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TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, May 20, 2016

ITEM NO.  

+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The Transportation Committee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its April 15, 2016, meeting.

+2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee 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 Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT

+3. STATE ROUTE 125 STATUS UPDATE (Ray Traynor)

In December of 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors made a strategic acquisition of the State Route 125 (SR 125) tolling franchise to improve mobility in the South County. The attached report provides an update on the SR 125 toll traffic and fiscal performance through the third quarter of FY 2016.

REPORTS

+4. 2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 12 – ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION (Michelle Smith)

The 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is the multiyear program of proposed major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2015 to FY 2019. Amendment No. 12 is a special amendment to re-program funds based on the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 12 - Administrative Modification to the 2014 RTIP.

+5. PROPOSED PROJECT SUBMITTALS: FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2016 RIDES TO WELLNESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM (Danielle Kochman)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the list of proposed regional project submittals for the Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Rides to Wellness Demonstration and Innovative Coordinated Access and Mobility Grant Program.
+6. COASTAL RAIL TRAIL-CHESTERFIELD TO G STREET PROJECT

(Chris Carterette)

The Transportation Committee is asked to review the Coastal Rail Trail: Chesterfield to G Street Project, and based on recent action by the City of Encinitas, direct staff to put on hold further design and environmental work for the project pending an agreement with the City of Encinitas for development of a new alignment along the western side of Coast Highway 101.

+7. MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT: SUPPLEMENT 4 TO CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR CONSTRUCTION SERVICES AGREEMENT (John Haggerty)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to: (1) approve the Guaranteed Maximum Price negotiated between Mid-Coast Transit Constructors and SANDAG for Supplement 4 of the Construction Manager/General Contractor Construction Services Agreement (Supplement 4) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit (Mid-Coast) Project in the amount of $927.5 million; and (2) execute Supplement 4 for the Mid-Coast Project after receiving an executed Full Funding Grant Agreement from the Federal Transit Administration.

+8. REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM PROJECT SCORING CRITERIA (Jenny Russo)

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Guidelines for the Cycle 3 of ATP funding on March 17, 2016. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors adopt Resolution No. 2016-27 certifying the submission of the proposed Regional ATP Project Scoring Criteria to the CTC for use in the Cycle 3 Regional ATP competition.

+9. FY 2017 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (Lisa Madsen)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors find that the Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District made a reasonable effort to implement productivity improvements during FY 2016, and approve continuing this program in FY 2017, which fulfills the requirements outlined in Section 99244 of the Transportation Development Act.

+10. REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: STATUS REPORT (Carolina Ilic)

In December 2014, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a Regional Complete Streets Policy to be used as a guide for SANDAG to implement regional transportation projects. Staff will provide a progress update.
11. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

If the five speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.

12. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, June 3, 2016, at 9 a.m.

13. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

APRIL 15, 2016

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Todd Gloria (City of San Diego) at 9:04 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Lisa Shaffer (North County Coastal), and a second by Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County), the Transportation Committee approved the meeting minutes of April 1, 2016. Yes – Chair Gloria, Vice Chair Jim Desmond (North County Inland), Mayor Mary Salas (South County), Councilmember Jones, Chair Harry Mathis (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), Deputy Mayor Shaffer, Vice Chair Rebecca Jones (North County Transit District [NCTD]), and Mr. Jim Janney (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCAA]). No - None. Abstain – None. Absent – County of San Diego.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

John Wotzka, a member of the public, submitted written comments and spoke about various transportation issues.

Laurie Berman, District 11 Director, Caltrans, announced construction crews will close southbound State Route 67 (SR-67) from Mapleview Street to Riverford Road from 10 p.m. on Friday, April 15, 2016, until 5 a.m. on Monday, April 18, 2016. Motorists can expect significant delays of an hour or more and are urged to ‘Steer Clear of 67’ and avoid the area. The closure is needed for the County of San Diego’s - Woodside Avenue Flood Control Project. Visit http://www.dot.ca.gov/d11/index.html for detour information.

CONSENT

3. FY 2015 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE CLAIM AMENDMENT (ADOPT)

The Transportation Committee was asked to adopt Resolution No. 2016-21 approving the FY 2015 STA claim amendment for NCTD.

4. SPECIALIZED TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAMS STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)

This report provided an overview of the progress made to date by the grant recipients in each program.
5. **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: STATUS UPDATE AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS (INFORMATION)**

This report provided an overview of progress made by TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program recipients through December 31, 2015.

**Action:** Upon a motion by County of San Diego Chair Roberts, and a second by Councilmember Jones, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item Nos. 3 through 5. Yes – Chair Gloria, Vice Chair Desmond, Mayor Salas, County of San Diego Chair Roberts, Councilmember Jones, MTS Chair Mathis, Deputy Mayor Shaffer, NCTD Vice Chair Jones, and Mr. Janney. No - None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.

**REPORTS**

6. **REQUEST BY THE CITY OF OCEANSIDE TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR USE OF THE SANDAG COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)**

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, Senior Accountant, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Shaffer, and a second by NCTD Vice Chair Jones, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Agreement to issue $5 million in commercial paper through the TransNet Debt Financing Program for the City of Oceanside Railroad Crossing Safety Improvement Project. Yes – Chair Gloria, Vice Chair Desmond, Mayor Salas, County of San Diego Chair Roberts, Councilmember Jones, MTS Chair Mathis, Deputy Mayor Shaffer, NCTD Vice Chair Jones, and Mr. Janney. No - None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.

7. **FY 2017 REGIONAL TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)**

Kim Monasi, Financial Project Control Manager, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by NCTD Vice Chair Jones, and a second by County of San Diego Chair Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the FY 2017 Transit Capital Improvement Programs for the MTS and the NCTD; (2) approve the submittal of Federal Transit Administration grant applications for the San Diego region; and (3) adopt Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Resolution No. RTC-2016-03, approving Amendment No. 10 to the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program. Yes – Chair Gloria, Vice Chair Desmond, Mayor Salas, County of San Diego Chair Roberts, Councilmember Jones, MTS Chair Mathis, Deputy Mayor Shaffer, NCTD Vice Chair Jones, and Mr. Janney. No - None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.

8. **2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT NO. 11 (RECOMMEND)**

Michelle Smith, Associate Financial Analyst, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Salas, and a second by Councilmember Jones, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors adopt RTC Resolution No. RTC-2016-04 approving Amendment No. 11 to the 2014 RTIP. Yes – Chair Gloria, Vice Chair Desmond, Mayor Salas, County of San Diego Chair Roberts, Councilmember Jones, MTS Chair Mathis, Deputy Mayor Shaffer, NCTD Vice Chair Jones, and Mr. Janney. No - None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.
9. **CALIFORNIA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CYCLE 3: SANDAG PROJECTS FOR STATEWIDE COMPETITION (RECOMMEND)**

Linda Culp, Principal Regional Planner, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Desmond, and a second by Councilmember Jones, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the list of SANDAG projects for the third cycle of ATP statewide competitive funding and adopt Resolution 2016-22, approving the application for ATP funds. Yes – Chair Gloria, Vice Chair Desmond, Mayor Salas, County of San Diego Chair Roberts, Councilmember Jones, MTS Chair Mathis, Deputy Mayor Shaffer, NCTD Vice Chair Jones, and Mr. Janney. No - None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.


André Douzdjian, Director of Finance, provided an update on the planned issuance of $350 million in long-term fixed rate debt in July 2016 to support the TransNet Early Action Program.

Ray Major, Chief Economist, briefed the Transportation Committee about the latest developments in the financial markets, the economy, revenues, and financial strategies.

**Action:** This item was presented for information.

11. **CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no additional public comments.

12. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, May 6, 2016.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Gloria adjourned the meeting at 9:48 a.m.
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STATE ROUTE 125 STATUS REPORT

Introduction

In December 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors made a strategic acquisition of the State Route 125 (SR 125) tolling franchise to improve mobility. The Board’s strategy was to increase utilization of the toll facility in order to mitigate congestion growth on local streets and the parallel segment of Interstate 805 (I-805). The Board implemented its strategy by reducing tolls on SR 125 at the beginning of FY 2013. This report provides a status update on the continued results of the program efforts.

Discussion

The initial SANDAG goals for the program were to increase usage of SR 125 and for the program to be fiscally responsible. To meet these goals, SANDAG reduced tolls and increased marketing and outreach efforts to generate new customer accounts and greater usage of the facility.

SANDAG annually establishes traffic and fiscal targets to measure the success of the program. Details regarding the traffic and fiscal performance of the facility are summarized below. SANDAG actions to improve SR 125 operations and performance have resulted in an improved credit rating. In March 2016, Fitch Ratings upgraded SR 125 from BBB, to BBB+ with a positive outlook, validating the robust financial performance resulting from SANDAG management.

