MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, March 5, 2015

9:30 to 11 a.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Staff Contact: Alex Estrella
(619) 699-1928
alex.estrella@sandag.org

Beginning in February, the parking garage elevators at Wells Fargo Plaza will undergo a six month mechanical modernization. During this period, only one garage elevator will be in service. Please allow yourself extra time to make your way up from the garage to the SANDAG offices and Board Room. For those requiring special assistance, please call the SANDAG front desk in advance of any meetings at (619) 699-1900.

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS

• REGIONAL BIKE NETWORK BRAND

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, March 5, 2015

ITEM NO.  RECOMMENDATION

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the meeting coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the meeting coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to working group members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. CTAC members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES  APPROVE

The CTAC is asked to review and approve the minutes from its February 5, 2015, meeting.

REPORTS

+4. TransNet REGIONAL CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FEE ADJUSTMENT AND ANNUAL SUBMITTAL OF FUNDING PROGRAMS BY LOCAL JURISDICTIONS (Marney Cox and Ariana zur Nieden)  CONSENT

In accordance with the TransNet Extension Ordinance, each local agency must submit its Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) funding program to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee by April 1 of each year in order to remain eligible for TransNet local street and roads funding. In addition, the TransNet Ordinance requires SANDAG to adjust the RTCIP fee amount on July 1 of each year based upon the construction cost index. At the February 27, 2015, meeting, the Board of Directors approved a 2.5 percent RTCIP fee adjustment beginning July 1, 2015.

+5. REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS (JENNY RUSSO)  DISCUSSION

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as biking and walking. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will adopt the ATP Guidelines and fund estimate for the second cycle of ATP funding on March 26, 2015. The ATP Guidelines require 40 percent of the fund estimate to be allocated by the regional Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) through a competitive selection process. MPOs, in administering the Regional ATP, are permitted to utilize a different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged community with CTC approval. The draft Regional ATP call for projects will be discussed with CTAC members to solicit feedback.
6. **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: EVALUATION PANEL FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING (Carolina Gregor)**

   SANDAG needs to create an evaluation panel to score the proposals that will be submitted for the third cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. The evaluation panel will consist of two members each from the CTAC and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, as well as staff representatives from SANDAG, Caltrans, the transit operators, and the academic community. A balance of subregional representation will be sought to the extent possible. The CTAC should appoint two members and an alternate to the evaluation panel. Members can only serve on the evaluation panel if their jurisdiction is not submitting a proposal for the program. The work of the evaluation panel will be conducted during April 2015.

7. **REGIONAL BIKE NETWORK BRAND (Beth Robrahn and Elizabeth Cox)**

   SANDAG has developed a new brand for the San Diego Regional Bike Network to represent regional bikeway projects as well as programs and services designed to support and encourage more people to ride a bike for transportation. The brand also will present biking as a viable, practical, and reasonable choice for everyday travel, with a goal of influencing a positive attitude about more people riding bikes in the San Diego region. SANDAG Active Transportation and Communications staff will present the new brand and provide examples of its application.

8. **CALTRANS UPDATES**

   Caltrans will provide an update on various local programs, funding program deadlines, and announcements regarding upcoming conferences.

9. **ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**

   The next CTAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 2, 2015.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
FEBRUARY 5, 2015, MEETING MINUTES

The meeting of the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Mario Sanchez (City of El Cajon) at 9:40 a.m.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The attendance sheet for this meeting is attached.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the CTAC on any issue. There were no public comments.

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Item 3A: Approval of November 6, 2014, meeting minutes.

Action: Upon a motion by Mohammad Sammak (Solana Beach) and a second by Linda Marabian (City of San Diego), the CTAC approved the November 6, 2014, meeting minutes.

Yes: Chair Sanchez, Vice-Chair Frank Rivera (Chula Vista), Ed Walton (Coronado), Kipp Hefner (Encinitas), Julie Procopio (Escondido), Hank Levien (Imperial Beach), Ms. Marabian, Ramin Abidi (County of San Diego), Mr. Sammak; No: None; Abstain: Marshall Plantz (Carlsbad), and Gary Kellison (Oceanside); Absent: City of Del Mar, City of La Mesa, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, City of Santee, City of Vista, Metropolitan Transit System, and North County Transit District.

Item 3B: Approval of January 8, 2015, meeting minutes.

Action: Upon a motion by Ms. Marabian and a second by Mr. Sammak, the CTAC approved the January 8, 2015, meeting minutes.

Yes: Chair Sanchez, Mr. Plantz, Mr. Walton, Ms. Procopio, Mr. Kellison, Ms. Marabian, Mr. Abidi, and Mr. Sammak; No: None; Abstain: Vice-Chair Rivera, Mr. Hefner, and Mr. Levien; Absent: City of Del Mar, City of La Mesa, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, City of Santee, City of Vista, Metropolitan Transit System, and North County Transit District.
REPORTS

4. CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP ROSTER REVIEW
   (DISCUSSION)

Alex Estrella (SANDAG) requested that CTAC members review and provide updated membership
representative contact information for the 2015 calendar year. The membership roster would also
be used to update membership list in anticipation of the upcoming submittals of the form
700 Statement of Economic Interest for 2014.

5. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROPOSED FEE
   ADJUSTMENT (DISCUSSION)

Arian zur Nieden (SANDAG) announced the proposed 2.5 percent annual RTCIP fee adjustment that
will be presented for Board of Directors approval on February 27, 2015. The fee adjustment is in
accordance with the Transnet Extension Ordinance, which requires that SANDAG adjust the
Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) fee on annual basis. The most
recent annual adjustment raised the minimum RTCIP exaction by two percent, from $2,209 to
$2,254 beginning July 1, 2014. Staff evaluated construction cost trends and relevant indices, and
based on this analysis a proposed 2.5 percent fee adjustment will be recommended to the Board of
Directors for approval. This would raise the minimum RTCIP exaction from $2,254 to $2,310. Staff
will provide an update on the Board of Director’s final action at the March 5, 2015, CTAC meeting.

A question was raised regarding the procedures for expending the RTCIP funds. Staff indicated that
once the ordinance from the respected agencies is passed and thus allowing the collection of funds
then the procedures follow the traditional programming process; the RTCIP funds need to be
programmed into the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

7. TransNet LOCAL STREET AND ROAD PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT (DISCUSSION)

Item Number 7 was moved ahead of Item Number 6 due to SANDAG staff request. Mr. Estrella
reminded CTAC members that the data request submittals for the Local Street and Road Program
Annual Report has been issued by Miguel Arciniega and requested that the information be
submitted by February 20, 2015. It was also announced that staff will be reaching out and request
that CTAC members provide the Independent Tax Payers Oversight Committee (ITOC) with a brief
presentation of corresponding Local Street and Road Program highlights. Mr. Estrella will be
looking at agency volunteers on a quarterly basis. Mr. Rivera has volunteered to be the first and will
be going to the upcoming ITOC meeting on February 11, 2015.

Staff also introduced and highlighted the development of a new tool that will become part of the
ProjectTrak submittal process. The intent is to institute this new data collection as part of the
ProjectTrak process in an effort to facilitate the collection of Local Street and Road Program project.
The intent is that this new tool will minimalize work effort and help standardize the process for
collecting Local Street and Road Program information. Michelle Smith (SANDAG) provided an overview
of the new tool. Staff proposed that the reporting be done on a biannual basis and to work on a
project by project basis. The biggest issue which was brought up to the agencies was the desire to find
a consistent measurement value to be used with the new tool and requested input and feedback from
CTAC members. As a first step, CTAC members suggested that several agencies serve as test agencies to
pilot the new tool. Two agencies agreed to volunteer to participate in the new ProjectTrak submittal process; Mr. Plantz and Mr. Kellison. Staff also asked the agencies to provide any input regarding the new tool and or reach out Ms. Smith for any questions. CTAC members will be provided with an update with the findings from the testing session with the two volunteer agencies and will also provide any future information on the planned rollout of the new tool at a future meeting.

