAC, Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) will serve as the three primary working groups providing input on the program guidelines and project rankings. The Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) will be asked to review the program guidelines and project rankings for consistency with the *TransNet* Program eligibility. The Regional Planning Committee will provide policy guidance and recommendations to the SANDAG Board on the program guidelines, criteria, and project selection for the SGIP, and the Transportation Committee will provide policy guidance and recommendations to the Board on the program guidelines, criteria, and project selection for both the SGIP and ATGP. The SANDAG Board will release the call for projects and approve the final project awards for both programs. Under the proposed schedule, the Board would release the call for projects for both programs in October 2014, and approve the selected projects in June 2015. Grants would be executed and work would begin by October 2015.

Next Steps

TWG, CTAC, and the ATWG will provide input on the proposed changes to the program guidelines during June. The ITOC will receive a report on these two grant programs in July 2014, and the policy advisory committees will be asked to make recommendations on the proposed program guidelines in September 2014, for a call for projects to be released by the SANDAG Board in October 2014.

Attachments:

1. *TransNet* SGIP
 - a. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for Capital Grants
 - b. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for Planning Grants
2. *TransNet* ATGP
 - a. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for Capital Grants
 - b. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for non-Capital Grants

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, carolina.gregor@sandag.org

***TransNet* SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (SGIP) CAPITAL GRANTS**

SGIP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Capital Grants)

Eligible capital grant projects include pedestrian improvements, bicycle facilities, transit access improvements, and other innovative smart growth-supporting infrastructure. Proposed capital SGIP projects may include, but are not limited to, the following eligible elements.

- Public Plazas
- Pedestrian Street Crossings
- Streetscape Improvements (such as, median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and street furniture)
- Parklets
- Traffic Calming Features (such as, pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles)
- Access Improvements to Transit Stations/ Routes
- Wayfinding Signage
- Community Gateway Features
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths and Bridges
- On Street Bike Lines
- Bicycle Parking
- Low Impact Development Elements Included as Part of the Above

Applicants are encouraged to utilize innovative solutions that are new to the region, and that are comprehensive in scope.

SGIP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Capital Grants)

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for capital projects are discussed in detail below.

1. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the location of the proposed grant project, in terms of the project area's land use and transportation characteristics at present, and in the near-term future.

Land use and transportation characteristics will be scored by SANDAG staff using current SANDAG land use and transportation data. Planned densities and land uses must be in adopted general plans and/or community plans. Pending amendments will not be considered. It is the responsibility of local jurisdictions to ensure that SANDAG has current land use data, and to submit information regarding entitled development within the project area.

A. Intensity of Planned Development in Project's SGOA

A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds

Up to six points are available. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG, comparing PLANNED land use densities for the project area to the density thresholds prescribed for the project's smart growth opportunity area place type. Densities will be based on the land use designations in SANDAG's currently adopted regional growth forecast.

Projects in areas with planned residential and/or employment densities that exceed the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score highest in this category.

A2. Expedited Approval Process

A total of four points are available, if an applicant can demonstrate that a specific plan, master Environmental Impact Report, or other mechanism is in place to allow for administrative approval of development projects. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B. EXISTINGS AND ENTITLED LAND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT AREA

B1. EXISTING Development Density

Up to six points are available. EXISTING development density around the proposed capital project will be calculated by SANDAG, comparing EXISTING densities within 1/4-mile of the project to the density thresholds prescribed for the project's smart growth opportunity area place type. The 1/4-mile area around a project will extend for the full length of linear projects. Project areas where residential and/or employment development exceeds the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score the highest in this category.

B2. ENTITLED Development Density

Up to six points are available. ENTITLED development projects within a 1/4-mile radius of the proposed capital project will qualify if any portion of the development project boundary is within the 1/4-mile area surrounding the proposed capital project. Densities will be scored relative to minimum threshold for the area's smart growth place type. To receive points, applicant must describe entitled developments in the application. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B3. Mix of Uses

Up to three points are available. Mix of Uses will be calculated by SANDAG by counting the number of current uses in the project area. Multi-family residential does not count toward these points; it must exist within the project area in addition to the other uses in order to earn points (i.e. projects without multi-family residential within 1/4 mile of the project area will not receive any points). The categories of land uses counted include single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, and visitor-serving.

B4. New Uses

A total of two points are available. The applicant must provide evidence of any new uses that would be added to the project area as a result of land development that the proposed capital project would support.

C. NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

C1. New Affordable Housing Development

Up to 3 points are available. The applicant will identify new affordable housing that will be produced in conjunction with the entitled land development within 1/4-mile of the project. "Affordable housing" means housing that serves extremely low, very low, or low income households (between zero to 80 percent of area median income adjusted for household size). Affordable housing costs are defined in Section 6918 for renters and Section 6920 for purchasers of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations, and in Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, or by the applicable funding source or program. Acquired and rehabilitated affordable housing qualifies under this criterion. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

C2. Low to Very-Low Income Affordable Units

A total of two points are available, if 50-100 percent of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents.

D. TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT AREA

SANDAG staff will score these criteria based on the transportation facilities within 1/4-mile walking distance of the project boundary. Walking distance will be determined through geographic system information transit and bicycle networks, and network of actual available walking paths.

D1. Relation to Transit

Up to 12 points are available. Transit facilities must be either existing or funded for construction to qualify.

D2. Bicycle Facilities

Up to two points are available. Bicycle facilities will be identified by the current San Diego Regional Bike Map unless the applicant provides additional information about existing or planned bike facilities not on the current map.

Only bicycle facilities built consistent with California Highway Design, Chapter 1000 standards will qualify. One point will be awarded where bicycle facilities exist within a 1/4 mile of the proposed project, and two points when those facilities connect directly to the project.