Year-to-date Results as of March 31, 2016

During the first three quarters of FY 2016, the toll facility operations continued to outperform expectations, achieving 11.8 million trips, which is 4 percent above the third quarter forecast (11.3 million trips). Toll revenue over the same period was $25.9 million, which is 1.9 percent above the third quarter forecast.

Operating expenses through the first three quarters totaled $6.7 million, which is 21 percent under budget. Operating expenses can be impacted many factors, including timing and cost of project implementation. Lower third quarter operating expenses can be attributed to reductions in irrigation expenditures, staff costs, insurance premiums, and equipment, as well as the delay of FY 2016 spring marketing campaign. All debt service obligations and reserve funding deposits were met during the period.
Year-over-Year Results

The following key performance indicators measure comparative results as of the end of the third quarter of FY 2016 and FY 2015, respectively:

- Traffic - The number of vehicle trips on the toll road in FY 2016 was 7.5 percent greater when compared to the same period in FY 2015. A key metric in evaluating performance is average weekday traffic, which has grown to 47,800 vehicle trips per day in FY 2016 compared to 44,000 vehicle trips per day over the same period in FY 2015.

- Toll Revenues - SR 125 has generated $2.3 million more in toll revenue in FY 2016 than during the same period in FY 2015; this represents year-over-year growth of 10 percent.

- FasTrak Membership and Transponders in Circulation - SANDAG has been actively marketing to highlight the benefits of SR 125, and has been conducting outreach in the nearby communities. As a result of the marketing and outreach efforts, SR 125 has been able to steadily add new customers and transponders. The net increase in customer accounts was 2,927, bringing the total number of active accounts to 42,332. The net increase in transponders was 6,244, resulting in a total of 76,506 transponders in circulation for SR 125.

Maintenance Reserves and Future Capital Expenditures

The SR 125 toll road is a ‘pay-as-you-go’ operation, which means that major maintenance activities and capital expenses occur as funds are generated from toll operations. The early and sustained success of the toll road has resulted in sufficient reserve deposits to enable the completion of important maintenance projects to address deficiencies in the tolling system and preservation of the roadway through pavement rehabilitation, as well as to accelerate the development of the Southbound State Routes 125/905/11 connectors, to provide direct connections from the border/regional transportation system to the toll road facility.

Projected FY 2016 Year-End Performance

With the solid performance over the first three quarters of FY 2016, the toll road is on pace to close the fiscal year with approximately 15.8 million vehicle trips, which would be 3 percent above the forecast (15.3 million trips), and to generate approximately $34.6 million in toll revenue, which would exceed the revenue forecast target ($34.4 million) by 1.2 percent. Operations and maintenance expenses are anticipated to close the year at $10 million, or 14 percent below the budget of $11.4 million.

Next Steps

Staff will continue with business development and marketing efforts to attract and retain customers and to increase use of the road. Staff will report back to the Transportation Committee on the program’s performance next year.

RAY TRAYNOR
Director of Operations

Key Staff Contact: Ray Traynor, (619) 710-4001, ray.traynor@sandag.org
2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT No. 12 - ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION

File Number 1500300

Introduction

On September 26, 2014, the Board of Directors adopted the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2015 to FY 2019. The 2014 RTIP is a multibillion dollar program of projects funded by federal, state, TransNet local sales tax, and other local funding sources. The 2015 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, which incorporates the SANDAG 2014 RTIP, received federal approval on December 15, 2014.

Background

There are two types of processes to update the RTIP, administrative modifications and formal amendments. Formal amendments require, among other things, a 15-day public notice period, while administrative modifications are considered minor in nature and do not require a public notice period. Chapter 2 of the adopted 2014 RTIP provides additional details regarding the differences between formal amendments and administrative modifications. Amendment No. 12 is considered an administrative modification because the programming for each project is increasing by less than 40 percent, or $10 million, which is consistent with the federally accepted administrative modification procedures.

SANDAG is processing Amendment No. 12 to the 2014 RTIP as an administrative modification due to timing-related issues related to federal funding. The federal agencies delegated the approval of administrative modifications to the state, thereby streamlining the approval process.

Discussion

Project changes included in this administrative modification are summarized below with further programming details included in Table 1 (Attachment 1).
Caltrans

**Interstate 5 – High Occupancy Vehicle/Managed Lanes (CAL09)** – This amendment proposes to revise funding between fiscal years in response to the decrease in the State Transportation Improvement Program funding of $41,000,000 as approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). In order to keep this project fully funded, this amendment proposes to increase TransNet – Major Corridor funding by $6,753,000, federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality by $5,176,000 and federal Regional Surface Transportation Program funding by $29,071,000. Total amount programmed remains at $540,962,000.

**Highway Bridge Program (CAL44)** – In March 2016, Caltrans posted an updated listing for the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) based on local survey results. This amendment proposes to increase the amount of HBP funds and Local funds for various projects included in this grouped listing. Total programmed increases by $8,377,000 bringing the new total to $193,775,000.

**Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements – State Highway Operation and Protection Program Collision Reduction Program (CAL46B)** – This amendment proposes to revise a project description to one of the projects part of this grouped listing. Total programmed amount remains at $207,126,000.

**City of Escondido**

**East Valley/Valley Center (ESC02A)** – This amendment proposes to revise funding between phases and fiscal years. The federal High Priority Program (HPP) funding was not needed for the right-of-way portion since actual right-of-way costs came in under estimates. The HPP funding will be moved to FY 2016 and will be utilized for the construction phase. Total project remains at $10,566,000.

**Various Agencies**

**Grouped Projects for Active Transportation Program (V14)** – At its October 2015 meeting, the Board of Directors approved the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 2 project listing for the region-wide call for projects; subsequently, at its January 2016 meeting, the CTC approved projects for the ATP Cycle 2 statewide call for projects. In order to request allocation from the CTC, these projects must be programmed in a federally approved RTIP.

This amendment proposes to program the initial phase of work for FY 2017 for the following projects: (1) El Portal Pedestrian and Bike Underpass Project, in the City of Encinitas; (2) West La Mesa Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity Project, in the City of La Mesa; (3) Euclid and Market Complete Streets Project, in the City of San Diego; and (4) Chollas, Oak Park Branch Trail Project, under the Urban Corps of San Diego. Total programmed amount for this grouped listing increases by $2,876,000, bringing the new total to $35,934,000.

**Fiscal Constraint Analysis**

Federal regulations require the 2014 RTIP to be a revenue constrained document, with programmed projects based upon available or committed funding and/or reasonable estimates of future funding. Funding assumptions are generally based upon: (1) authorized or appropriated levels of federal and state funding from current legislation; (2) conservative projections of future federal and state
funding based upon a continuation of current funding levels; (3) the most current revenue forecasts for the TransNet Program; and (4) the planning and programming documents of the local transportation providers.

As an administrative modification, an updated fiscal constraint analysis is not required. The proposed changes included in Amendment No. 12 do not affect the fiscal constraint submitted as part of Amendment No. 10 to the 2014 RTIP, the last federally approved formal amendment that updated the financial capacity for the 2014 RTIP. Chapter 4 of the Final 2014 RTIP discusses in detail the financial capacity analysis of major program areas, including discussion of available revenues. The 2014 RTIP, including Amendment No. 12, continues to be reasonable when considering available funding sources.

**Air Quality Analysis**

On October 16, 2015, SANDAG found the 2014 RTIP, as amended in Amendment No. 7, in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the San Diego region. All of the required regionally significant capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan) and Amendment No. 7 to the 2014 RTIP. The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration jointly approved the conformity determination for the 2014 RTIP, as amended, and the conformity determination for the Regional Plan, on December 2, 2015.

The proposed amendment does not reflect a change in the design, concept, or scope of the project or the conformity analysis years as modeled for the regional emissions analysis of the 2014 RTIP, as amended, and the Regional Plan. Projects in the 2014 RTIP Amendment No. 12 meet the conformity provisions of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.122(g)). All capacity increasing projects in Amendment No. 12 were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the Regional Plan and Amendment No. 7 to the 2014 RTIP. All other projects not included in the air quality conformity analysis are either non-capacity increasing or are exempt from the requirement to determine conformity according to the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.126). SANDAG followed interagency consultation procedures to determine which projects are exempt. Amendment No. 12 does not interfere with the timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures. The 2014 RTIP, including Amendment No. 12, remains in conformance with the SIP.