6. QUARTERLY TransNet FINANCIAL REPORTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2014 (DISCUSSION)

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin (SANDAG) provided CTAC members with the Local Agency Street and Road Balances sheet. The balance sheet lists each agency’s committed funds for local streets and roads as of December 31, 2014. The balance sheet also highlights the agencies whose estimated committed funds as of June 2015 fall below the 75 percent threshold. Staff requested that local jurisdictions who fall below the 75 percent threshold prepare a letter to be presented at the next ITOC meeting on Wednesday, February 11, 2015. The letters must provide an explanation of local agency and street and road balances and may be submitted to Ms. Kondrat-Dauphin at lisa.kondrat-dauphin@sandag.org by Tuesday, February 10, 2015, at 12 noon. Post note: Upon staff’s review and City of Vista input for the Local Street and Road Balance sheet for the City of Vista, it was determined that the appropriate value that should have been listed in the Quarterly TransNet Financial Balance sheet for anticipated percentage to be spent by June 30, 2015, should have been and has been corrected to 113 percent.

8. DESIGNATION OF ROUTES OF SIGNIFICANCE (DISCUSSION)

James Dreisbach-Towle (SANDAG) informed CTAC members about Caltrans Headquarters initiated coordination with designated regional transportation agencies to identify and designate Routes of Significance (RoS). In compliance with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: A legacy for Users, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) under regulation 23 CFR 511 Subpart C, requires states to collaborate with local or regional agencies to designate RoS in metropolitan areas with a population exceeding one million. RoS are defined as non-interstate roadways in metropolitan areas that are designated by states as meriting the collection and provisions of information related to traffic and travel conditions. There are currently six regional areas in California that meet this requirement and these areas fall under the jurisdiction of multiple Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. Monitoring real-time traffic and travel conditions on roadways and sharing this information with the traveling public improves the security of the surface transportation system, addresses congestion problems, supports improved response to weather events and surface transportation incidents, and facilitates the dissemination of real time traveler information.

Staff was informed that RoS package submittals are due to the state by April 10, 2015, and must meet four provisions of data criteria designed to enhance traffic and traveler information services which include; construction activities where the availability of information about full construction activities that close or reopen roadways or lanes will be ten minutes or less from the time of the closure or reopening, roadway or lane blocking incidents where the information related to roadway or lane blocking traffic incidents will be ten minutes or less from the time that the incident is verified, roadway weather observations where the availability of information about hazardous driving conditions and roadway or lane closures or blockages because of adverse weather conditions will be ten minutes or less from the time of hazardous condition, blockage, or closure is observed, and travel
time information where the availability of information along limited access roadway segments will be ten minutes or less from the time that the travel time calculation is completed. The information for all four provisions must be 85 percent accurate and available 90 percent of the time.

It was also noted that the next call for RoS package submittals is planned for 2018. Submittals by CTAC members must be turned in to Mr. Dreisbach-Towle by Friday, April 3, 2015. For further information or questions please contact James Dreisbach-Towle at (619) 699-1914 or james.towle@sandag.org

9. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM – INTERACTIVE STORY MAP (INFORMATION)

Suchi Mukherjee (SANDAG) provided an overview of an interactive map that highlights the project status information for projects funded through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program. The map is available at: keepsandiegomoving.com/grants. Staff also announced that applications for new funds and the grant programs are due March 20, 2015. While CTAC didn’t have any comments about the story map, they did express a few concerns about the grant application process. CTAC members were concerned that the file sizes requested for electronic submittals might be too large for applications and the concern that many jurisdictions may be submitting all at once. They expressed concern about the system crashing, who they would contact in case they were having issues, and what “back-up” plan staff might have in place to facilitate application submittals. Staff mentioned that the earlier the agencies submit the applications during the two week submittal window, the more of an opportunity staff has to troubleshoot. However, CTAC members expressed that they might wait until the last day to submit in order to get their city council resolution, as this is an onerous process.

10. CALTRANS UPDATES (INFORMATION)

Active Transportation Program (ATP) – the upcoming deadline for ATP Allocation and/or Extension Request packages to the District Local Assistance Engineers (DLAE) is March 30, 2015, for the May 27-28, 2015, California Transportation Commission meeting in Fresno.

Local Programs Procedures 15-01 Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) Update Chapter 10 “Consultant Selection” – Chapter 10 of the LAPM has been updated, as recommended in the findings form the Division of Local Assistance’s (DLA) “Process Review of the Local Agency A&E Consultant Selection and Procurement” dated July 7, 2014. The updated chapter incorporates process flow charts; clarifies and provides added guidance; provides more comprehensive simplified checklist (Exhibit 10-C); improves exhibits; and removes duplicate exhibits. The link to Chapter 10 of LAPM is dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/prog_p/ch10.pdf

Office Bulletin (OB) 14-08 “Notice to Proceed” REMINDER to Agencies – new policy requires that local agencies submit a copy of their notice of contract award, Notice of Proceed letter, or equivalent, to their respective DLAE concurrent with its issuance to the contractor, for all federal-aid projects. Please submit relevant documents to the following:

- Erwin Gojuangco – DLAE, erwin.gojuangco@dot.ca.gov
- Anna Alonso – Construction Oversight Engineer, anna.alonso@dot.ca.gov
- Your Respective Local Assistance Area Engineer
Notice of Proposed Rule Making on National Highway System – FHWA released the Notice of Proposed Rule Making on National Highway System Pavement and Bridge Performance Measures. This proposes rules for assessing pavement and bridge condition, target establishment, and reporting. Comments are due to FHWA on April 6, 2015.

federalregister.gov/articles/2015/01/05/2014-30085/national-performance-management-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway

Upcoming Training

- Procuring A&E Contracts – March 10, 2015 – 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., located at Caltrans District 11 offices, in the Garcia Room 125A and 125B. Training is now open for enrollment. Space is limited so please reserve your spot as soon as possible.
- ATP Training: Disadvantaged Communities – TENTATIVE DATE/TIME – March 12, 2015 – 8 am to 5 p.m., located at Caltrans District 11 offices in the Gallegos Room 134
- ATP Training: Cycle 2 Call for Projects – TENTATIVE DATE/TIME – April 21, 2015 – 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. located at Caltrans District 11 offices in the Gallegos Room 134
- Federal Aid Series – May 18 – May 22, 2015 located in Caltrans District 11 San Diego region. Specific times and location to be announced at a later date
- For question and to register for an upcoming training, please contact the District 11 Local Assistance Training Coordinator, Debo Ledesma-Ribera at debora.ledesma-ribera@dot.ca.gov or by calling (619) 278-3766

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The next CTAC meeting is scheduled for March 5, 2015.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Sanchez adjourned the meeting at 10:55 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall Plantz, First Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Bilse, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Frank Rivera, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Kaplan, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Valle/Rick Hopkins, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Ed Walton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Newton, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Tim Thiele</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Minicilli, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mario Sanchez, Chair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majed Al-Ghafry, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Ed Deane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Kipp Hefner, Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Julie Procopio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Domingues, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Hank Levien</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Kasner, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Greg Humora</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Feilen, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dann Marquardt, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Leon Firsht</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Stephen Manganiello</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Kuna Muthusamy, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Gary Kellison</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David DiPierro, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Steve Crosby</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melody Rocco, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Linda Marabian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Chui, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abi Palaseyed, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>Ramin Abidi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Rayback, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirous Daylamian, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Vo, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Little, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Minjie Mei</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Mohammad Sammak</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Goldberg, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Greenstein, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Greg Mayer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Shell, First Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husam Hasenin, Second Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Mark Thomsen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Bridget Hennessey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADVISORY MEMBERS LISTED BELOW (ATTENDANCE NOT COUNTED FOR QUORUM PURPOSES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caltrans</th>
<th>Melina Pereira</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER ATTENDEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANDAG STAFF MEMBERS LISTED BELOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Estrella – Miguel Arciniega – Ellison Alegre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dreisbach-Towle - Ariana zur Nieden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin - Suchi Mukherjee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Smith – Dawn Vetese – Jose Nuncio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TransNet REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FEE ADJUSTMENT AND ANNUAL SUBMITTAL OF FUNDING PROGRAMS BY LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

Introduction

The Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP), an element of the TransNet Extension Ordinance, requires the 18 cities and the County of San Diego to collect an exaction from the private sector for each new housing unit constructed in their jurisdiction. The TransNet Extension Ordinance further requires the submittal of the RTCIP funding programs to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee on an annual basis by April 1.