D3. Walkability

Up to four points are available. Walkability will be determined by the intersection density of the street network in the project area based on the following scale:

Intersection Density (<i>per Square Mile</i>)	Points
290 or greater	4
225-290	3
100-224	2
Less than 100	1

D4. Transportation Demand Management Strategies

Up to two points are available. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies within the project area must be described in the project application.

Existing TDM programs within the project area, such as requiring TDM plans as part of the development review process, or parking management strategies such as shared parking or allowing reductions in parking requirements receive two points, and proposed programs or policies receive one point.

Examples of TDM policies and programs that can be considered for this points category are included in (but not limited to those found in) *Integrating TDM into the Planning and Development Process*, which can be found at www.sandag.org/smartgrowth.

E. COMMUNITY DESIGN FEATURES AND CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT AREA

E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context

Up to six points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using aerial imagery, Google Street View and/or site visits, and guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 3 – Consistent Street Edge (for large developments)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 4 – Street Frontages
- Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design)
- Parking (Chapter 9 Parking)

The highest scoring projects will be located in project areas that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will be located in project areas that minimally exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

Points are also available under this criterion if the local jurisdiction has developed design guidance for the project area that is in line with the above principles, such as:

- Design guidelines
- Form-based codes
- Renderings of proposed development

2. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the actual proposed grant project, in terms of how well the project meets the objectives of this grant program.

A. Support for Public Transit

Up to five points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 10 – Transit Access (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets – in terms of guidance for stops and stations, as well as bicycle and pedestrian access to transit
- Chapter 6 – Transit Stations

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

B. Providing Transportation Choices

Up to five points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 8 – Street Connectivity (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 9 – Pedestrian Realm
- Smart Growth Scorecard 13 – Vehicle and Bicycle Parking (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 14 – Parking Demand Management (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

Additionally:

- Pedestrian facility design must be consistent with the recommendations in the SANDAG *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians*, should improve street crossings where necessary, and/or connect the community and its activity centers.
- Bicycle facilities should be designed consistent with the requirements of Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design manual, or the California MUTCD. Projects may also use AASHTO standards. Bicycle parking should be designed consistent with the bicycle parking guidelines in the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Highest scoring projects will provide continuity with bike routes beyond the immediate project area and connect to important community destinations, especially public transit.
- Projects that do not directly facilitate travel, such as public gathering areas should contribute to reducing vehicle travel by bringing needed public places into walking or bicycling range of community members.
- Changes to vehicle parking should significantly reduce the role of the automobile for travel in the area as well as the impact of parking on the community design of the area.

C. Community Enhancement

Up to five points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 12 – Plazas and Seating
- Neighborhood Context (3.2 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Chapter 8 – Parks and Civic Space

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections, and contribute toward a setting that is more likely to attract private investment. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections, and lack features that would help to accomplish the goal of placemaking. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

D. Addressing Project Area Issues

Up to five points are available. This criterion will assess how well the project addresses issues specific to the community, which will be unique in each location, depending on demographics and specific needs; and how well the project preserves and integrates existing cultural and natural resources in the project area.

Specific issues to be addressed may pertain to specific populations such as the elderly or disabled or other low-mobility populations, or may address area issues such as crime, or work toward a goal of economic revitalization for existing businesses.

In the example of specific populations, the proposed project could reduce roadway speeds and employ other traffic calming improvements that will ensure safer access for elderly residents from a residential street to a senior center or retail district around the corner.

In the example of crime, the proposed project could seek to improve public safety by employing crime prevention through environmental design strategies, cleaning up an eyesore, or removing a nuisance that attracts crime.

The applicant should demonstrate how the project will effectively integrate and preserve existing cultural and natural resources in the area that help shape the identity of that community. Natural resources could include (but are not limited to) creeks and open space.

Cultural resources could range from (but are not limited to) locally owned small businesses, murals, memorials and monuments, and historical buildings, bridges, or other infrastructure that represent landmarks in the community.

Highest scoring projects will address area issues comprehensively and effectively, and with design features that artfully integrate community resources into the project. Capital projects should preserve and protect important cultural and natural resources in the project area, and when appropriate, integrate such resources into the project design.

Smart Growth Scorecard 5 – Historic and Natural Features from *Designing for Smart Growth* will also be used to score this criterion.

E. Sustainability

Up to two points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 6 – Sustainable Design (for streetscapes)
- Energy Conservation and Landscaping (3.5 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Stormwater Runoff (5.5 in Chapter 5 Multimodal Streets)

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

F. Universal Design

Up to two points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 7 – Universal Access
- Universal Design (6.2 in Chapter 6 Transit Stations)

Additionally, intersection improvements must include pedestrian signals and detectable warnings designed for pedestrians with visual and hearing impairments.

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles of universal design. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Projects that only meet Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines will not receive points. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

For more information and resources on universal design principles, please visit:

- <http://design.ncsu.edu/cud/>
- <http://www.icat-ciat.org/guidelines.html>
- <http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/>

3. PROJECT READINESS

A. Major Milestones Completed

Up to four points are available. SANDAG will score projects based on the project development milestones completed.

- Environmental clearance under California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act if appropriate is worth one point.
- Completion of right-of-way acquisition, all necessary entitlements, or evidence provided by the applicant that no right-of-way acquisition is required, earns one point.
- Completion of final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) also earns one point.
- One point will be awarded if the applicant can provide evidence that the project is fully funded, OR the grant will fully fund the project.

B. Evidence of Local Commitment

Up to two points are available. The applicant should demonstrate that the project is supported by the community, as a result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders.

Projects that can provide evidence of a comprehensive, community-based planning process leading to the project and endorsement of community groups will be awarded two points.