JOSÉ A. NUNCIO
TransNet Department Director

Attachment: 1. Table 1: 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program – Amendment No. 12 – Administrative Modification

Key Staff Contact: Michelle Smith, (619) 595-5608, michelle.smith@sandag.org
**Table 1**

2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment No. 12 - Administrative Modification
San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Caltrans**

**MPO ID: CAL09**

**Project Title:** Interstate 5 - HOV/Managed Lanes

**Project Description:** From La Jolla Village Dr. to Harbor Dr. - construct High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Managed Lanes on I-5; construct Phase 1: Construct HOV from Lomas Santa Fe to Birmingham and replace San Elijo Bridge; Construct Phase 2: construct HOV lanes from Birmingham to SR78; Construct Phase 3: Soundwalls on private property from Manchester to SR-78. Toll Credits of $2,201 will be used to match federal funds for the ROW phase, Toll Credits of $13,981 will be used to match federal funds for the CON phase

**Change Reason:** Revise funding between fiscal years

**RT:5**

**Capacity Status:** CI  
**Exempt Category:** Non-Exempt

**Est Total Cost:** $546,586

**Open to Traffic:** Phase 1: Sep 2020  
Phase 2: Sep 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$149,840</td>
<td>$53,427</td>
<td>$23,921</td>
<td>$43,438</td>
<td>$29,055</td>
<td>$103,579</td>
<td>$38,292</td>
<td>$7,969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC AC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$178,626</td>
<td>$(51,546)</td>
<td>$(60,594)</td>
<td>$(66,486)</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP - Conversion</td>
<td>$111,027</td>
<td>$111,027</td>
<td>$27,901</td>
<td>$41,522</td>
<td>$67,599</td>
<td>$67,599</td>
<td>$67,599</td>
<td>$67,599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP AC</td>
<td>$152,943</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$7,730</td>
<td>$99,382</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$9,561</td>
<td>$143,382</td>
<td>$143,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $540,962 $91,296 $210,277 $166,335 $29,055 $44,000 $175,542 $62,202 $303,218

* $5.324M programmed in CAL46A; $299K provided outside of the RTIP

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 14-07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$143,087</td>
<td>$53,427</td>
<td>$25,281</td>
<td>$44,172</td>
<td>$13,123</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$100,390</td>
<td>$36,286</td>
<td>$6,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC AC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$144,674</td>
<td>$(49,810)</td>
<td>$(54,407)</td>
<td>$(40,547)</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - Conversion</td>
<td>$62,716</td>
<td>$62,716</td>
<td>$17,441</td>
<td>$22,638</td>
<td>$22,638</td>
<td>$22,638</td>
<td>$22,638</td>
<td>$22,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td>$30,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP - Conversion</td>
<td>$81,957</td>
<td>$81,957</td>
<td>$36,966</td>
<td>$41,522</td>
<td>$41,522</td>
<td>$41,522</td>
<td>$41,522</td>
<td>$41,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP AC</td>
<td>$193,943</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$7,730</td>
<td>$99,382</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$9,561</td>
<td>$184,382</td>
<td>$184,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $540,962 $91,296 $177,685 $166,776 $49,123 $52,225 $172,353 $60,196 $308,414

Friday, May 6, 2016
### 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program  
**Amendment No. 12 - Administrative Modification**  
**San Diego Region (in $000s)**

**MPO ID: CAL44**  
**RTIP #: 14-12**

**Project Title:** Highway Bridge Program

**Project Description:** Countywide - projects are consistent with 40 CFR Part 93.126 Exempt Table 2 categories – widen narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)

**Change Reason:** Increase funding, Revise funding between fiscal years

**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Non capacity widening or bridge reconstruction

**Est Total Cost:** $193,775

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>$185,827</td>
<td>$14,902</td>
<td>$9,960</td>
<td>$11,237</td>
<td>$990</td>
<td>$6,675</td>
<td>$142,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$185,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B - LBSRA</td>
<td>$1,342</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$6,606</td>
<td>$1,581</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$396</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>$3,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds AC</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(1,030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$193,775</td>
<td>$16,483</td>
<td>$10,010</td>
<td>$11,633</td>
<td>$1,118</td>
<td>$8,385</td>
<td>$146,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$193,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Local Funds are programmed separately for Cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, and San Marcos

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 14-09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>$178,411</td>
<td>$14,902</td>
<td>$9,960</td>
<td>$11,237</td>
<td>$751</td>
<td>$18,381</td>
<td>$123,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B - LBSRA</td>
<td>$1,342</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$5,645</td>
<td>$1,581</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$396</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
<td>$2,496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$185,398</td>
<td>$16,483</td>
<td>$10,010</td>
<td>$11,633</td>
<td>$848</td>
<td>$19,405</td>
<td>$127,017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$185,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MPO ID: CAL46B**  
**RTIP #: 14-12**

**Project Title:** Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements - SHOPP Collision Reduction (CR) Program

**Project Description:** Projects are consistent with 40 CFR Parts 93.126 and 93.127 Exempt Tables and 3 categories - railroad/highway crossing, safer non-federal-aid system roads, shoulder improvements, traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects, intersection signalization projects at individual intersections, pavement marking demonstration, truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area, lighting improvements, emergency truck pullovers

**Change Reason:** Revise Lump Sum List - No Change To Programming

**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Safety - Pavement marking demonstration

**Est Total Cost:** $207,126

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - CR - NHS (AC)</td>
<td>$42,220</td>
<td>$11,733</td>
<td>$17,305</td>
<td>$13,182</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - CR - STP (AC)</td>
<td>$152,141</td>
<td>$28,790</td>
<td>$106,799</td>
<td>$8,830</td>
<td>$7,722</td>
<td>$152,141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP STP - Collision Reduction</td>
<td>$12,765</td>
<td>$12,765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$207,126</td>
<td>$28,790</td>
<td>$118,532</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>$20,904</td>
<td>$207,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 14-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - CR - NHS (AC)</td>
<td>$42,220</td>
<td>$11,733</td>
<td>$17,305</td>
<td>$13,182</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - CR - STP (AC)</td>
<td>$152,141</td>
<td>$28,790</td>
<td>$106,799</td>
<td>$8,830</td>
<td>$7,722</td>
<td>$152,141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP STP - Collision Reduction</td>
<td>$12,765</td>
<td>$12,765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$207,126</td>
<td>$28,790</td>
<td>$118,532</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>$20,904</td>
<td>$207,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Escondido, City of

**MPO ID:** ESC02A  
**RTIP #:** 14-12

| Project Title: | East Valley/Valley Center  
| Project Description: | East Valley Pkwy/Valley Center Rd from Bevin Dr to northern City limits  
| | - Widen roadway from 4 to 6 lanes with raised medians, left turn pockets, and dedicated right turn lanes; modify signals at Lake Wohlford Rd/Valley Center Rd and Beven Dr/Valley Center Rd; widen bridge over Escondido Creek  
| Change Reason: | Revise funding between fiscal years and phases  
| Capacity Status: | CI  
| Exempt Category: | Non-Exempt  
| Est Total Cost: | $10,566  
| Open to Traffic: | Dec 2017  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI (Cash)</td>
<td>$632</td>
<td>$346</td>
<td></td>
<td>$287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$4,006</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,570</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,445</td>
<td>$1,973</td>
<td>$373</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RTCIP</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td></td>
<td>$363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,566</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,319</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,306</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>$905</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,966</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT LAST AMENDED 14-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI (Cash)</td>
<td>$632</td>
<td>$346</td>
<td></td>
<td>$287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$4,006</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,570</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,445</td>
<td>$1,973</td>
<td>$373</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RTCIP</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td></td>
<td>$363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,566</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,919</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,306</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>$905</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,066</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Various Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: V14</th>
<th>RTIP #:14-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPO ID:</strong></td>
<td><strong>RTIP #:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Title:
Grouped Projects for Active Transportation Program (ATP)

#### SANDAG ID:
1223014

#### Project Description:
Projects are consistent with 40 CFR Part 93.126 Exempt Table 2 categories - bicycle and pedestrian facilities (both motorized and non-motorized)

#### Change Reason:
Increase funding

#### Capacity Status:
NCI

#### Exempt Category:
Air Quality - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities

---

**Est Total Cost:** $35,934

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - BPNS</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$1,004</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP - R</td>
<td>$13,023</td>
<td>$12,385</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP - S</td>
<td>$16,438</td>
<td>$4,586</td>
<td>$9,076</td>
<td>$1,235</td>
<td>$652</td>
<td>$889</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$4,393</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,934</strong></td>
<td><strong>$350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,696</strong></td>
<td><strong>$755</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,095</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$35,934</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 14-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - BPNS</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$1,004</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP - R</td>
<td>$12,385</td>
<td>$12,385</td>
<td>$12,385</td>
<td>$12,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP - S</td>
<td>$14,791</td>
<td>$4,586</td>
<td>$9,076</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$889</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,802</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,058</strong></td>
<td><strong>$350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>$422</strong></td>
<td><strong>$153</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,095</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$33,058</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RTIP Fund Types