Discussion

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires SANDAG to annually adjust the minimum RTCIP fee amount on July 1 of each year, based on an analysis of construction cost indices, but never less than two percent. The purpose of this annual adjustment is to ensure the RTCIP retains its purchasing power to improve the regional arterial system. Staff has evaluated construction cost trends and relevant indices, and based on this analysis; a 2.5 percent fee adjustment was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors at its February 27, 2015, meeting, raising the minimum RTCIP exaction from $2,254 to $2,310 beginning July 1, 2015 (Attachment 1).

In accordance with RTCIP provisions, local jurisdictions within the San Diego region are required to submit their RTCIP funding programs by April 1 each year. The purpose of each jurisdiction's funding program is to provide additional revenue to fund improvements to the regional arterial system necessitated by development of newly constructed residences. Failure by a local jurisdiction to submit its funding program results in a loss of eligibility to receive its TransNet local streets and roads funding for the upcoming fiscal year. All 18 cities and the County of San Diego are required to submit certification that their RTCIP funding programs are still in place and include the necessary components to fulfill the TransNet Extension Ordinance requirements. Certification must be received by April 1, 2015. This will be verified as part of the annual fiscal and compliance audit process for FY 2015.

Attachment: 1. February 27, 2015, Board of Directors Report – Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program: Proposed Fee Adjustment

Key Staff Contacts: Marney Cox, (619) 699-1930, marney.cox@sandag.org
Ariana zur Nieden, (619) 699-6961, ariana.zurnieden@sandag.org
Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires the 18 cities and the County of San Diego to collect an exaction from the private sector for each new housing unit constructed in that jurisdiction (units constructed for extremely low, very-low, low, and moderate income households may be exempted) for contribution to the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP). RTCIP revenue is required to be used to construct improvements on the Regional Arterial System, such as new or widened arterials, traffic signal coordination and other traffic improvements, freeway interchange and related freeway improvements, railroad grade separations, and improvements required for express bus and rail transit. The TransNet Extension Ordinance further requires SANDAG to adjust the RTCIP fee amount each year. The purpose of this annual adjustment is to ensure the RTCIP retains its purchasing power to improve the Regional Arterial System.

The most recent annual adjustment raised the minimum RTCIP exaction by 2 percent, from $2,209 to $2,254 beginning July 1, 2014. Staff evaluated construction cost trends and relevant indices, and based on the analysis discussed below, a 2.5 percent fee adjustment is recommended to the Board of Directors for approval at its February 27, 2015, meeting. This would raise the minimum RTCIP exaction from $2,254 to $2,310 beginning July 1, 2015.

Discussion

Background

The purpose of the RTCIP is to help ensure future development contributes its proportional share of the funding needed to pay for the Regional Arterial System and related regional transportation facility improvements, as defined in the most recent Regional Transportation Plan adopted by SANDAG. The RTCIP funding programs fall under the responsibility of the 19 local jurisdictions, which have established these programs under the state’s Mitigation Fee Act. The jurisdictions must maintain their RTCIP funding programs and comply with specific administrative requirements in order to remain eligible for TransNet local streets and road funding.
Section 9 of the TransNet Extension Ordinance requires the RTCIP exaction to be adjusted annually in an amount not to exceed the percentage increase set forth in the Engineering Construction Cost Index (CCI) published by the Engineering News Record (ENR), or a similar CCI. However, the Ordinance also states that in no event shall the adjustment be less than 2 percent per year.

Analysis of Construction Cost Indices

The TransNet Extension Ordinance allows for flexibility in choosing an appropriate CCI, one that most closely reflects price trends experienced by the TransNet construction program over the past year. SANDAG staff evaluated changes recorded in the ENR CCI and the Caltrans statewide CCI. Each index collects a different set of cost factors to determine construction cost trends.

The ENR CCI represents an average from 20 cities across the nation and is based on monthly price changes in four areas: lumber, cement, structural steel, and labor. From December 2013 to December 2014 the national ENR CCI rose 2.8 percent. Although San Diego is not tracked in the national index, Los Angeles is one of the 20 cities that are tracked. Los Angeles, because of its proximity, may reflect construction cost trends more similar to those in San Diego the Los Angeles CCI increased by 2.5 percent (January 2014 to January 2015; December 2014 not available). Both the CCI for the nation and for Los Angeles show moderate cost increases year-over-year, similar to trends TransNet has experienced in its construction bids during the past year. In addition, both indices indicate some softening of cost pressures (rates of increase are slowing). These moderate increases in the CCI reflect broader trends in the economy, which has experienced soft to declining commodity prices such as gas, diesel fuel, copper, and cement, as well as very moderate wage increases.

The Caltrans CCI is based on quarterly price changes gathered from transportation project bids from throughout the state for earthwork, aggregate, concrete, asphalt, and steel. The Caltrans CCI rose 25.3 percent over the past year (third quarter 2013 to third quarter 2014, which is the latest available). Over the past quarter (second quarter 2014 to third quarter 2014) however, the index trend has become more stable, rising 2.7 percent. Although year-over-year the Caltrans CCI has exhibited a highly volatile trend, the more recent data suggest that the broader economic trends mentioned above are beginning to settle down these cost trends.

Based on staff’s evaluation, the Caltrans CCI has experienced significant fluctuations based on large swings in the price bids for excavation and pavement, which likely will moderate during the coming year. The moderate increases exhibited by both the national ENR and Los Angeles CCI reflect the slow turnaround in the broader construction industry. According to the ENR analysis of these construction cost trends, there may be some price rise spillover occurring from the rebounding housing market (primarily multi-family) for materials and labor that is relied on by various areas of construction. The general consensus is for construction cost increases to moderate during 2015. In light of this evaluation of construction cost trends during 2014, staff is recommending that the ENR CCI for Los Angeles through January 2015 be used to set the increase for the RTCIP fee. As indicated above, the ENR CCI for Los Angeles increased by 2.5 percent between January 2014 and January 2015. A 2.5 percent increase would raise the RTCIP fee to $2,310 starting July 1, 2015.
**Next Steps**

In accordance with TransNet Extension Ordinance provisions, each jurisdiction’s RTCIP Funding Program must be submitted for review by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) by April 1 of each year in order to remain eligible for TransNet local streets and road funding. The annual submittal of RTCIP funding programs by local jurisdictions is scheduled for review at the April 8, 2015, ITOC meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Key Staff Contacts:   Marney Cox, (619) 699-1930, marney.cox@sandag.org  
Ariana zur Nieden, (619) 699-6961, ariana.zurnieden@sandag.org
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ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION
PROGRAM GUIDELINES
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL COMPETITION
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BACKGROUND OF PROGRAM

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The ATP is administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

State and federal law segregate the ATP into multiple, overlapping components. ATP funds are distributed through three separate competitive programs:

1. **Small Urban/Rural Competition** - Ten percent of ATP funds are distributed to small urban and rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less via a competitive process administered by the CTC.

2. **Statewide Competition** - Fifty percent of ATP funds are distributed to projects competitively awarded by the CTC on a statewide basis.