Projects that cannot demonstrate that their planning process involved a diverse group of community stakeholders and that the project has the support of some, but not most community groups will receive one point.

Evidence of opposition from individuals within the community will not reduce the points awarded unless there is an ad hoc organization of opposition, or the number of individuals in opposition is significant.

4. Grant-Score Ratio

Up to 16 points are available. The grant-score ratio is scored by dividing the sum of the weighted points earned on the criteria in categories I and II by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 16 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives 16 points, and the one(s) with the lowest receives one point.

5. Matching Funds

Up to ten points are available. Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available ten points distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives ten points, and those with the lowest receive one point.

6. SANDAG Board Policy No 033 Points for Affordable Housing Production

Up to 75 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.

SGIP SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Capital Grants)

NO.	CATEGORY	PTS	CRITERIA	PTS POSSIBLE	WEIGHT	SCORE POSSIBLE	%
1.	LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT IMPROVEMENT						26%
A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project's SGOA							
A1.	Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds	3	<i>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</i> Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more	Up to 6	1	6	2%
2		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent					
1		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent					
3		AND Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more					
2		Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent					
1		Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent					
6		OR <i>For community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</i> Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more					
4		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent					
2		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent					
A2.		Expedited Approval Process					
B. EXISTING and ENTITLED Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project							
B1.	EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site- ON THE GROUND	3	<i>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</i> Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more	Up to 6	1	6	2%
2		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent					
1		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent					
3		AND Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more					
2		Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent					
1		Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent					
6		OR <i>For community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</i> Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more					
4		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent					
2		Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent					
B2.		EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site- IN THE PIPELINE	3				
2	Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent						
1	Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent						
3	AND Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more						
2	Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent						
1	Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent						
6	OR <i>For community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</i> Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more						

NO.	CATEGORY	PTS	CRITERIA	PTS POSSIBLE	WEIGHT	SCORE POSSIBLE	%
B2.	EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site- IN THE PIPELINE	4 2	Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent				
B3.	Mix of Uses	3 2 1	(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor within 1/4 mile of project site) Multi-family residential + 6 other uses Multi-family residential + 4-5 other uses Multi-family residential + 2-3 other uses	Up to 3	2	6	2%
B4.	New Use	2	New use will be added to the project area	2	1	2	1%
C. New Affordable Housing Development							
C1.	New Affordable Housing	3 2 1	Percent of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within 1/4 mile of project site) 100 percent of units affordable 99-75 percent of units affordable 74-25 percent of units affordable	Up to 3	2	6	2%
C2.	Low to very-low income affordable units	2	50-100 percent of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents	2	1	2	1%
D. Transportation Characteristics (Within walking and biking distance of proposed capital project)							
D1.	Relation to Transit	12 10 8 6	Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub: Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center- Project abuts or is onsite Project is within 1/2 mile Transit hub- Project is within 1/4 mile Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 minutes All day)- Project is within 1/4 mile	Up to 12	1	12	4%
D2.	Bicycle Facilities	2 1	EXISTING bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I), or PLANNED bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I) (as identified in <i>San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan</i> or local bicycle master plan) Direct connection to proposed project Facilities within 1/4 mile radius of project	Up to 2	2	4	2%
D3.	Walkability	4 3 2 1	Intersection Density per square mile: 290 or greater 225-289 100-224 Less than 100	Up to 4	2	8	3%
D4.	TDM Strategies	2 1	EXISTING TDM programs or policies in place PROPOSED TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy	Up to 2	2	4	2%

NO.	CATEGORY	POINT S	CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	WEIGHT	SCORE POSSIBLE	%
E.	Community Design Features						
E1.	Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context	6	Design Characteristics of existing community, AND/OR proposed design characteristics prescribed by documented guidance for the area or jurisdiction through design guidelines, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development; area will be assessed relative to the following sections in <i>Design for Smart Growth</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent Street Edge (Smart Growth Scorecard) • Street Frontages (Smart Growth Scorecard) • Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design) • Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design) • Parking (Chapter 9 Parking) • Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design) 	Up to 6	2	12	4%
2.	QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT						30%
A.	Support for Public Transit	5	How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area?	Up to 5	5	25	8%
B.	Providing Transportation Choices	5	How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, specifically walking and bicycling?	Up to 5	5	25	8%
C.	Community Enhancement	5	How well does the proposed project enhance the public realm in the project area, to engender support for smart growth, through place making and creating regional destinations?	Up to 5	4	20	7%
D.	Addressing Project Area Issues	5	How well does the project address identified special needs and concerns of the community, such as improving access for elderly, disabled, low-mobility populations, or increasing public safety? How well does the project preserve and appropriately integrate cultural and natural resources in the project area?	Up to 5	3	15	5%
E.	Sustainability	2	How well does the proposed project incorporate Green Stress/Low-Impact Development principles, to address stormwater runoff, energy conservation, and landscaping/street trees?	Up to 2	1	2	1%
F.	Universal Design	2	How well does the project incorporate Universal Design principles, to ensure access for users of all ages and abilities?	Up to 2	1	2	1%
3.	PROJECT READINESS						11%
A.	Major Milestones Completed	1 1 1 1	Environmental Clearance Right-of-way Acquisition Final Design Project Full Funded (matching funds secured OR grant will fully fund project)	Up to 4	5	20	7%
B.	Evidence of Local Commitment	2	Project is supported by the community, and is the result of a comprehensive, public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stake holders	Up to 2	6	12	4%
4.	COST EFFECTIVENESS						5%
A.	Ratio of grant request to project score		Project grant request, divided by score up to this point; ranked relative to each other	0		16	5%
5.	MATCHING FUNDS						3%
			All Projects scored on a curve, from most to least matching funds			10	3%
6.	POLICY NO. 033 POINTS					75	25%
	TOTAL PROJECT SCORE					300	100%