### Federal Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIP/CBI</td>
<td>Border Infrastructure Program/Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 117/STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed appropriations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Program under SAFETEA-LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation under TEA-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>High Priority Program under SAFETEA-LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Highway System (administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-RL</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program - Highway Railway Crossings Program (Section 130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ/RSTP Conversion</td>
<td>Reimbursement of advanced federal funds which have been advanced with local funds in earlier years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Active Transportation Program (Statewide and Regional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBSRA</td>
<td>Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit Account (State Prop. 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds AC</td>
<td>Local Funds - Advanced Construction; mechanism to advance local funds to be reimbursed at a later fiscal year with federal/state funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTCIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-B</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BPNS</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local System Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>TransNet - LSI funds previously programmed but not requested/paid in year of allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI (Cash)</td>
<td>TransNet - LSI funds which agencies have received payment, but have not spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Major Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC AC</td>
<td>TransNet - Major Corridors - Advanced Construction; mechanism to advance TransNet funds to be reimbursed at a later fiscal year with federal/state funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED PROJECT SUBMITTALS:
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2016 RIDES TO WELLNESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Introduction

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has announced the availability of $5.3 million in funding for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 Rides to Wellness Demonstration and Innovative Coordinated Access and Mobility Grants. The FTA is currently soliciting proposals for this grant program, and this report provides information on the proposed project submittals.

Discussion

The FTA’s goal for the Rides to Wellness program is to identify and test promising healthcare access solutions that other communities can replicate. The program is intended to support increased access to care, improved health outcomes, and reduced healthcare costs. Funding for the program is available through the federal surface transportation reauthorization acts, including Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century and Fixing America’s Surface Transportation.

Eligible projects are defined as implementation-ready capital and operating projects that enhance public transportation access, such as mobility management, health and transportation provider service partnerships, technology, and other activities. The Rides to Wellness Demonstration Grant projects will operate as pilots for up to 18 months.

Eligible applicants include states, tribes, and Designated or Direct Recipients of FTA funds. Designated Recipients are agencies designated by the state to administer FTA funds. Direct Recipients are entities that receive funding directly from FTA. Proposers must serve as the lead agency of a local consortium that includes stakeholders from the transportation, healthcare, human service, or other sectors. Members of this consortium are eligible as subrecipients to the Proposer.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the list of proposed regional project submittals for the Federal Fiscal Year 2016 Rides to Wellness Demonstration and Innovative Coordinated Access and Mobility Grant Program described in this report.
Proposed Rides to Wellness Demonstration Grant Submittals

As the Designated Recipient for the San Diego urbanized area, and the lead of San Diego’s Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), SANDAG is an eligible applicant, and members of SSTAC are eligible subrecipients. Two members of SSTAC have submitted requests for SANDAG to submit project applications to the Rides to Wellness program on their behalf.

- **On the Go Navigator** – Jewish Family Services is proposing to expand their existing *On the Go* Call Center to incorporate requests for health care and related supportive services utilizing Transportation Network Companies (TNC) for individuals who do not have access to smart phones. Bridging the technology gap for individuals will help increase access to care, improve health outcomes, and reduce healthcare and transportation costs. The grant will cover the costs of the partnership with TNCs to develop new platform, marketing, and call center operations, and to subsidize transportation costs.

- **Improved Medical Transportation Access** – Facilitating Access to Coordinated Transportation (FACT) is proposing to augment their current brokerage services to provide rides to TriCity Medical Center patients traveling from the Emergency Room to hospital locations for admissions, patients being discharged to travel to their homes, for follow up appointments, and to pharmacies. TriCity Medical Center has committed to track and report on the changes in patients’ health outcomes as a result of the improvement in transportation availability. The grant will cover the costs of operating the call center, subsidizing transportation, and administration.

Next Steps

Pending action by the Transportation Committee, the grant proposals would be submitted to the FTA by the May 31, 2016, deadline. If SANDAG is awarded funding from these programs, staff will prepare the appropriate budget and Regional Transportation Improvement Program amendments, and contracts with the subrecipients to enable pass-through of the funding.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contacts: Danielle Kochman, (619) 699-1921, danielle.kochman@sandag.org
COASTAL RAIL TRAIL: CHESTERFIELD TO G STREET PROJECT

Introduction

The Coastal Rail Trail is a 44-mile system of bikeways generally along the coastal rail corridor between the cities of Oceanside and San Diego. Segments of this bikeway, including Chesterfield to G Street, are included in the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP), adopted by the Board of Directors in 2013 (Attachment 1). Since 2013, SANDAG has been working with the City of Encinitas and North County Transit District (NCTD) on a 1.7-mile segment in the Cardiff community between Chesterfield Drive and G Street. This project is a Class 1 facility, planned as a paved 10-foot wide multi-use path with a natural surface on either side separating people biking and walking from vehicular travel. Funding for the project is provided through a combination of TransNet, an Active Transportation Program (ATP) state grant, and Federal Highway Administration Transportation Enhancement funds. The total FY 2016 budget is $6.1 million.

In May 2015, the Encinitas City Council identified their preferred alignment to be generally east of the railroad tracks and parallel to San Elijo Avenue. Following this input, SANDAG developed plans for the bikeway along this east side alignment to about a 35 percent level of engineering design and was proceeding with environmental clearance for the project. In March 2016, the City Council approved a change in this direction to the west side of the railroad tracks generally parallel to Coast Highway 101. To date, staff has only completed approximately a 5 percent level of engineering effort on the Coast Highway 101 (west side) alignment.

Discussion

Coastal Rail Trail in the City of Encinitas

Riding to 2050: the Regional Bike Plan, approved by the Board of Directors in 2010, identifies four segments of the Coastal Rail Trail (39A, B, C, and D) that cover the length of the City of Encinitas from north to south (Attachment 2). The southernmost three segments are included in the EAP, with the segment from Leucadia Boulevard north to the City of Carlsbad currently below the EAP funding line.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to review the Coastal Rail Trail: Chesterfield to G Street Project, and based on recent action by the City of Encinitas, direct staff to put further design and environmental work on the project on hold pending an agreement with the City of Encinitas for developing a new alignment along the western side of Coast Highway 101.
In 2014, SANDAG was awarded an ATP, Cycle 1 grant from the State of California for $1.025 million towards the construction phase of the Chesterfield to G segment. A condition of the grant is that the project must be ready to advertise (RTA) for construction by a particular date or SANDAG loses access to the funding. This date will either be June 2017 (assuming a 12-month extension from the approved schedule), or February 2018 (assuming a 20-month extension from the approved schedule), depending on the outcome of a SANDAG request to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) at its June meeting. Should the direction be to continue design on the Coast Highway 101 alignment, it will be virtually impossible to meet the June 2017 RTA date and very difficult to meet the February 2018 RTA date. There is a risk that the $1.025 million in state ATP funding for the project’s construction phase could be lost to the region.

**Eastern Alignment along San Elijo Avenue**

SANDAG has been working with the City of Encinitas to solidify the project alignment since 2013. Staff held three community workshops between 2013 and 2015, provided numerous presentations to community groups, and held regular project meetings with city staff. In January 2015, SANDAG received input from city staff to present two alternatives at a community workshop in April 2015. At the end of May 2015, the Encinitas City Council directed SANDAG to proceed with an alignment in NCTD rail right-of-way along the eastern side of the railroad tracks paralleling San Elijo Avenue.

By March of 2016, the project team had reached 35 percent engineering design and was proceeding with environmental clearance expected to be finalized by October 2016. To date, more than $800,000 dollars have been spent on the project. Staff estimates that, in the last 18 months, just under $500,000 was spent specifically on development of the eastern alignment along San Elijo Avenue.

At its March 30, 2016, meeting, the Encinitas City Council approved a request to change the project alignment from the rail corridor’s east side to the west side within the City’s right-of-way on South Coast Highway 101 (Attachment 3).

**Western Alignment along Coast Highway 101**

Using city right-of-way, the Coast Highway 101 alignment could consist of a Class 1 shared-use path and wide buffered bike lanes (requiring a lane reduction). Initial analysis of the western portion of the NCTD right-of-way shows the area between the tracks and Coast Highway 101 to be insufficient for siting the Coastal Rail Trail. Furthermore, siting the Coastal Rail Trail within the NCTD right-of-way would likely require a fence between the railroad tracks and the project, as was the case with the eastern alignment. From the initial Alternatives Analysis stage, staff estimates approximately a 5 percent level of design has been completed for the Coast Highway 101 alignment. While this alignment option was initially presented to the community at the April 2015 workshop, staff expects an additional significant outreach effort would be needed, prior to beginning the preliminary engineering and environmental process for the requested west side alignment.