3. **Regional Competition** - Forty percent of ATP funds are distributed to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000. These funds are distributed based on total MPO population. The funds allocated under this portion of the ATP must be selected through a competitive process by the MPOs. As an MPO, SANDAG is the administrator for the San Diego regional competition. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition must be considered in the Regional Competition.

A minimum of 25 percent of the funds distributed by each of the three competitions must benefit disadvantaged communities.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the ATP is to implement strategies that increase and attract active transportation users; provide facilities for walking and biking in urban, suburban, and rural portions of the region; and to provide connections between them. Projects and programs funded through this program are consistent with the vision of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Diego Region.

In order to help implement active transportation projects in the San Diego Region, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) invests Transportation Development Act and TransNet regional funds regularly for infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects. ATP funds from the State of California provide an important new funding source for active transportation projects. As part of the Cycle 2 San Diego Regional ATP competition, $4.361 million will be available in the second cycle of this competitive program.

PROGRAM GOALS

California Senate Bill (SB) 99 establishes California’s ATP with six program goals that provide a foundation for the state and regional ATP programs:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) and SB 391 (Chapter 585, Statutes of 2009)
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity though the use of programs including but not limited to projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users
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ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

The applicant and/or implementing agency for ATP funds assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants and/or implementing agencies must be able to comply with all federal and state laws, regulations, and policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement). Refer to Chapter 4, Agreements, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) for guidance and procedures on Master Agreements. The LAPM is available here: dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/lapm.htm.

The following entities, within the State of California, are eligible to apply for ATP funds:

- **Local, Regional, or State Agencies** – examples include city, county, MPO, and Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA)
- **Caltrans**
- **Transit Agencies** – Any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- **Natural Resources or Public Land Agencies** – Federal, tribal, state, or local agency responsible for natural resources or public land administration. Examples include:
  - State or local park or forest agencies
  - State or local fish and game, or wildlife agencies
  - Department of the Interior Land Management Agencies
  - U.S. Forest Service
- **Public Schools or School Districts**
- **Tribal Governments** – Federally-recognized Native American Tribes. For funding awarded to a tribal government, a fund transfer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be necessary. A tribal government may also partner with another eligible entity to apply, if desired.
- **Private Nonprofit Tax-Exempt Organizations** – May apply for projects eligible for Recreational Trail Program funds, recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to non-motorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails. Projects must benefit the general public, and not only a private entity.
- **Other** - Any other entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails that the CTC determines to be eligible.

PARTNERING WITH IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Entities that are unable to apply for ATP funds or that are unable to enter into a Master Agreement with the state, must partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. Entities that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project may partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement (e.g. letter of intent) must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation. The implementing agency will be responsible and accountable for the use and expenditure of program funds.
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ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

All projects must be selected through a competitive process and must meet one or more of the program goals. Because the majority of funds in the ATP are federal funds, projects must be federal-aid eligible. There are four different eligible project types:

1. INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

   Capital projects that will further the goals of the ATP. This typically includes the environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction phases of a capital (facilities) project. A new infrastructure project will not be programmed without a complete project study report (PSR) or PSR equivalent. The application may be considered a PSR equivalent if it defines and justifies the project scope, cost, and schedule. Though the PSR or equivalent may focus on the project components proposed for programming, it must provide at least a preliminary estimate of costs for all components.

   A capital improvement that is required as a condition for private development approval or permits is not eligible for funding from the ATP.

   • SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECTS

      For a project to contribute toward the Safe Routes to School funding requirement, 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. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.

   • RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROJECTS

      For trail projects that are primarily recreational to be eligible for ATP funding, the projects must meet the federal requirements of the Recreational Trails Program as such projects may not be eligible for funding from other sources (fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/). Multi-purpose trails and paths that serve both recreational and transportation purposes are generally eligible in the ATP, so long as they are consistent with one or more goals of the program.

2. NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

   Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of the ATP. The CTC intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure projects on pilot and start-up projects that can demonstrate funding for ongoing efforts. The ATP funds are not intended to fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students.

3. INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS WITH NON-INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENTS

   Projects that have both infrastructure and non-infrastructure components will be scored using the scoring criteria that represents the higher proportion of the project. For example, a project that is more than 50 percent infrastructure will be scored using the infrastructure scoring criteria. Combination projects need to specify the percentage of each component (e.g. 75 percent infrastructure and 25 percent non-infrastructure).
4. PLANS

The development of a community-wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.

- ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan. An active transportation plan prepared by a city or county may be integrated into the circulation element of its general plan or a separate plan which is compliant or will be brought into compliance with the Complete Streets Act, Assembly Bill 1358 (Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008). An active transportation plan must include, but not be limited to, the following components or explain why the component is not applicable:

- The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips resulting from implementation of the plan.
- The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.
- A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other destinations.
- A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities.
- A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities.
- A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments.
- A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.
- A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities at major transit hubs. These must include, but are not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.
- A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle and pedestrian networks to designated destinations.
- A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.
- A description of bicycle and pedestrian safety, education, and encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists and pedestrians.
- A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.
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- A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy.

- A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.

- A description of past expenditures for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses.

- A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.

- A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district. If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.

A city, county, school district, or transit district that has prepared an active transportation plan may submit the plan to the county transportation commission or transportation planning agency for approval. The city, county, school district, or transit district may submit an approved plan to Caltrans in connection with an application for funds for active transportation facilities which will implement the plan.
EXAMPLE PROJECTS

Below is a list of projects considered generally eligible for ATP funding. This list is not intended to be comprehensive; other types of projects that are not on this list may also be eligible if they further the goals of the program.

- Development of new bikeways and walkways that improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users.
- Improvements to existing bikeways and walkways, which improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users.
  - Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways and walkways.
  - Preventative maintenance of bikeways and walkways with the primary goal of extending the service life of the facility.
- Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Safe Routes to School projects that improve the safety of children walking and bicycling to school, in accordance with Section 1404 of Public Law 109-59.
- Safe routes to transit projects, which will encourage transit by improving biking and walking routes to mass transportation facilities and school bus stops.
- Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park and ride lots, rail and transit stations, and ferry docks and landings for the benefit of the public.
- Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit, including rail and ferries.
- Establishment or expansion of a bike share program.
- Recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to non-motorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails.
- Development of a community wide bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.
- Education programs to increase bicycling and walking, and other non-infrastructure investments that demonstrate effectiveness in increasing active transportation, including but not limited to:
  - Development and implementation of bike-to-work or walk-to-work school day/month programs.
  - Conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts, walkability and/or bikeability assessments or audits, or pedestrian and/or bicycle safety analysis to inform plans and projects.
  - Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.
  - Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans.
  - Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs.
  - Components of open streets events directly linked to the promotion of a new infrastructure project.
  - Targeted enforcement activities around high pedestrian and/or bicycle injury and/or fatality locations (intersections or corridors). These activities cannot be general traffic enforcement but must be tied to improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
  - School crossing guard training.
  - School bicycle clinics.
  - Development and implementation of programs and tools that maximize use of available and emerging technologies to implement the goals of the ATP.
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PROJECT APPLICATION

ATP project applications are available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html.

A project application must include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant’s governing board. Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, documentation of the agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency must be submitted with the project application. A project application must also include documentation of all other funds committed to the projects.

One hardcopy and one electronic (PDF) copy of the application must be received by SANDAG no later than 4 p.m. on Tuesday, July 14, 2015. Applications should be addressed to:

Jenny R. Russo
Regional ATP Administrator
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Applicants that submit applications for the statewide competition will automatically be considered for the regional competition. Applicants do not need to submit another hardcopy of their application to SANDAG if they have already provided one as part of the statewide competition.

PRE-APPLICATION WORKSHOP

SANDAG will conduct a pre-application workshop for prospective applicants to provide an overview of the program and the application process and answer any questions. Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend this workshop. The workshop will take place on Tuesday, June 9, 2015, from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. in the Seventh Floor Board Room at the SANDAG offices.