***TransNet* SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (SGIP) PLANNING GRANTS**

SGIP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Planning Grants)

Eligible planning projects include updates to land use plans to qualify "Potential" SGOA as "Existing/Planned," and other planning activities that facilitate smart growth. Proposed planning projects must:

- Encourage transit, pedestrian, and bicycle trips
- Support a community's larger infill development or revitalization effort
- Improve internal mobility
- Enhance sense of place

Project activities eligible for planning grant funding include but are not limited to:

Comprehensive planning efforts such as:

- Specific area plans or community plans
- Amendments to general plans or specific plans

OR

Smaller scale neighborhood planning activities such as:

- Traffic calming or mobility plans
- Feasibility studies for future capital improvements
- Parking management plans
- Form-based codes or design guidelines
- Planning efforts required to make smart growth zoning changes

Applicants may conduct a Health Benefit and Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform development of local planning efforts funded by the SGIP, such as specific plans, area plans, general plans, or specific plan amendments. HIA uses evidence-based analysis to inform decision-makers of potential health outcomes and health co-benefits of a proposed project, policy, or plan. Often, health outcomes of a proposed project are hidden or unintended and would not otherwise be considered if a HIA were not completed.

SANDAG is in the process of developing a technical assistance program to support local agencies in conducting HIAs. The technical assistance program is intended to provide technical expertise through an on-call consultant at no additional cost to eligible agencies. Additional information regarding the process of receiving technical assistance for HIA related work will be provided at a later date.

Priority will be given to those planning efforts that will result in or allow administrative or expedited approval of smart growth development projects. Planning projects must start within one year of grant award and must be complete within two years of grant award.

SGIP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Planning Grants)

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for planning projects are discussed in detail below.

1. RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL TRANSIT

Up to five (5) points are available. Transit Infrastructure and Service within the SGOA will be scored as indicated below.

- SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (five points)
- SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (three points)
- SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (one point)

Note: Rural Villages are not scored on this criterion because the place type does not require transit service. Consequently, Rural Village scores will be normalized to the total 200 points available to other place types.

2. SMART GROWTH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Up to five (5) points are available. Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development? How well does the proposed planning effort support development at or above the intensity of use targets for the area's smart growth place type?

3. PLANNING PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Up to 6.67 points are available. How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?

4. METHOD TO ACCOMPLISH THE SGIP PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Up to six (6) points are available. How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project Scope of Work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the Scope of Work include significant public outreach?

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Up to seven (7) points are available. Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth or lead directly to an implementable development or capital project? In particular, is a plan in place, or will the project develop a plan that will facilitate smart growth development through a master EIR or other mechanism that allows for administrative approval of development projects? Does the plan area include significant environmental concerns that may delay or prevent successful implementation of the plan? How will the public participation process significantly involve a diverse group of stakeholders and help develop consensus for smart growth?

6. EVIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMITMENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Up to 2.5 points are available. How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives. Is the proposed planning project supported by the community?

7. MATCHING FUNDS

Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 20 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio will receive 20 points, and the project(s) with the lowest ratio will receive one point.

8. POLICY NO.033 POINTS

Up to 50 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.

SGIP SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Planning Grants)

NO.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	PTS POSSIBLE	WEIGHT MULTIPLIER	TOTAL PTS POSSIBLE
1.	Relationship to Regional Transit	Is the transit infrastructure and service within the SGOA existing, programmed or planned?	5	3	15
2.	Smart Growth Development Potential	Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area.	5	4	20
3.	Proposed Project Goals and Objectives	How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?	6.67	3	20
4.	Method to Accomplish Program Objectives	How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives and include public outreach?	6	5	30
5.	Implementation	Is the project ready to go, will it result in specific implementation actions such as zoning changes or a master EIR?	7	5	35
6.	Evidence of Local Commitment/ Community Support	How has the applicant demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? (ordinances, policies, incentives)? How will the plan process engage the community?	2.5	4	10
7.	Matching Funds	Points awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.			20
8.	Policy No.033 Points	Points are awarded per jurisdiction based upon the methodology adopted in Policy No. 033			50
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE					200

TransNet/TDA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATGP) **CAPITAL GRANTS**

ATGP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Capital Grants)

Eligible capital grant projects will result in construction of facilities intended for use by bicyclists and pedestrians, or will provide safer roadway access for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming. Eligible activities include design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and installation of traffic control devices. Eligible capital grant projects may include but are not limited to:

- New bicycle facilities including paths and bicycle boulevards
- Bicycle lane striping and widening
- New sidewalks, widening of sidewalks, sidewalk gap closures
- New pedestrian facilities
- Pedestrian over and under crossings
- Shortcuts to shorten bike/walk travel time and provide for safer connections
- High visibility crosswalks (ladder/zebra/continental style)
- Bulb outs and intersection treatments
- Roundabouts and traffic circles
- Speed humps and speed tables
- Raised intersections
- Median refuges
- Road diets
- Full or half street closures
- Pedestrian and bicycle-related traffic control devices and pavement markings
- Pedestrian-scale lighting
- Signage and wayfinding

Applicants are encouraged to utilize innovative solutions that are new to the region, and to focus efforts in project areas that (1) lend themselves to development of neighborhood-level bicycle and pedestrian networks, (2) connect residential areas to activity centers such as schools, transit centers, commercial districts, and parks, and (3) are comprehensive and include all of the following: bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic calming improvements.