The alignment also raises potential issues regarding compliance with the North Coast Corridor Public Works Plan/Transportation and Resource Enhancement Program (NCC PWP/TREP), in which the California Coastal Commission requires the Coastal Rail Trail to be constructed within 150 feet of the rail corridor, unless environmental, safety, or physical constraints exist that preclude the project’s ability to meet the requirement. If a further amendment to the NCC PWP/TREP is necessary, that could add time to the project team’s effort to meet the state ATP funding deadlines. Overall,
the NCC PWP/TREP timeline requires this and other Encinitas Coastal Rail Trail segments to be constructed by 2020.

**City of Encinitas Rail Corridor Vision Plan**

Another consideration is that the City of Encinitas is about to embark upon a formal process to develop its own Rail Corridor Vision Plan. This plan, which is expected to take more than a year to develop (and additional time to refine and formally adopt), is intended to identify the ideal configuration of a number of land uses in or adjacent to the rail corridor, including the Coastal Rail Trail. The City’s position suggests that development of the Coast Highway 101 alignment for Segment 39C could proceed concurrently with this planning effort (Attachment 3).

**Project Agreement**

A significant amount of funding and time has already been expended to develop the Chesterfield Drive and G Street segment of the Coastal Rail Trail. As discussed in this report, further project delays put significant risk on the ability to meet a 20-month extension for the ATP grant and more considerable risk on the ability to meet a shorter 12-month extension.

To move forward on further design and development of the project along the western alignment along Coast Highway 101 proposed by the City of Encinitas, staff believes an agreement would be needed between SANDAG and the City to outline clear timelines for continued development of this project, and to allow for the transfer of project risk to the City should a reversal, or lack of progress for the alignment occur. Specifically, the agreement would specify that the City would be responsible for the $1.025 million in ATP grant funds that would be lost should the overall project cost exceed the available project budget.

**Other Options Considered**

The following options for the development of the project were considered, however, staff’s recommendation is that the Transportation Committee support the western alignment pending execution of an agreement with Encinitas as discussed above.

A. Proceed immediately with design and environmental clearance for the eastern alignment along San Elijo Avenue as currently scoped, including development of an agreement with the City of Encinitas and within the time extension granted by the CTC for the ATP grant.

B. Place the project on hold and utilize the remaining TransNet funds on other EAP projects.

**Next Steps**

Pending the Transportation Committee’s approval, work would commence to expedite the execution of an agreement with the City of Encinitas for developing a new alignment along the western side of Coast Highway 101.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning
Attachments:
1. General Project Area Map
2. EAP Projects in Encinitas
3. May 3, 2016, letter from City of Encinitas regarding March 30, 2016, action by City Council

Key Staff Contact: Chris Carterette, (619) 699-7319 chris.carterette@sandag.org
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Dear Mr. Gallegos:

As you are aware, SANDAG has been designing a portion of the Coastal Rail Trail, Segment 39C, through the Cardiff community of Encinitas. The current alignment being studied for the trail lies between the railroad tracks and San Elijo/Vulcan Avenue, between Chesterfield Drive and ‘F’ Street. The trail consists of a bicycle/pedestrian path, landscaping, water quality features, retaining walls, fencing and parking improvements along portions of the adjacent roadway.

At our recent City Council meeting on March 30, 2016, the Council received an informational report regarding the Coastal Rail Trail project, as well as other projects being developed within the railroad corridor in Cardiff, including the LOSSAN San Elijo Double Tracking Project, Chesterfield Drive improvements, a proposed at-grade pedestrian crossing at Montgomery Avenue, rail quiet zones, a parking study and the City’s Rail Corridor Vision Study. The Council also heard about NCTD’s plans to fence the rail corridor. In addition to the report from City staff, Council heard from representatives of SANDAG and NCTD.

After receiving public comments and deliberating on the issue, Council approved a motion to pursue a Coastal Rail Trail alignment along the Coast Highway 101 corridor, which is on the west side of the rail corridor. This alignment had previously been considered along with the easterly alignment that is currently being developed. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the City Council’s decision and to request that SANDAG pursue the Coast Highway 101 alternative for Segment 39C of the Coastal Rail Trail. It should be pointed out that a Coast Highway 101 alternative may include a portion of the CRT on the east side of the railroad tracks north of the existing Santa Fe Drive pedestrian undercrossing. The undercrossing would be used to transition the CRT from Coast Highway 101 to the east side of the tracks.

The City does understand that approximately $500,000 has been expended on the development of the easterly alignment. The City also understands that the project has been awarded an Active Transportation Program Grant of slightly more than $1,000,000. The ATP Grant funds could be forfeited if a construction contract is not awarded by February 2018, which reflects an eight month extension from the original June 2017 deadline. Although the City understands SANDAG’s concerns about project costs, we believe the construction costs associated with the Coast Highway 101 alignment will be significantly less than the easterly alignment and the project could be completed within the existing budget.
The Coastal Rail Trail is a component of the North Coast Corridor Public Works Plan, which received approval by the California Coastal Commission. The plans on which the CCC approval was obtained included the CRT alignment on the east side of the railroad tracks, which is the alignment SANDAG had been pursuing. A subsequent amendment to the CCC provides some flexibility on the alignment of the CRT. The City is committed to working with SANDAG and the CCC to allow the development of the CRT along Coast Highway 101.

SANDAG staff has expressed concern about future segments of the CRT in Encinitas. The City is about to embark on a comprehensive citywide Rail Corridor Vision Study that will explore opportunities for public uses within the NCTD rail corridor. SANDAG will be invited to participate in that Study. The City will expedite that Study so that any uses proposed in the rail corridor that may affect future SANDAG projects can be identified early and coordinated to minimize any impacts.

The City appreciates the close working relationship we have enjoyed with SANDAG on this project and others. Given the extent of the projects proposed in the rail corridor in Cardiff and the public input we have received, we believe the Coast Highway 101 alignment is in the best interests of the City. Thank you in advance for your consideration of our request and please let me know if there is anything we can do to support this project moving forward.

Sincerely,

Kristin Gaspar
Mayor

cc: City Council
Introduction

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit (Mid-Coast) Project is a TransNet Early Action Program project extending the San Diego Trolley light rail system by 10.9 miles from the Old Town Transit Center to the University City area. The Board of Directors approved construction of the Mid-Coast Project using the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) project delivery method.

Mid-Coast Transit Constructors (MCTC), a joint venture construction entity of Stacy & Witbeck Inc., Skanska USA, and Herzog Contracting Corporation, was the CM/GC selected by the Board to deliver this project. MCTC also is the CM/GC implementing five other SANDAG projects contiguous to the Mid-Coast Project along the corridor, which include the San Diego River Bridge Double-Track, Elvira to Morena Double-Track, Voigt Drive Bridge, Gilman Drive Bridge, and Rose Creek Bikeway projects.

Board of Directors approval of individual supplemental agreements (“Supplements”) to the base general provisions agreement between SANDAG and MCTC (“Construction Services Agreement”) will enable the construction of the Mid-Coast Project and each of the other projects. To date, the Board has approved two Supplements – the first for the relocation of wet utilities and construction of Control Point Rose, and the second for construction of the San Diego River Bridge Double-Track Project.

Today’s action recommends approval of Supplement 4 to the CM/GC contract for construction of the Mid-Coast Project with a guaranteed maximum price (GMP) of $927.5 million.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to: (1) approve the Guaranteed Maximum Price negotiated between Mid-Coast Transit Constructors and SANDAG for Supplement 4 of the Construction Manager/General Contractor Construction Services Agreement (Supplement 4) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit (Mid-Coast) Project in the amount of $927.5 million; and (2) execute Supplement 4 for the Mid-Coast Project after receiving an executed Full Funding Grant Agreement from the Federal Transit Administration.
Discussion

CM/GC Process and Agreements

CM/GC is a two-step best value process. In the first step, a contractor is selected based on qualifications and price to provide pre-construction services during the design process. In the second step, a GMP for construction services is negotiated. SANDAG retains the option to bid the construction if a GMP cannot be negotiated.