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

This “Call for Projects” package refers to a number of documents that will help applicants prepare an application. Those documents can be found on the SANDAG website at: sandag.org/atpfunding.

QUESTIONS

If you have any questions regarding the regional ATP program, please contact:

Jenny Russo
jenny.russo@sandag.org
(619) 699-7314
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SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION

NON-INFRASTRUCTURE APPLICATIONS

Applicants that would like to be considered for non-infrastructure funding for the regional ATP competition will be asked to answer the following question, as a supplement to the state-wide application:

- **INNOVATION**: Does this project propose any solutions that are new to the San Diego Region?

INFRASTRUCTURE APPLICATIONS

Applicants that would like to be considered for infrastructure funding for the regional ATP competition will be asked to answer the following questions, as a supplement to the statewide application:

- **PROJECT READINESS – COMPLETION OF MAJOR MILESTONES**: Which of the following steps for the project have been completed?
  - Community Active Transportation Strategy/Neighborhood-Level Plan/Corridor Study
  - Environmental Documentation/Certification
  - Right-of-Way Acquisition
  - Final Design

- **LINKAGES TO BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND TRANSIT NETWORKS**: Provide a map that clearly illustrates the project’s relationship to existing local and regional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities. Specifically, note if the project closes any gaps in bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

- **EFFECTIVENESS AND COMPREHENSIVENESS OF PROPOSED PROJECT**: Describe the specific traffic calming, pedestrian, and bicycle treatments being proposed and why they are particularly suited to address the needs of the project area.

- **COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS**: Describe any programs that complement the proposed infrastructure improvements, including awareness, education efforts, increased enforcement, bicycle parking, etc. and who will be implementing them. In order to achieve points, programs must be included in the project Scope of Work, Schedule, and Budget.

- **INNOVATION**: Is this project an FHWA or State Experimentation Effort? Does this project propose any solutions that are new to the San Diego region?
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PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

STEP 1: ELIGIBILITY SCREEN
Applications will be screened for eligibility. Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible based on the guidelines below. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition, but deemed eligible for the state program will be considered; applicants will be required to submit a supplemental application (see page 9).

STEP 2: QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION
SANDAG will conduct the quantitative evaluation for all Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and formula-based scores.

STEP 3: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION
A multidisciplinary review panel representing a broad array of active transportation-related interests, such as academia, advocacy, and public health, will be convened to score the qualitative portion of the application. Panel members will not review or comment on applications from their own organization; or in the case of the County of San Diego, from their own department. Eligible applicants that do not apply for funding will be encouraged to participate.

STEP 4: INITIAL RANKING
An initial list of project rankings will be produced.

STEP 5: DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES ADJUSTMENT
Rankings will be adjusted to ensure that 25 percent of the available funds are dedicated to projects and programs benefiting Disadvantaged Communities as identified in the State Guidelines.

STEP 6: FINAL RANKING
Rankings will be provided to the CTC in November 2015 for adoption in December 2015.
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SCORING AND SELECTION PROCESS

After applications have been received and reviewed for eligibility, proposed projects will be scored and selected according to the process outlined below.

EVALUATION PANEL

The proposed projects will be scored by an evaluation panel consisting of Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) members, Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) members, Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) members, and/or an academic with expertise in a related field. Panel members must not represent local jurisdictions that have submitted applications for funding under Cycle 2 from their own agency/department, may not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted projects, nor may they (nor the organizations they represent) receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future. The Scoring Criteria are specified in the Scoring Criteria Matrix for each grant program.

SCORING APPROACH FOR CATEGORIES OF QUESTIONS

The criteria upon which projects will be scored fall into two general categories:

1. **Objective criteria** that are data-oriented and relate to existing or planned bicycle and pedestrian network connections, access to transit services, other transportation safety measures.

2. **Subjective criteria** that relate to the quality of the proposed plan or project.

Objective data-oriented criteria will be based on Geographic Information System (GIS), the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy, Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, and the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. For information that is not readily available to SANDAG, Applicants will be asked to provide supplementary data. Points for objective criteria will be calculated by SANDAG Technical Services Department staff in accordance with the point structures delineated in the scoring criteria, and are marked with an asterisk (*) in the Scoring Criteria Matrix of each program.

For subjective criteria related to the quality of the proposed project, applicants will need to provide responses. Points for subjective criteria will be awarded by the members of the evaluation panel.

PROJECT RANKINGS

Project rankings will be produced using a “Sum of Ranks” approach. Using this approach, projects will receive two scores: **objective** formula-based points that are calculated by SANDAG Technical Services Department staff and **subjective** quality-based points that are awarded by members of the Evaluation Panel. The **objective** points earned will be added to the **subjective** points awarded by each evaluator on the panel, and will then be translated into project rankings for each evaluator. For example, the project awarded the most points from a single evaluator will rank number one; the project awarded the second most points will rank number two; and so on (one being the best rank a project can receive). The rankings from each individual evaluator will then be summed for each project to produce an overall project ranking (sum of ranks). Therefore, projects with the lowest overall numerical rank will have performed the best.

The list of overall project rankings will be used to recommend funding allocations in order of rank. The top ranking projects (or the projects with the lowest overall numerical rank) will be recommended for funding in descending rank until funding is exhausted.

SELECTION PROCESS

SANDAG Contracts and Procurement staff will present the list of overall project rankings and corresponding funding recommendations to the Transportation Committee for recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors. The SANDAG Board will review and recommend the final list of projects to the CTC for consideration. The CTC will consider the Regional ATP project rankings in December 2015.
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PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Applicants must submit projects that meet all of the following criteria to be considered eligible for ATP funding.

CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

All projects submitted must be consistent with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The ATP will be evaluated for its effectiveness in increasing the use of active modes of transportation in California. Applicants that receive funding for a project must collect and submit data to Caltrans as described in the “Project Reporting” section of the statewide ATP Guidelines.

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

Unless programmed for state-only funding, project applicants must comply with the provisions of Title 23 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations and with the processes and procedures contained in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual and the Master Agreement with Caltrans. Below are examples of federal requirements that must be met when administering ATP projects.

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance and documentation is required on all projects. Refer to Chapter 6, Environmental Procedures, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on complying with NEPA and other federal environmentally related laws.

- Project applicants may not proceed with the final design of a project or request “Authorization to proceed with Right-of-Way” or “Authorization to proceed with Construction” until Caltrans has signed a Categorical Exclusion, a Finding of No Significant Impact, or a Record of Decision. Failure to follow this requirement will make the project ineligible for federal reimbursement.

- If the project requires the purchase of right of way (the acquisition of real property), the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 apply. For more information, refer to Chapter 13, Right of Way, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual.

- If the project applicant requires the consultation services of architects, landscape architects, land surveyors, or engineers, the procedures in the Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual must be followed.

- Contract documents are required to incorporate applicable federal requirements such as Davis Bacon wage rates, competitive bidding, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises/Equal Employment Opportunity provisions, etc. For more information, refer to Chapter 9, Civil Rights and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, and Chapter 12, Plans, Specifications & Estimate, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual.

Failure to comply with federal requirements may result in the repayment to the State of ATP funds.

FULLY FUNDED PROJECTS

A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the ATP.

MINIMUM REQUEST FOR FUNDS

In order to maximize the effectiveness of program funds and to encourage the aggregation of small projects into a comprehensive bundling of projects, the minimum request for ATP funds that will be considered is $250,000. This minimum does not apply to non-infrastructure projects, Safe Routes to Schools projects, and Recreational Trails projects.