ATGP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Capital Grants)

How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. PROJECT READINESS

A. Completion of Major Milestones

Projects will be scored based on the number of milestones completed. Up to 20 points are available. The scores will be assigned for either completion of each milestone, or proof that it is not required (environmental and right-of-way below) as follows:

- Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or Community Active Transportation Strategy: Two points
- Environmental clearance (CEQA and/or NEPA; or evidence that environmental clearance is not required) – Four points
- Right-of-way acquisition (must be complete, including all necessary entitlements, or evidence that no right-of-way acquisition is required) – Four points
- Final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) – Ten points

2. PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY

A. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network

Up to eight points are available. Regional Bicycle Network is defined in *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*.

- Project will build direct connection to the network (project must directly connect to an existing or proposed segment of the network) – Six points
- Project will build part of the network, consistent with facility classification proposed in *Riding to 2050* – Eight points

B. Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network

Eight points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap between existing bicycle facilities. A gap is defined as a lack of facilities between two existing facilities, or a situation where there is an undesirable change in facility type (e.g., a project proposing to change a segment of class III between two class II segments into class II).

C. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network

Eight points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap in the existing pedestrian network. Applicant must demonstrate evidence of an existing gap. Examples include missing sidewalk segments, or enhancement of one or more blocks in between blocks that have previously been upgraded.

D. Connection to Transit

Up to 12 points are available; projects that include both bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible for points for both modes. SANDAG staff will analyze project area via GIS to determine score. Regional transit station is defined as any station served by COASTER, SPRINTER, San Diego Trolley, Bus Rapid Transit, or Rapid Bus. Distance is defined as walkable distance (accounting for barriers such as canyons)

- Bike improvements
 - Project is within 1.5 miles of regional transit station – Six points
- Pedestrian improvements: Score will be based on actual available walking paths, as mapped in GIS.
 - Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop – Two points
 - Project directly connects to a local transit stop (proposed improvements must directly connect to transit stop) – Four points
 - Project is within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station – Four points
 - Project directly connects to a regional transit station (proposed improvements must directly connect to the station) – Six points

E. Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers

Points will be awarded based on applicant description of safety hazard or collision history. Collision data must be highlighted to point out which collisions are applicable to the project area and why they are relevant. Up to 12 points are available.

Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or collision history, specifically, correctable crashes involving bicyclists or pedestrians within the last seven years:

- A. One to two correctable collisions – Two points
- B. Three to four correctable collisions – Four points
- C. Five or more correctable collisions – Six points

and/or

Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians – up to six points.

To gain points for creating access or overcoming barriers, applicant must describe detractors in the project area that prohibited safe access, such as a lack of facilities, high traffic volumes and speeds in an area with origins and destinations that would warrant bicycle or pedestrian trips if access were safe, freeway on/off ramps, blind curves, steep slopes, etc.

Points will be awarded based on degree of hazard and potential for increased bicycle or pedestrian trips.

Points will be awarded for both collision history **and** hazardous conditions lacking collision history in two ways:

- Project area with multiple hazardous locations - A project area encompasses two hazardous locations, one with collision data and one that is so unsafe that it prohibits safe access; or
- Project area with an intersection or roadway segment that has both barriers **and** crash data - A location within a project area has crash data, but also has been identified as a high barrier roadway in *The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan* Bicycle Barriers Model.

3. QUALITY OF PROJECT

A. Effectiveness of Proposed Traffic Calming, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Priority Measures

Points will be awarded based on the quality of traffic calming and bicycle and pedestrian priority measures proposed, and the potential for the proposed measures to address the area need as stated by the applicant. Design guidelines such as those outlined in *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*, and the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide will be used as a guide to inform scoring.

The highest scoring projects will make significant changes to the area's transportation infrastructure in a way that results in an environment where reduced vehicular speeds provide for safer access for bicyclists and pedestrians, and definitively prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian access. Examples of highest scoring projects include road diets that reallocate right-of-way and/or reconfigure the roadway to balance access for all modes, and projects that include a broad array of context-appropriate traffic calming devices and bicycle/pedestrian priority measures.

Lower-scoring projects will have fewer features and make only minimal improvements for bicycle and pedestrian access.

Up to 15 points are available.

- Traffic calming measures – up to five points
- Bicycle priority measures – up to five points
- Pedestrian priority measures – up to five points

Traffic calming measures will be analyzed for frequency, relative to the following guidelines:

- Residential Street – 20 mph = Devices every 250 feet, so one device would be effective 250 feet on either side
- Collector or Main Street – 25 mph = 400 feet
- Arterial street (traffic taming) – 35 mph = 800 feet

B. Relationship to Program Objectives

Up to 18 points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the Active Transportation Grant Program objectives:

- Encourage the development of a cohesive network of complete streets and improve bicycle/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other community gathering places, and support smart growth placemaking.
- Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming and complete streets design principles.
- Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that comprehensively prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.
- Increase community support for bicycling and walking as a viable transportation choice for all trip purposes, and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.
- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of bicycling and walking in the region, by providing supportive facilities, amenities and programs for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Consideration will be given to both the number of objectives that the project addresses, and how well the project meets the program objectives, particularly with respect to the following:

- Complete streets
- Improved bicycle/pedestrian connectivity to destinations
- Potential to support smart growth places
- Improved safety
- Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region
- Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access
- Social equity
- Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips
- Potential to improve health outcomes over time
- Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

C. Innovation

Up to eight points will be awarded. Four points will be awarded if the applicant provides evidence of the project being an FHWA or state experimentation effort.