The Board of Directors approved a Pre-Construction Services Agreement with MCTC to provide constructability support for the Mid-Coast Project, including value engineering, staging, scheduling, costing, subcontracting plans, and other services to reduce risks and cost in advance of construction. Subsequently, the Board approved a CM/GC Construction Services Agreement with MCTC that includes general provisions for the control of work, methods of payment, legal responsibilities and requirements, insurance, financial conditions, and other contract requirements for all construction work approved for the CM/GC. Construction work is authorized by the Board through negotiated GMP contract supplements as indicated in Table 1 below, with actual and anticipated dates for Board approval. Currently, staff expects a total of seven construction supplements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Board Approval (actual in Bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select CM/GC Contractor</td>
<td>May 9, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction Services Agreement</td>
<td>September 12, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM/GC 1 Construction Service Agreement</td>
<td>June 26, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 1 - Wet Utilities and CP Rose</td>
<td>June 26, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 2 – San Diego River Bridge</td>
<td>March 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 3 – Gilman Drive Bridge</td>
<td>June, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 4 – Mid-Coast Corridor Transit</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 5 – Elvira to Morena Double Track</td>
<td>Summer, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 6 – Voigt Drive Bridge</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement 7 – Rose Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GMP negotiations for each supplement are based on detailed estimates of labor, materials, equipment, and other direct construction costs to which indirect costs such as supervision, quality control, insurance, and bonds are applied. This method of cost estimating is known as “bottom-up” and is typical of how contractors bid projects. In a CM/GC contract, the contractor will develop its bottom-up estimate, and SANDAG will develop its own bottom-up independent cost estimate (ICE). The initial step in negotiating a GMP is to reconcile quantities of the physical work, such as cubic yards of bridge concrete or number of railroad ties. Direct and indirect costs are then attributed to those quantities/items. The contractor and owner then negotiate the direct and indirect cost attributable to those items.
Supplement 4 – Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

SANDAG initiated the GMP negotiation process for the Mid-Coast Project in fall 2015. At the start of the process, staff provided MCTC plans, specifications and engineering reports that were developed at the approximately 80 percent design level, depending on the type of work and location. This GMP plan and specification set (GMP plan set) was used as the basis for reconciling quantities and negotiating the GMP.

SANDAG employed an expert construction estimating consultant, Stanton Construction Services (Stanton), to prepare quantities and develop an ICE from the GMP plan set. The quantities were reconciled to those developed by MCTC and the design engineer to arrive at final quantities. In December 2015, based on the reconciled final quantities, SANDAG had Stanton develop an ICE and requested that MCTC submit a GMP cost proposal. On January 5, 2016, MCTC submitted its initial GMP proposal. During the remainder of January, the SANDAG negotiating team, composed of SANDAG staff, project management and construction management consultant staff, and the designer, met with the MCTC negotiating team in a series of technical meetings on cost.

The two negotiating teams compared:

- direct costs for labor, material and equipment, and the rates for production;
- indirect costs for supervision, quality assurance, insurance and bonding, and escalation; and
- construction risk including subcontractor work, access to work areas, third party coordination, and unanticipated conditions.

Costs were compared with both teams providing open book access to the information used to develop costs for direct, indirect, and construction risk numbers. The teams also exchanged information on construction sequencing options and production rates to come to agreement on the overall construction duration of 56 months.

The first MCTC cost proposal and ICE were substantially apart. After a number of negotiation meetings, SANDAG and MCTC were able to reach an agreement on a GMP for the Mid-Coast Project construction in the amount of $927.5 million. The recommended GMP is within 2.4 percent of the final ICE, as indicated in Table 2 below. This amount is considered fair and reasonable by the SANDAG negotiating team.
Table 2 – Mid-Coast GMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% Difference from ICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$906 million</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTC Proposal</td>
<td>$981 million</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended GMP</td>
<td>$927.5 million</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) subcontracting goal for this project is 11.3 percent. MCTC has committed to achieving the DBE goal.

**GMP Construction Scope**

The proposed $927.5 million GMP is the not-to-exceed amount for building the project within the scope of the plans and specifications agreed to by both parties in the course of the negotiations including: clarifications and design refinements, duration, construction sequencing, access, permits, and other conditions.

The total cost of construction of the Mid-Coast Project includes items outside the GMP for various items, including for traction power substations; upgrading Trolley control and communications facilities; fare collection equipment; wet and dry utility relocation and connections; owner-provided safety services including railroad flagging and highway support; environmental mitigation; and allowances for other anticipated items.

In the GMP, the negotiating teams share certain risks. As an example, SANDAG would pay separately for contractor office and laydown facilities and share in the risk for hauling dirt off the project. Staff expects to manage these items at a lower cost than MCTC had proposed. MCTC would have the risk for maintaining stormwater measures throughout the 56 months of construction, which reduces SANDAG exposure to ongoing costs and the risk from damage due to temporary runoff measures caused by severe weather.

A GMP Conformed Plan and Specification set of documents will be approved as part of the executed contract for Supplement 4. The GMP Conformed Set will reflect any changes and clarifications negotiated from the original GMP plans to reflect the agreed GMP price. Final construction plans will be issued after the contract is executed in work packages. In the GMP price, MCTC assumes the risk (cost) of any design advancement from the conformed set at approximately 80 percent design to the 100 percent issued for construction (IFC) plans. Change orders above the GMP price would be issued only for new or undefined work added by SANDAG to the IFC plans or for unanticipated conditions such as differing geotechnical site conditions, late owner furnished access, or materials or new permit requirements.
Next Steps

The Transportation Committee is being asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to execute Supplement 4 to the CM/GC contract to construct the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project contingent on the Federal Transit Administration awarding of a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for the Project. The FFGA is anticipated to be awarded in August. Board approval of Supplement 4 would allow SANDAG and MCTC to prepare and process the contract agreement and ready it for execution and notice to proceed immediately after the FFGA approval.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Location Map

Key Staff Contact: John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, john.haggerty@sandag.org
Introduction

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) is a competitive funding program administered jointly by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans to fund projects that encourage active modes of transportation. As a requirement of the legislation, the CTC adopted the ATP Guidelines for the third cycle of ATP funding on March 17, 2016. Funding is being awarded in two stages, beginning with the statewide competition in April 2016, followed by the regional competition in July 2016. This report provides an overview of the ATP, including the role of SANDAG, and next steps in the process. The complete ATP Guidelines are available at http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP.htm.

Discussion

ATP Funding Distribution and Available Funding

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: 10 percent of ATP funds are distributed to small urban and rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less via a competitive process jointly administered by the CTC and Caltrans.

2. Statewide Competition: 50 percent of ATP funds are distributed to projects competitively awarded by the CTC on a statewide basis.

3. Regional Competition: 40 percent of ATP funds are distributed to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000. The funds allocated under this portion of the ATP must be selected through a competitive process facilitated by the MPOs. As an MPO, SANDAG is the administrator for the San Diego regional

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors adopt Resolution No. 2016-27, in substantially the same form as attached, certifying the submission of the proposed Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) Scoring Criteria in Attachment 2 to the California Transportation Commission for use in the Cycle 3 Regional ATP competition.
A minimum of 25 percent of the funds distributed by each of the three competitions must benefit disadvantaged communities. Cycle 3 of the ATP includes funding for two years, beginning with FY 2020. The amount of funding available will be determined by the CTC at its May 18–19, 2016, meeting.

**Eligible Applicants**

Local, regional, and state agencies are eligible to apply for both the statewide and regional competitive programs. Examples include, but are not limited to, cities, counties, MPOs, and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies as well as Caltrans, transit agencies, natural resources or public land agencies, public schools or school districts, tribal governments, and private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations. A complete list of eligible applicants is provided in the ATP Guidelines.

**Regional Competition Guidelines & Selection Criteria**

The CTC Guidelines allow MPOs, with CTC approval, to use a different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged community for its competitive selection process.

For the past two cycles of the ATP, the Board of Directors approved using the project selection criteria from the TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program for the San Diego regional ATP competition. Adjustments were made to reflect requirements of the CTC Guidelines. Additional changes were made to expand the eligible project types to include stand-alone pedestrian plans and active transportation plans, modification of the minimum project size, and exclusion of SANDAG Board Policy No. 033: Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Funding Incentives requirement.

For the third cycle of the regional ATP competition, staff proposes utilizing guidelines similar to those used in the past two cycles, with modifications intended to reflect changes made to the ATP Guidelines by the CTC in March 2016. A summary of the changes made to the ATP Guidelines from the past two cycles is included in Attachment 1. The proposed Regional ATP Program Scoring Criteria are included in Attachment 2.

**Next Steps**

Pending the Transportation Committee’s recommendation, the Board of Directors would be asked to approve the submission of the proposed Regional ATP Program Scoring Criteria to the CTC for use in the Cycle 3 Regional ATP competition at its May 27, 2016, meeting. The CTC is scheduled to consider the proposed Regional ATP Program Scoring Criteria at its June 29-30, 2016, meeting.