MAXIMUM REQUEST FOR FUNDS

The total amount of funding requested by each applicant cannot exceed the total amount available ($4.36 million).
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MATCHING FUNDS

Matching funds are not required. If an applicant chooses to provide matching funds, those funds cannot be expended prior to the allocation of ATP funds in the same project phase (permits and environmental studies; plans; specifications and estimates; right-of-way capital outlay and support; and construction capital outlay and support). Matching funds must be expended concurrently and proportionately to the ATP funds. The matching funds may be adjusted before or shortly after contract award to reflect any substantive change in the bid compared to the estimated cost of the project.

DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. Scores are available at http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html
- At least 75 percent of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp.asp. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefitting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged.

MINIMUM DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES (INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS ONLY)

Proposed bicycle and pedestrian elements must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Chapter 10), the California MUTCD, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Projects may also use AASHTO standards and must also be consistent with the guidelines outlined in Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bike Plan and Planning and Designing for Pedestrians.

PROJECT READINESS (INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS ONLY)

Applicant must have completed a feasibility study or an equivalent evaluation of project feasibility. For smaller-scale projects, an equivalent evaluation of project feasibility must have included the following:

- Agency staff field evaluation
- Concept drawings
- Horizontal alignment
- Identification of potential challenges
- Identification of right-of-way
- Identification of environmental requirements
- Cost estimate
- Preliminary community input
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SANDAG BOARD POLICY NUMBER 031, RULE 21

Active transportation projects that are a component of major roadway reconstruction projects funded by TransNet, and therefore subject to the Routine Accommodations Provisions outlined in SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21, are not eligible.

BASELINE DATA COLLECTION

Applicants must include baseline data collection within the project application. Prior to project construction, a selected applicant must collect data on (at minimum) observed bicycle and pedestrian demand and safety in the project area, and submit results to SANDAG. A subset of selected applicants may be selected for in-depth evaluation by SANDAG, in which case, SANDAG will conduct the data collection effort with required participation from the selected applicants’ staff. Such in-depth evaluation conducted by SANDAG will take place solely for the purpose of SANDAG Active Transportation data collection and monitoring efforts, and will not impact the selected applicants’ budgets.

Bicycle and pedestrian observed demand data must be collected prior to project construction, through counts, observations of bicyclist/pedestrian/driver behavior, and intercept surveys using the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project methodology:

- Counts must be conducted prior to project construction, during National Documentation Days in the second week of September. Supplementary counts and surveys can be conducted during January, May, and July to provide seasonal data if desired.
- Counts should be conducted for two hours, at peak times relative to the facility. For example, facilities attracting utilitarian trips should be counted on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., whereas facilities attracting recreational trips should be counted on a Saturday, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.
- Counts must be conducted using standard forms, to be provided by SANDAG. Completed forms must be submitted to SANDAG as a project deliverable.

FUNDING FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

Funding from the ATP may be used to fund the development of community wide bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or active transportation plans in predominantly disadvantaged communities.

The first priority for the funding of active transportation plans will be for cities, counties, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, MPOs, school districts, or transit districts that have neither a bicycle plan, a pedestrian plan, a safe routes to schools plan, nor an active transportation plan. The second priority for the funding of active transportation plans will be for cities, counties, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, or MPOs that have a bicycle plan or a pedestrian plan but not both.

Applications for plans may not be combined with applications for infrastructure or other non-infrastructure projects.

REIMBURSEMENT

The ATP is a reimbursement program for eligible costs incurred. Reimbursement is requested through the invoice process detailed in Chapter 5, Accounting/Invoices, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual. Costs incurred prior to CTC allocation and, for federally funded projects, Federal Highway Administration project approval (i.e. Authorization to Proceed) are not eligible for reimbursement.

DESIGN STANDARDS

Streets and Highways Code Section 891 requires that all city, county, regional, and other local agencies responsible for the development or operation of bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted utilize all minimum safety design criteria established by Caltrans. Chapter 11, Design Standards, of the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual describes statewide design standards, specifications, procedures, guides, and references that are acceptable in the geometric, drainage, and structural design of Local Assistance projects. The chapter also describes design exception approval procedures, including the delegation of design exception approval authority to the City and
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County Public Works Directors for projects not on the state highway system. These standards and procedures, including the exception approval process, must be used for all ATP projects.

For capital projects off the state highway system, the project applicant will be responsible for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

All facilities constructed using ATP funds cannot revert to a non-ATP use for a minimum of 20 years or its actual useful life as documented in the project application, whichever is less, without approval of the CTC.
INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

How will projects be scored? The following narrative descriptions will be used to assist the evaluation panel in scoring applications. The Infrastructure Scoring Criteria Matrix on Page 21 is a summary of this information.

1. PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY

   A. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network

      NOTE: SANDAG’s Technical Services Department will calculate the points awarded for this criterion using the Regional Bicycle Network laid out in SANDAG Riding to 2050: The San Diego Region Bicycle Plan. Higher points will be awarded to projects proposing to construct part of the planned regional bikeway network. (Up to 8 points possible)

      • Will the proposed project directly connect to the Regional Bikeway Network? (6 points) OR
      • Will the proposed project construct part of the Regional Bikeway Network? (8 points)

   B. Completes Connection in Local Bicycle Network

      Points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap between existing local 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. For example, a project upgrading a connection between two Class II segments from a Class III to a Class II segment could be closing a gap. (Up to 8 points possible)

   C. Completes Connection in Existing Pedestrian Network

      Points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap between existing local 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. For example, a project upgrading a connection between two Class II segments from a Class III to a Class II segment could be closing a gap. (Up to 8 points possible)

   D. Connection to Transit

      NOTE: SANDAG’s Technical Services Department staff will calculate the points awarded for these criteria based on the transit facilities within particular distances of the project boundary.

      A regional transit station is defined as any station served by COASTER, SPRINTER, San Diego Trolley, Bus Rapid Transit, or Rapid Bus. Distance refers to walking distance based on actual available pathways. Projects that propose both bicycle and pedestrian improvements will be eligible to receive points for both modes in this category. (Up to 12 points possible)

      • Bicycle improvement within 1.5 miles of a regional transit station (6 points)

      and/or

      • Pedestrian improvement within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop (2 points)
      • Pedestrian improvement directly connects to a local transit stop (4 points)
      • Pedestrian improvement within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station (4 points)
      • Pedestrian improvement directly connects to a regional transit station (6 points)

   E. Safety and Access Improvements

      Points for this section will be awarded based on the applicant’s description of safety hazards and/or collision history, degree of hazard(s), and potential for increasing bicycle or pedestrian trips. Some hazards may be so unsafe as to prohibit access and therefore lack collision data. Projects lacking collision data may still receive points only for creating safe access or overcoming hazardous conditions; however, the highest scoring projects will present both.
To earn points without collision data, Applicant must describe detractors in the project area that prohibit safe access (ex. lack of facilities, high traffic volumes/speeds where bicycle/pedestrian trips would increase with safer access, freeway on/off ramps, blind curves, steep slopes, etc.) The evaluation panel will also consider vehicle speed limit and average daily traffic information in identifying the degree of hazard. (Up to 12 points possible)

- One to two correctable collisions (2 points)
- Three to four correctable collisions (4 points)
- Five or more correctable collisions (6 points)

and/or

- Creates safe access/overcomes hazardous conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians (6 points)

2. QUALITY OF PROJECT

This section will be scored using the guidance outlined in SANDAG Riding to 2050: The San Diego Region Bicycle Plan; Planning and Designing for Pedestrians; and the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide.

Points will be awarded based on the quality of proposed measures and the potential to address community needs identified by the Applicant. The highest scoring projects will make significant infrastructure changes that result in reduced speeds and safer environments for bicyclists and pedestrians, balance the needs of all modes, and include a broad array of devices to calm traffic and/or prioritize bicyclists and pedestrians. Low-scoring projects will have fewer features and make minimal improvements.