Up to four points will be awarded if the project proposes solutions that are relatively new to the region, such as colored bike lanes or shared access lanes, sharrows, cycletracks, reverse angled parking, and other examples. The highest scoring projects will utilize the following innovations such as, but not limited to, those found in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, specifically:

Bike Lanes and Cycle tracks

- Buffered bike lanes
- Left-side bike lanes
- Cycle tracks (one-way protected, raised, two-way)

Intersections

- Bike boxes
- Intersection crossing markings
- Two-stage turn queue boxes
- Median refuge island
- Through bike lanes
- Cycle track intersection approach

Bicycle Signals

- Bicycle signal heads
- Signal detection and actuation
- Active warning beacon for bike facility crossing at unsignalized intersection
- Hybrid signal for bike route crossing of major street

Bikeway Signing and Marking

- Colored bike facilities
- Shared lane markings
- Bike route wayfinding signage and markings system

Innovative pedestrian/traffic calming solutions could include:

Crossings

- Automated pedestrian detection devices at signalized crossings, including infrared, microwave, and video detectors
- Pre-crossing safety information such as illuminated push buttons and safety advisories to pedestrians and drivers
- Automated “WALK” clearance phase extension for slower crossings such as those made by elderly and disabled pedestrians
- “Animated eyes” and/or pavement markings to remind pedestrians to look for turning vehicles
- HAWK signals
- Rectangular Rapid flash beacons (must include ADA accommodation: a locator note and audible speech to convey that warning lights have been activated, not just that a signal has been activated); in-street lighting is discouraged
- Mid-block chokers
- Mid-block crossings with accompanying signage and enhanced area lighting
- Dynamic lighting at marked crosswalks: focused on the crosswalk and activates when a pedestrian crosses
- High visibility crossings (ladder/zebra/continental style)
- Advance yield bars

4. SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

A. Complementary Programs

Up to three points will be awarded if the project includes program activities that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness program, education or encouragement efforts, and enforcement activities. Consideration will be given to both the breadth and depth of programs proposed.

B. Supportive Policies and Plans

Up to three points will be awarded if the project is preceded by a complete streets policy included in a community or specific plan, or a community active transportation strategy. The highest scoring projects will have completed a community active transportation strategy specific to the project area.

Intersections

- Right-turn slip lane and crosswalk, with geometry designed to slow turning vehicles
- Right-turn slip lane with raised crosswalk
- Raised crosswalks
- Raised intersections
- Median refuge island with corral
- Median refuge island with pedestrian activation button
- Pedestrian scramble
- Freestanding crosswalk yielding signs
- Traffic circles and roundabouts
- Semi- and Partial Diverters
- Forced Turn Channelization
- Advance stop bars
- Stencils and signage
- Prohibited right turns on red

Access for Elderly and Disabled Persons

- Use of rapid ticks and slow chirps instead of speech to indicate when to cross and when to wait (where it is technically feasible to have two poles at least 10 feet apart on a corner)
- Vibro-tactile walk indicators
- Push button locator tone
- Locator tone and walk indication ticks/tones that adjust in response to ambient noise levels
- On traffic pole, tactile arrow running parallel to associated crosswalk

5. FORMULA SCORES.

A. Demand (GIS Analysis)

This criterion includes seven factors, listed below. SANDAG will analyze the area relative to the factors below, using GIS. A buffer of a half-mile will be created around the project area for projects with pedestrian improvements, and one mile for projects with bicycle improvements. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (with the exception of vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles, for all projects. Projects will then be scored relative to each other, by ranking the raw scores from highest (15 points) to lowest (1 point).

- Population
- Employment
- Population Density
- Employment Density
- Intersection Density
- Activity Centers
- Vehicle Ownership

D. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive- Board Policy No. 033

Points will be awarded based on the "SCORING CRITERIA Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points" detailed in Exhibit 3 of Board Policy No. 033. Up to 50 points will be awarded.

E. Matching Funds

Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be explicitly identified. The application must include supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Projects will be scored relative to each other, by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. Points will be distributed from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds will receive ten points, and the projects with the least matching funds will receive one point. Projects without secured matching funds will not receive any points for this category.

F. Cost/Benefit

Score will be determined by taking the subtotal score of Criteria 1 through 12 and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The projects with the highest cost benefit ratio will receive ten points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive one point.

For projects that only include phases prior to construction:

- Project will be scored and ranked together with construction projects
- Score will be reduced according to ultimate phase proposed in project, as follows:
 - Environmental clearance – subtract 75 percent
 - Right-of-way acquisition – subtract 50 percent
 - Final design – subtract 25 percent

ATGP SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Capital Grants)

NO.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	POTENTIAL PTS	%
1. PROJECT READINESS				
A.	Completion of Major Milestones	Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase: Community active transportation strategy/neighborhood-level plan/corridor study Environmental Clearance Right-of-way Acquisition Final Design	Up to 20 2 4 4 10	10%
2. PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY				
A.	Connection to Regional Bicycle Network	Project directly connects to the Regional Bikeway Network or Project is a part of the Regional Bikeway Network	Up to 8 6 8	4%
B.	Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network	Closes a gap between existing bicycle facilities (guidance will include definition of gap, and will include situations where there exists an undesirable change in facility type)	8	4%
C.	Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network	Closes a gap in the existing network	8	4%
D.	Connection to Transit	Bike improvements proximity: Project is within 1.5 miles of regional transit station Pedestrian improvements proximity: Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop Project directly connects to a local transit stop Project is within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station Project directly connects to a regional transit station	Up to 12 6 2 4 4 6	6%
E.	Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers	Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or accident history. A. One to two correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years B. Three to four correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years C. Five or more correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years and/or Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians.	Up to 12 2 4 6 6	6%