LAURA COTÉ  
Director of Administration
Attachments:  
1. Changes made to the ATP Guidelines for Cycle 3 
2. Proposed 2016 ATP Program Guidelines for San Diego Regional Competition ATP Cycle 3 
3. Draft Resolution No. 2016-27 

Key Staff Contact: Jenny Russo, (619) 699-7314, jenny.russo@sandag.org
Changes Made to the Active Transportation Program Guidelines for Cycle 3

Funding

• Changed the allowability of funding for active transportation plans to only include plans that are within or encompass disadvantaged communities.

• Reduced the maximum amount of ATP funds that can be allocated to fund active transportation plans from 3 percent to 2 percent.

• Added that the lowest priority for funding of active transportation plans will be for updates of plans that are more than 5 years old.

Application

• Changed the definition for non-infrastructure projects to be limited to start-up projects only, which are projects where no program currently exists. Start-up projects are required to demonstrate how the program is sustainable after ATP funding is exhausted. ATP funds can no longer be used to fund ongoing program operations.

Disadvantaged Communities

• Changed the definition of a disadvantaged community so that a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that procures a significant benefit and target its benefits primarily to low income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

• Changed the requirements of how a project qualifies as directly benefitting a disadvantaged community. The project must either have a direct connection, or be part of a larger project that connects or is directly adjacent to the disadvantaged community served.

• Added under the Median Household Income criteria that unincorporated communities may use data at the Census Place level.

• Added under the national school lunch program criteria that the project must be located within 2 miles of the school(s) represented.

• Added another category that allows applicants to use the definition of a disadvantaged community as adopted in the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, which includes minority, low-income, and senior populations.

• Added another criterion that allows any project located within a federally-recognized tribal land to qualify as benefitting a disadvantaged community.

• For safe routes to school projects, changed the designation for this project type to only include projects for which the students are the intended beneficiaries of the project.

• Allowed for applications to be scored in relation to the severity of and the benefit provided to the disadvantaged community rather than automatically assigning points.

Funding Exchange Language

• Added language to describe the process SANDAG would take to implement a funding exchange in the event a SANDAG project is selected to receive ATP funding as a result of the regional ATP competitive process and the funding for that project contains TransNet funds.
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BACKGROUND OF THE ATP 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 jointly by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans.

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** - 10 percent of ATP funds are distributed to small urban and rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less via a competitive process administered jointly by the CTC and Caltrans.

2. **Statewide Competition** - 50 percent of ATP funds are distributed to projects competitively awarded by the CTC on a statewide basis.

3. **Regional Competition** - 40 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 facilitated 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 OF THE ATP

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.

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
## CYCLE 3 SCHEDULE

The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the Cycle 3 ATP.

### Statewide Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTC adoption of ATP Guidelines</td>
<td>3/17/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated available funding released</td>
<td>5/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Call for Projects released</td>
<td>4/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application submittal deadline for Statewide Competition</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC staff recommendation of projects for Statewide Competition</td>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC approval of recommended projects for Statewide Competition</td>
<td>12/7-12/8/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated available funding released by CTC</td>
<td>5/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommendation of Regional ATP guidelines presented to SANDAG Transportation Committee</td>
<td>5/20/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP guidelines considered by SANDAG Board of Directors</td>
<td>5/27/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC considers SANDAG Regional Guidelines for approval</td>
<td>6/29-6/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Call for Projects released</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Application Workshop for Regional Competition</td>
<td>7/14/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application submittal deadline for Regional Competition</td>
<td>8/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring and ranking of Regional Competition applications</td>
<td>9/1-11/4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) considers approval of TransNet/ATP Swap concept (if applicable)</td>
<td>11/9/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Swap coordination with applicants (if applicable) for Regional Competition</td>
<td>11/14-11/23/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of ranked project list (through posting of Transportation Committee Agenda) for Regional Competition</td>
<td>12/2/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommendation of Regional Competition ranked projects presented to SANDAG Transportation Committee</td>
<td>12/9/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP project rankings considered by SANDAG Board of Directors</td>
<td>12/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC considers adoption of ranked project list for SANDAG Regional Competition</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNDING

SOURCES
The ATP is funded from various federal and state funds appropriated in the annual State Budget Act. There are
- Federal Transportation Alternative Program funds, except for federal Recreation Trail Program funds appropriated
to the Department of Parks and Recreation
- Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds or other federal funds
- State Highway Account funds

AMOUNT OF FUNDING AVAILABLE
Cycle 3 of the ATP includes funding for two years; 2019-2020, and 2020-2021. The amount of funding available for
Cycle 3 will be determined by the CTC in May, 2016.

MINIMUM REQUEST FOR FUNDS
In order to maximize the effectiveness of program funds and to encourage the aggregation of small projects into one
larger comprehensive project, 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, and
plans.

MAXIMUM REQUEST FOR FUNDS
The total aggregate amount of funding requested by each applicant cannot exceed the total amount available.

MATCHING FUNDS
Matching funds are not required. If an applicant chooses to provide matching funds, those funds cannot be expended
prior to the CTC allocation of ATP funds in the same project phase (permits and environmental studies; plans
specifications and estimates; right-of-way; and construction). 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.

FUNDING FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS
Funding from the ATP may be used to fund the development of community wide active transportation plans within
or, for area-wide plans, encompassing disadvantaged communities, including bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools,
or comprehensive active transportation plans. A list of the components that must be included in an active
transportation plan can be found in the section of these guidelines entitled “Active Transportation Plan for
Disadvantaged Communities” (page 9).

A maximum amount of two percent (2%) of the funds distributed by the regional competition will be
available for funding active transportation plans.

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 a comprehensive active transportation plan. The
second priority for the funding of 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. The lowest
priority for funding of plans will be for updates of active transportation plans older than 5 years.

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 Caltrans 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.
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 Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) for guidance and procedures on Master Agreements. The LAPM is available here: dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/laa/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

Eligible applicants 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. In addition, eligible applicants that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project are encouraged to partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. If another entity agrees to be the implementing agency and 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.
ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

All projects will be selected through this competitive process and must meet one or more of the ATP program goals. Because the majority of funds in the ATP are federal funds, projects must be federal-aid eligible.

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

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 will 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. PSR guidelines are posted on the CTC’s website at [http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/stip.htm](http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/stip.htm).

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

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 on start-up projects. A project is considered to be a start-up when no program currently exists. Start-up projects must demonstrate how the program is sustainable after ATP funding is exhausted. ATP funds cannot fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those that benefit school students. Program expansions or new components of existing programs are eligible for ATP funds as long as the applicant can demonstrate that the existing program will be continued with non-ATP funds.

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% infrastructure and 25% non-infrastructure).

4. **PLANS**
   
   The development of a community-wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.
PROJECT TYPE REQUIREMENTS

State and federal law segregate the ATP into multiple, overlapping components. Below is an explanation of the requirements specific to these components.

DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate, with verifiable information, a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a disadvantaged community. To count as providing a benefit, a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

For a project to qualify as having a direct benefit to a disadvantaged community, the project must be located within or in reasonable proximity and have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community served by the project; or the project must be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or is directly adjacent to that disadvantaged community. The application must include a map that delineates the specific disadvantaged census tract(s) or school(s) that will benefit from the project in relationship to the project site. It is incumbent upon the applicant to clearly articulate how the project benefits the disadvantaged community. There is no presumption of benefit, even for projects located within a disadvantaged community. To qualify as a disadvantaged community, the community served by the project must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- **Median Household Income**: The Median Household Income (Table ID B19013) is less than 80 percent of the statewide median based on the most current Census Tract (ID 140) level data from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey (<$49,191). Communities with a population less than 15,000 may use data at the Census Block Group (ID 150) level. Unincorporated communities may use data at the Census Place (ID 160) level. Data is available at [http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml](http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml).

- **CalEnviroScreen**: An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 25 percent in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 2.0 (CalEnviroScreen 2.0) scores. The score must be greater than or equal to 36.62. The list can be found at the following link under SB 535 List of Disadvantaged Communities: [http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGlInvest/](http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGlInvest/).

- **National School Lunch Program**: 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/sdfslessp.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sdfslessp.asp). Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area. The project must be located within 2 miles of the school(s) represented by this criteria.

- **Other**
  - If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment to demonstrate that the community’s median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income.
  