A. Impact and Effectiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures

Up to 5 points are available within each of the three project categories: bicycle, pedestrian, and/or traffic calming measures. Therefore, projects that propose improvements in more than one category are eligible to earn more points (up to 15 total points possible). In scoring traffic calming measures, the following minimum thresholds for frequency/effectiveness of traffic calming devices along a roadway will be taken into consideration:

- Residential Street (20 mph) = Devices every 250 feet (on either side)
- Collector or Main Street (25 mph) = Devices every 400 feet
- Arterial street (35 mph) = Devices every 800 feet

- How well will the proposed traffic calming address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation? (up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area? (up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area? (up to 5 points)

B. Program Objectives

Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project aligns with ATP objectives. (Up to 18 points possible)

C. Innovation

Points will be awarded based on the breadth of solutions proposed by the project that are new to the region. Refer to the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide for examples of innovative improvements. No points will be awarded for facilities or treatments that have received FHWA approval (ex. Sharrows), unless they are new to the region. The Applicant should determine whether the proposed improvements have been FHWA approved and make a determination prior to submitting this application. (Up to 8 points possible)

- Is this project an FHWA or State experimentation effort? (4 points)
3. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

This section will be scored based upon the Applicant’s demonstration of plans, policies, and programs that support the proposed project. Consideration will be given to both the breadth and depth of programs. The highest scoring projects will have an adopted Community Active Transportation Strategy that incorporates Complete Streets policies specific to the project area.

A. Complimentary Programs

Points will be awarded for demonstrating that the proposed project will be complemented by supportive programs including, but not limited to: awareness campaigns, education efforts, increased enforcement, and/or bicycle parking. High scoring projects will demonstrate collaboration and integration with the supportive program(s). Up to 3 points possible.

B. Supportive Plans and Policies

Applicant must demonstrate any supportive policies by citing language from approved local plans relevant to the proposed project. Additional points will be awarded to projects preceded by a Complete Streets policy included in a community or specific plan, or Community Active Transportation Strategy completed prior to this application. The highest scoring projects will be supported by adopted plans that emphasize active transportation and identify priority improvements in the project area.

4. DEMAND ANALYSIS USING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

NOTE: SANDAG Technical Services Department staff will calculate the points awarded for this criterion based on a GIS analysis of the project area relative to the seven factors listed below.

A half-mile buffer will be created around pedestrian improvement projects and a one-mile buffer will be created around bicycle improvement projects. 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 (up to 15 points) to lowest (1 point). (Up to 15 points possible)

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

5. PROJECT READINESS

Evidence of a completed feasibility study or equivalent evaluation of project feasibility.

A. Completion of Major Milestones

Points will be awarded based on the project development milestones completed. (Up to 20 points possible)

- Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or community active transportation strategy. (Up to 2 points)
- Environmental clearance under California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, if appropriate. (Up to 4 points)
- Completion of right-of-way acquisition, all necessary entitlements, or evident provided by the applicant that no right-of-way acquisition is required. (Up to 4 points)
- Completion of final design (plans, specifications, and estimates). (Up to 10 points)

6. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Ratio of Grant Request to Project Score
NOTE: SANDAG Technical Services Department staff will calculate the points awarded for this criterion.

The grant-score ratio is calculated by dividing the total project grant request amount by the sum of points earned in Categories 1 through 5. The projects will be ranked against each other based on the resulting quotient and the available 10 points will be distributed accordingly. The project(s) with the smallest quotient will receive 10 points, and the one(s) with the largest quotient will receive 1 point. (Up to 10 points possible)

7. MATCHING FUNDS

NOTE: SANDAG Technical Services Department staff will calculate the points awarded for this criterion.

Supporting documentation demonstrating that matching funds have been secured and the source(s) of the matching funds should be detailed. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Points for this criterion will be calculated by SANDAG Contracts and Procurement Staff by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be awarded points proportionately on a scale of 0 to 10 based on the statistical distribution of matching fund quotients. The project(s) with the largest quotient will receive 10 points, and the project(s) with no matching funds will receive no points. (Up to 10 points possible)

8. PUBLIC HEALTH

Up to 10 points will be awarded for improving public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues. Points will be awarded to applicants that conduct the following:

- Coordinate with the local health department to identify data and risk factors for the community - 2 points
- Describe the targeted populations and the health issues that the project will address - 2 points
- Assess health data using the online California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) tool available at http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx - 3 points
- Assess the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) available at http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org - 3 points

9. USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS

Projects should seek to use the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code, as partners to undertake or construct applicable projects in accordance with Section 1524 of Public Law 112-141. Up to 5 points will be deducted if an applicant does not seek corps participation or if an applicant intends not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate. Applicants will not be penalized if either corps determines that they cannot participate in a project.

The California Conservation Corps can be contacted at ccc.ca.gov. Community conservation corps can be contacted at californialocalconservationcorps.org.

10. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. Scores are available at http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html
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- At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/filessp.asp. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefitting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

- The project benefits a disadvantaged community. (10 points) OR

- The project does not benefit a disadvantaged community. (0 points)
**INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX**

Projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the below criteria.

Points calculated by SANDAG’s Technical Services Department or Contracts and Procurement Department are marked with an asterisk (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PTS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY (29 % of total points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.*</td>
<td>Regional Bicycle Network</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project will directly connect to the Regional Bikeway Network or Project will construct part of the Regional Bikeway Network</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Local Bicycle Network</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Closes a gap between existing bicycle facilities</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Existing Pedestrian Network</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Closes a gap in the existing pedestrian network</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.*</td>
<td>Connection to Transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bicycle improvement within 1 ½ miles of a regional transit station and/or Pedestrian improvement within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop Pedestrian improvement directly connects to a local transit stop Pedestrian improvement within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station Pedestrian improvement directly connects to a regional transit station</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Safety and Access Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or accident history within the last seven years: 1 to 2 correctable crashes involving non-motorized users 3 to 4 correctable crashes involving non-motorized users 5 or more correctable crashes involving non-motorized users and/or Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibit safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (41% of total points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Project Impact and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td>How well will the proposed traffic calming address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation? How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area? How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Program Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>How well does the project meet the ATP program objectives?</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PTS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C. Innovation</strong></td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort? Does the project utilize innovative solutions or propose solutions that are new to the region and can potentially serve as a replicable model?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS (4% of total points)

| A. Complementary Programs | Are capital improvements accompanied by supportive programs such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and/or increased enforcement? | Up to 3 | 2% |
| B. Supportive Plans and Policies | Demonstrated complete streets policy in an approved plan or completed community active transportation strategy? | Up to 3 | 2% |

### 4.* DEMAND ANALYSIS (GIS) (9% of total points)

Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.

### 5.* PROJECT READINESS (12% of total points)

**Completion of Major Milestones**
- 2 Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or community active transportation strategy.
- 4 Environmental Clearance
- 4 Right-of-way Acquisition
- 10 Final Design

Up to 20 | 12% |

### 6.* COST EFFECTIVENESS (6% of total points)

Ratio of grant request to project score

Project grant request, divided by score in Categories 1 through 5, ranked relative to each other.

Up to 10 | 6% |

### 7.* MATCHING FUNDS (6% of total points)

Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:
1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source
2. Approved match grant
3. In-kind services.

Points for matching funds are awarded by ranking the matching fund amounts proposed by each applicant, dividing each matching fund amount by the highest matching fund rank, then multiplying the number of points available by this quotient. The project with the largest proposed matching funds will receive ten points. Projects that do not include matching funds will receive 0 points.

Up to 10 | 6% |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PTS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH (6% of total points)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coordination with the local health department to identify data and risk factors for the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Description of the targeted populations and the health issues that the project will address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessment of health data using the online California Health Interview Survey tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessment of the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (-3% of total points)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The applicant sought California Conservation Corps or a qualified Community Conservation Corps participation on the project</td>
<td>0 to -5</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>or The applicant did not seek California Conservation Corps or a qualified Community Conservation Corps for participation on the project or the applicant intends not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY (6% of total points)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project benefits a disadvantaged community</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>or The project does not benefit a disadvantaged community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT SUBCATEGORIES

There are three categories of Non-infrastructure ATP Grants: Planning, EEA Programs\(^1\), and Bicycle Parking. Eligible projects are listed by category below.