NO.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	POTENTIAL PTS	%
3.	QUALITY OF PROJECT			
A.	Effectiveness and Comprehensiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures	<p>How well will the proposed traffic calming address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation?</p> <p>How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area?</p> <p>How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</p>	<p>Up to 15 total Up to 5</p> <p>Up to 5</p> <p>Up to 5</p>	7.5%
B.	Relationship to Program Objectives	How well does the project meet the program objectives?	Up to 18	9%
C.	Innovation	<p>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort?</p> <p>Does the project propose solutions that are new to the region, and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region? Does the project utilize innovative solutions such as those listed in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Guide?</p>	<p>Up to 8 4</p> <p>Up to 4</p>	4%
4.	SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS			
A.	Complementary Programs	Is this project accompanied by programs that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and increased enforcement?	Up to 3	1.5%
B.	Supportive Policies and Plans	Demonstrated policy language in approved plan, or a completed community active transportation strategy/plan	Up to 3	1.5%
5.	FORMULA SCORES			
A.	Demand (GIS analysis)	Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.	Up to 15	7.5%
B..	Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive	Score is based on the formula provided in Board Policy No. 033	50	25%
C.	Matching Funds	<p>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation. 	Up to 10	5%
D.	Cost/Benefit	Subtotal Score(not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount	Up to 10	5%
TOTAL			200	

TransNet/TDA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATGP) NON-CAPITAL GRANTS

ATGP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Non-Capital Grants)

Active Transportation Non-Capital Grants can be classified into three categories:

1. Planning

Planning efforts intended to address bicycle and/or pedestrian access at a neighborhood or citywide level, primarily to accommodate non-recreational bicycle and walking trips

Eligible planning projects include:

- Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategies – maximum funding amount of \$300,000
- Bicycle master plans – maximum funding amounts are as follows:
 - Cities with population up to 50,000 - \$100,000 (\$75,000 + \$25,000 for environmental) – Coronado, Del Mar, Imperial Beach, Solana Beach, and Lemon Grove
 - Cities with population 50,000 to 150,000 - \$150,000 (\$125,000 + \$25,000 for environmental) – Carlsbad, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, La Mesa, National City, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, and Vista
 - Cities with population greater than 150,000 - \$200,000 (\$150,000 + \$50,000 for environmental) – Chula Vista, Oceanside, and the County of San Diego
 - City of San Diego - \$250,000 (\$200,000 + \$50,000 for environmental)

2. Education/Awareness/Encouragement

Education/Awareness/Encouragement projects include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Education – Programs to teach walking and bicycling safety skills to children and adults.
- Eligible education projects can take place at schools, places of employment, community centers, or other venues.
- Awareness – Multimedia campaigns to impact the attitudes and behavior of the general public, generally to improve safety for all roadway users but bicyclists and pedestrians in particular.
- Encouragement – Targeted outreach and events designed to encourage walking and bicycling as a viable mode of transportation for everyday/utilitarian trips.

3. Bicycle Parking

Planning and implementation of bicycle parking facilities.

Eligible projects include bicycle racks, lockers, bike corrals, and/or other bike storage facilities such as bike stations. The maximum funding amounts for bicycle parking facilities is \$50,000, and for bike stations, \$100,000. Facilities must be designed for general public access, i.e. not serving any single place of employment or single activity center.

ATGP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Non-Capital Grants)

How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. ALL GRANTS

A. Relationship to Program Objectives

Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the Active Transportation Grant Program objectives:

- Encourage the development of a cohesive network of complete streets and improve bicycle/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other community gathering places, and support smart growth placemaking.
- Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming and complete streets design principles.
- Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that comprehensively prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.
- Increase community support for bicycling and walking as a viable transportation choice for all trip purposes, and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.
- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of bicycling and walking in the region, by providing supportive facilities, amenities and programs for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Consideration will be given to both the number of objectives that the project addresses, and how well the project meets the program objectives, particularly with respect to the following:

- Complete streets (planning, encouragement, parking)
- Improved bicycle/pedestrian connectivity to destinations (planning, encouragement, parking)
- Potential to support smart growth places (ALL)
- Improved safety (planning, education, awareness, encouragement)
- Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region (ALL)
- Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access (planning, awareness, encouragement, parking)
- Social equity (ALL)
- Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips (ALL)
- Potential to improve health outcomes over time (planning, education, awareness, encouragement)
- Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (ALL)

Up to 30 points are available for planning grants, and up to 20 each for education/awareness/encouragement, and bicycle parking grants. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate the potential for measurable impact across multiple objectives.

B. Comprehensiveness

Planning:

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed planning effort, in terms of both scope and scale. The highest scoring projects will address Complete Streets principles (addressing and prioritizing access for both bicyclists and pedestrians, and traffic calming), or could be considered a Community Active Transportation Strategy (CATS).

The highest scoring planning efforts will aim for significant changes to the area's transportation infrastructure, resulting in an environment where street design and vehicular speeds provide for safer access for bicyclists and pedestrians, and definitively prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian access.

Lower-scoring projects will plan for only minimal improvements for bicycle or pedestrian access.

Education/awareness/encouragement:

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed education, awareness, or encouragement effort, in terms of scope **and** potential impact.

The highest scoring projects will reach more of the region's residents, or a specific underserved or vulnerable population such as low-income populations who rely more on walking or biking because they lack access to a car, elderly, or Limited English Proficiency populations. The highest scoring projects will also take place over a longer period of time, and complement a capital improvement project. Higher scoring projects could also be part of a larger transportation demand management effort.

Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope, scale, or duration, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects.

Bicycle Parking:

Up to 12 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed parking project, in terms of scope and scale. The highest scoring projects will cover a larger geographic area and complement a capital improvement project. Higher scoring projects could also be part of a larger transportation demand management effort.

Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope and scale, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects.

C. Methodology

Planning:

Up to 30 points are available. Points will be awarded according to how well the planning process or proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals. Highest scoring projects will include a comprehensive planning process in their scopes of work that address the goals of Complete Streets, prioritize bicyclist and pedestrian access, plan for traffic calming, and tie into Safe Routes to School efforts in the project area.