PLANNING

Eligible planning projects should address bicycle and/or pedestrian access, primarily to accommodate non-recreational bicycle and walking trips, through neighborhood or citywide plans. Eligible planning projects may include, but are not limited to:

- Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategies
- Bicycle Master Plans

EDUCATION, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND AWARENESS (EEA) PROGRAMS

Eligible EEA programs may include, but are not limited to:

- **Education Programs** that teach walking and bicycling safety skills to children and adults through schools, places of employment, community centers, or other venues.
- **Encouragement Programs** that propose targeted outreach and events designed to encourage walking and bicycling as a viable mode of transportation for everyday/utilitarian trips.
- **Awareness Programs** that intend to improve overall roadway safety, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians, by impacting the attitudes and behaviors of the general public through multimedia campaigns.

BICYCLE PARKING

Eligible projects intend to plan and implement bicycle parking facilities and must be designed for general public access (may NOT exclusively serve any single entity). Eligible bicycle parking/storage projects may include, but are not limited to:

- Bike Racks
- Bike Lockers
- Bike Corrals
- Bike Stations

\(^1\) \textit{(EEA) Education, Encouragement, and Awareness Programs}
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NON-INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

How will projects be scored? The following narrative descriptions will be used to assist the evaluation panel in scoring applications. The Non-Infrastructure Scoring Criteria Matrix on page 28 is a summary of this information.

1. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the ATP objectives. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate the potential for measurable impact across multiple objectives.

2. COMPREHENSIVENESS

Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed project, plan, or program, in terms of both scope and scale. The quality of the proposed project and its potential to address community needs identified by the Applicant will be considered.

- **Planning:** The highest scoring projects will: aim to address Complete Streets principles; incorporate traffic calming measures; prioritize bike/pedestrian access; and/or be considered a Community Active Transportation Strategy (CATS). *(Up to 15 points)*

- **EEA Programs:** The highest scoring projects will: reach more of the region’s residents, including specific underserved or vulnerable populations that lack vehicular access; take place over a longer period of time; complement a capital improvement project; and/or be part of a larger transportation demand management (TDM) effort. Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope, scale, or duration, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects. *(Up to 15 points)*

- **Bike Parking:** The highest scoring projects will: cover a larger geographic area; complement a capital improvement project; and/or be part of a larger TDM effort. Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope and scale, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects. *(Up to 10 points)*

3. METHODOLOGY

Points will be awarded across all categories according to how well the proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals.

- **Planning:** Highest scoring projects will include a comprehensive planning process in their scopes of work that addresses the goals of Complete Streets, prioritizes bicyclist and pedestrian access, plans for traffic calming, and ties into Safe Routes to School efforts in the project area. *(Up to 30 points)*

- **EEA Programs:** Highest scoring projects will clearly and succinctly demonstrate how the project scope of work will directly address the proposed program goals and objectives, and will also list measurable objectives and/or deliverables. Lower scoring projects will state a generic need, broad goals, and/or will fail to clearly articulate how the scope of work will address project goals. *(Up to 30 points)*

- **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 may still be considered. The highest scoring bicycle parking projects will be appropriately located with attractive and functional designs and demonstrate how the project will directly address the proposed program goals and objectives. *(Up to 10 points)*

4. COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Points will be awarded according to the inclusiveness of the planning process and based on evidence that key stakeholders will be active participants in the process. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate: strong community support for the project; substantial community input into the planning or other process; identification of key stakeholders, including underserved and limited English proficiency populations, ensuring a meaningful role in the effort.

Lower scoring projects will: have minimal opportunities for community engagement in the scope of work; include generic letters of support that fail to demonstrate substantive stakeholder involvement; and/or fail to account for
limited English proficiency populations. *(Planning: Up to 15 points; EEA Programs: Up to 15 points; Bike Parking: Up to 10 points)*

5. EVALUATION

Points will be awarded for applications that clearly demonstrate a commitment to monitoring and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the proposed project. The 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 and/or 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. *(Planning: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: Up to 20 points; Bike Parking: Up to 10 points)*

6. INNOVATION

Points will be awarded for applications that propose innovative solutions that show the potential to serve as a replicable model for the region. The highest scoring projects will include innovative methods of accomplishing project goals that have not yet been tried in the San Diego region to date. For innovations that have been implemented in other regions, the Applicant must demonstrate that the measure was successful and effective in those cases. *(Planning: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: Up to 10 points; Bike Parking: Up to 30 points)*

Ex. Ciclovias or Sunday Streets programs; bikesharing programs; bike corrals; bike stations; or bike parking ordinances.

7. DEMAND ANALYSIS (GIS)

NOTE: SANDAG Technical Services Department staff will calculate the points awarded based on a GIS analysis of the project area relative to the seven factors listed below.

A half-mile buffer will be created around pedestrian improvement projects and a one-mile buffer will be created around bicycle improvement projects. 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 (up to 20 points) to lowest (1 point). No information is needed from the Applicant for this section. *(Planning: Up to 20 points; EEA Program: Not Applicable; Bike Parking: Up to 20 points)*

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

8. COST EFFECTIVENESS

NOTE: SANDAG Contracts and Procurement staff will calculate the points awarded for this criterion.

The grant-score ratio is calculated by dividing the total project grant request amount by the sum of points earned in Categories 1 through 7. The projects will be ranked against each other based on the resulting quotient and the available 20 points will be distributed accordingly. The project(s) with the smallest quotient will receive 20 points, and the one(s) with the largest quotient will receive 1 point. *(Up to 20 points)*

9. MATCHING FUNDS

NOTE: SANDAG Contracts and Procurement staff will calculate the points awarded for this criterion.

Supporting documentation that demonstrates that matching funds have been secured AND the source(s) of matching funds are detailed. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Points for this criterion will be calculated by SANDAG’s Contracts and Procurement staff by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be awarded points proportionately on a
scale of 0 to 20 based on the statistical distribution of matching fund quotients. The project(s) with the largest quotient will receive 20 points, and the project(s) with no matching funds will receive no points. (Up to 20 points)

10. PUBLIC HEALTH

Up to 10 points will be awarded for improving public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues. Points will be awarded to applicants that conduct the following:

- Coordinate with the local health department to identify data and risk factors for the community - 2 points
- Describe the targeted populations and the health issues that the project will address - 2 points
- Assess health data using the online California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) tool available at http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx - 3 points
- Assess the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) available at http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org - 3 points
## NON-INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX

Projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the below criteria.

Points calculated by SANDAG’s Technical Services Department or Contracts and Procurement Department are marked with an asterisk (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ATP Program Objectives</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>How well does the proposed project address ATP objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>How comprehensive is the proposed plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EEA PROGRAMS BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EEA PROGRAMS BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>How effective will the proposed effort be in meeting the demonstrated need and project goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>Does the planning project include an inclusive process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EEA PROGRAMS BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>Does the project involve broad segments of the community and does it have broad and meaningful community support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>EEA PROGRAMS BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>EEA PROGRAMS BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>Is this project new to the region and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Demand Analysis (GIS)</td>
<td>PLANNING BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Project grant request, divided by score in Categories 1 through 7, ranked relative to each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ *(EEA) Education, Encouragement, and Awareness Programs*
## NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

|   | Matching Funds | ALL | | | | | Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:
|   | 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source  
|   | 2. Approved match grant  
|   | 3 In-kind services  
|   | Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The project(s) with the largest quotient will receive twenty points, and the project(s) with no matching funds will receive no points. | 20 | 20 | 20 |

|   | Public Health | ALL | | | | Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues? | 10 | 10 | 10 |

|     | TOTAL POINTS | 160 | 160 | 160 |