Education/awareness/encouragement, and parking:

Up to 30 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement, and up to 10 points are available for parking. Points will be awarded according to how well the proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals. Highest scoring projects will include a succinct explanation of the need for the project, clearly articulated project goals, and a Scope of Work that directly addresses those goals and lists measurable objectives and/or deliverables.

Lower scoring projects will have stated a generic need, broad goals, and/or a scope of work that fails to clearly articulate how the project goals will be met.

Bicycle parking projects must demonstrate that they meet guidelines outlined in *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*. Innovations that deviate from the guidelines will be may be considered. The highest scoring bicycle parking projects will be placed appropriately, in appropriate locations, with design that is both attractive and functional, and can demonstrate that they serve the goals as stated by the applicant.

D. Community Support

Planning:

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the inclusiveness of the planning process, and evidence that key stakeholders will be active participants in the process. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate that:

- the effort is strongly supported by the community,
- community input is a substantive component in the planning process, and
- that key stakeholders, including underserved and limited English proficiency populations, have been identified and will have a meaningful role in the planning effort.

Lower scoring projects will:

- have a Scope of Work that includes minimal opportunities for community input,
- include generic letters of support that fail to show substantive involvement from key stakeholders, and
- fail to involve underserved and limited English proficiency populations (when appropriate in the plan area).

Education/Awareness/Encouragement and Bicycle Parking:

Up to 16 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement, and up to 10 points are available for parking. Points will be awarded according to the quantity and quality of the role of community involvement in the project. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate that:

- the effort is strongly supported by the community,
- relevant stakeholders representing the community had input into the methodology,
- community organizations have a substantive role in project implementation, and
- the Scope of Work includes language-appropriate program delivery for non-English speaking populations (for education/awareness/encouragement projects, if appropriate for the plan area).

Lower scoring projects will:

- fail to show meaningful community support,
- include generic letters of support that fail to show substantive involvement from key stakeholders,
- fail to involve community organizations in project implementation, and
- fail to account for limited English proficiency populations in program delivery (when appropriate in the plan area).

E. Matching Funds

Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be explicitly identified. The application must include supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Projects will be scored relative to each other, by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. Points will be distributed from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds will receive 20 points, and the projects with the least matching funds will receive 1 point. Projects without secured matching funds will not receive any points for this category.

F. Cost/Benefit

Score will be determined by taking the subtotal score of Criteria 1 through 12 and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The projects with the highest cost benefit ratio will receive 18 points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive 1 point.

G. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033

Points will be awarded based on the "SCORING CRITERIA Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points" detailed in Exhibit 3, of Board Policy No. 033. Up to 50 points will be awarded.

2. EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

A. Evaluation

Up to 20 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the quality of the evaluation proposed for the project. Highest scoring projects will:

- Have identified performance measures in the application, or will include a task for identification of performance measures in the Scope of Work;
- Include specific pre- and post-data collection efforts as part of the project scope, budget, and schedule in support of evaluating the project's effectiveness.

Lower scoring projects will lack meaningful evaluation methods or data collection as part of the project.

B. INNOVATION

Up to 10 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement grants, and up to 30 points are available for bicycle parking grants. Points will be awarded for innovative projects that show potential to serve as a replicable model for the region. Highest scoring projects will include innovative methods of accomplishing project goals that have not yet been tried in the San Diego region to date. Lesser points will be awarded to project activities that are relatively new to the region. No points will be awarded if the project proposes activities that are already in practice in the region.

If the proposed practice has been tried in other regions, the applicant must make the case that it has proven to be successful in those regions.

Examples of innovative encouragement projects could include but are not limited to ciclovia or Sunday Streets programs, and bikesharing. Innovative bicycle parking projects include but are not limited to bike corrals, and development of bicycle parking ordinances.

3. PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

A. Demand (GIS Analysis)

This criterion includes seven factors, listed below. SANDAG will analyze the area relative to the factors below, using GIS. A buffer of a half-mile will be created around the project area for projects with pedestrian improvements, and one mile for projects with bicycle improvements. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (with the exception of vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles, for all projects. Projects will then be scored relative to each other, by ranking the raw scores from highest (20 points) to lowest (1 point).

- Population
- Employment
- Population Density
- Employment Density
- Intersection Density
- Activity Centers
- Vehicle Ownership

ATGP EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT AND PARKING SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Non-Capital Grants)

NO.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS POSSIBLE
1.	ALL GRANTS		PLANNING	E/A/E	PARKING
A.	Relationship to Program Objectives	How well does the proposed project address program objectives?	30	20	20
B.	Comprehensiveness	<p>Planning: How comprehensive is the proposed plan? (geographic area and emphasis on bike/ped/traffic calming, CATS)</p> <p>Education/awareness/encouragement: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project? Scale also</p> <p>Parking: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?</p>	16	16	10
C.	Methodology	<p>Planning: How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals?</p> <p>Education/awareness/encouragement, parking: How effective will the proposed effort be in meeting the demonstrated need and project goals?</p>	30	30	10
D.	Community Support	<p>Planning: Does the planning project include an inclusive process?</p> <p>Other: Does the project involve broad segments of the community and does it have broad and meaningful community support?</p>	20	16	10
E.	Matching Funds	<p>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation. 	20	20	20
F.	Cost/Benefit	Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount	20	20	20
G.	Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033 Points	Points will be allocated according to methodology described in Policy No. 033	50	50	50

NO.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS POSSIBLE
2.	EDUCATION, AWARENESS, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY		PLANNING	E/A/E	PARKING
A.	Evaluation	How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?		20	10
B.	Innovation	Is this project new to the region and does it have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region?		10	30
3.	PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY		PLANNING	E/A/E	PARKING
A.	Demand (GIS analysis)	Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.	20		20
		TOTAL POINTS	200	200	200