  - The definition of a disadvantaged community as adopted in the SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan (San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, available at [http://www.sdforward.com/regionalplan](http://www.sdforward.com/regionalplan)) may be used in lieu of the options identified above. For San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, disadvantaged communities are identified as minority, low-income, and senior populations.
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- The term “minority” is described by the Federal Highway Administration as: Black (having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa); Hispanic (of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race); Asian American (having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands); or American Indian and Alaskan Native (having origins in any of the original people of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition).
- Low-income populations are those with income levels below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Rate.
- Senior populations include anyone 75 years old and older.
  - Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECTS

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

RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROJECTS

Trail projects that are primarily recreational should 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/).

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

A city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan (bicycle, pedestrian, safe-routes-to-school, or comprehensive). 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, including a description of bicycle facilities that serve public and private schools, and, if appropriate, a description of how the five Es (Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation) will be used to increase rates of bicycling to school.
- 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, including those at major transit hubs and those that serve public and private schools, and, if appropriate, a description of how the five Es (Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation) will be used to increase rates of walking to school. Major transit hubs 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, ADA level surfaces, 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 collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians.

• A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.

• 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. Components of an otherwise eligible project may not be eligible. For information on ineligible components, see the Caltrans Department of Local Assistance ATP website available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/atp_info.html.

- 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 improving the active transportation operations/usability 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. Components may include 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 analyses.
  - 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 or designed to promote walking and biking on a daily basis.
  - 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.
OVERVIEW

- 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.
PROJECT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

To apply for the regional competition, all applicants must complete:

1. The application utilized for the statewide competition
   The statewide application is available on the Caltrans ATP website at:
   
   http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/cycle-3.html

2. The Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire
   The Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire is included on the following page.

3. A resolution from the applicant’s authorized governing body that includes the following provisions, consistent with SANDAG Board Policy No. 035:
   - Applicant’s governing body commits to providing the amount of matching funds set forth in the grant application.
   - Applicant’s governing body authorizes staff to accept the grant funding and execute a grant agreement, if an award is made by the CTC or SANDAG.

Applicants that submit applications for the statewide competition will automatically be considered for the regional competition. Applicants that applied for the statewide competition do not need to submit another copy of their application to SANDAG if they have already provided one as part of the statewide competition; however all applicants for the regional competition must submit the Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire and a resolution from their authorized governing body to provide additional information needed for the regional competition.

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 project.

One electronic (PDF) copy of the application must be received by SANDAG no later than 4 p.m. on Friday, August 19, 2016. Applications should be addressed to:

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

PRE-APPLICATION WORKSHOP

SANDAG will conduct a pre-application workshop for prospective applicants to provide an overview of the ATP program and the application process, and answer any questions. Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend this workshop. The workshop will take place on Thursday, July 14, 2016, from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. in the Seventh Floor Board Room at SANDAG.

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: http://www.sandag.org/atpfunding unless otherwise noted.
REGIONAL ATP SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

NON-INFRASTRUCTURE APPLICATIONS

Applicants that would like to be considered for non-infrastructure funding for the regional ATP competition must answer the following question, as a supplement to the statewide 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 must 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. Address how the traffic calming measures will benefit pedestrians and bicycles.

- **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 scope of the project.

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

STEP 1: ELIGIBILITY SCREEN

Applications will be screened for eligibility, which will consist of the following:

- Consistency with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy
- Supplanting funds: a project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the ATP. ATP funds cannot be used to supplant other committed funds.
- The project must be one of the four types of projects listed in these Guidelines (a disadvantaged community, safe routes to school, recreational trails, or an active transportation plan for disadvantaged community).

Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible.

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 expertise in bicycling and pedestrian transportation, Safe Routes to School projects, and projects that benefit disadvantaged communities 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 ATP funding will be encouraged to participate in the multidisciplinary review panel.

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 that benefit Disadvantaged Communities as identified in the CTC Guidelines.

STEP 6: FINAL RANKING & CONTINGENCY PROJECT LIST

The final list of project rankings will be produced.

SANDAG will adopt a list of projects for programming the Regional ATP that is financially constrained against the amount of ATP funding available (as identified in the approved ATP Fund Estimate). In addition, SANDAG will include a list of contingency projects, listed in order based on the project’s final ranking. SANDAG intends to fund projects on the contingency list should there be any project failures or savings in the Cycle 3 Regional ATP. This will ensure that the Regional ATP will fully use all ATP funds, and that no ATP funds are lost to the region. The contingency list is valid until the adoption of the next Statewide ATP cycle.

The final ranking and contingency project list will be provided to the CTC in December 2016 for adoption in March 2017.

STEP 7: TRANSNET-ATP FUNDING EXCHANGE (OPTIONAL STEP)

If a SANDAG project is selected to receive ATP funding as a result of the regional ATP competitive process, and the funding for that project contains TransNet funds, there may be an opportunity to implement a funding exchange with projects recommended through the regional ATP. This exchange would reduce the administrative burden to local jurisdictions associated with federal funding requirements, and would consolidate the allocation of federal funds to as
few projects as practicable. Should a funding exchange be proposed, projects that elect to participate in the exchange would be removed from the regional ATP ranking and be funded through TransNet. The TransNet-funded projects would be administered as other TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program projects and be subject to the terms and conditions of SANDAG Board Policy No. 035.

SANDAG staff will make the determination of whether a funding exchange is an option under the Cycle 3 Regional ATP. The ability to make the exchange and the terms and conditions of such exchange shall be in SANDAG’s sole discretion and this determination will be made for Cycle 3 only.

Note: Projects that are a component of major roadway reconstruction projects funded by TransNet are subject to the Routine Accommodations Provisions outlined in SANDAG Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules, Rule 21 and will not be eligible for the funding exchange.
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 or other individual with expertise in bicycling and pedestrian transportation, Safe Routes to School projects, and projects that benefit disadvantaged communities or a related field. Panel members will not represent local jurisdictions that have submitted applications for funding under Cycle 3 from their own agency/department, will 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, cost effectiveness, and matching funds.

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 either the SANDAG Technical Services Department staff or Contracts and Procurement 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 either SANDAG Technical Services Department staff or Contracts and Procurement 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 March 2017.
**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 (available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/lapm.htm) 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 Caltrans 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 Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual.

- If the project applicant requires the consultation services of including but not limited to architects, landscape architects, land surveyors, or engineers, the procedures in Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual must be followed. The naming of a Partner in the application does not negate this requirement.

- 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 Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual.

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

**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, except that an agency may utilize other minimum safety design criteria if specific conditions are met, as described in Streets and Highways Code Section 891(b). 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.

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.

**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

**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.
INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

The following narrative descriptions will be used to assist the evaluation panel in scoring infrastructure project applications. The Infrastructure Scoring Criteria Matrix on pages 26-28 is a summary of this information.

References to the statewide application or Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire are shown in green text next to each section heading below.

4. PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY

A. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network
   (Part B, Narrative Question #2 and Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire)

   *NOTE: The SANDAG 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
   (Part B, Narrative Question #2 and Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire)

   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
   (Part B, Narrative Question #2 and Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire)

   Points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap in the existing pedestrian network. Applicant must demonstrate evidence of an existing gap. Examples include missing sidewalk segments, or enhancement of one or more blocks in between blocks that have previously been upgraded. (Up to 8 points possible)

D. Connection to Transit
   (Part 2, General Project Information)

   *NOTE: The SANDAG 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, SPRINT, 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  
(Part B, Narrative Question #3)

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 involving non-motorized users (2 points)
- Three to four correctable collisions involving non-motorized users (4 points)
- Five or more correctable collisions involving non-motorized users (6 points)

and/or

- Creates access or overcomes barriers in an area where hazardous conditions prohibit safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians (6 points)

5. 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\(^1\)  
(Part B, Narrative Question #3)

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)

\(^1\) Traffic calming measures that consist of roadway improvements that benefit motorists only will receive 0 points.
INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

• 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

*(Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire)*

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 available at [http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/design-guide/](http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/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)

• Does this project propose innovative solutions or propose solutions that are new to the region and can potentially serve as a replicable model? (Up to 4 points)

6. 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

*(Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire)*

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

*(Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire)*

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. **(Up to 3 points possible)**
7. DEMAND ANALYSIS USING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) (PART 2, GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION)

*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

8. PROJECT READINESS/COMPLETION OF MAJOR MILESTONES (PART 5, PROJECT SCHEDULE, AND REGIONAL ATP SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE)

Evidence of a completed feasibility study or equivalent evaluation of project feasibility. 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. (Up to 4 points)
- Completion of right-of-way acquisition, all necessary entitlements, or evidence 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)

9. COST EFFECTIVENESS (COVER PAGE, TOTAL ATP $)

Ratio of Grant Request to Project Score

*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 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 largest quotient will receive 10 points, and the one(s) with the smallest quotient will receive 1 point. (Up to 10 points possible)

10. MATCHING FUNDS (COVER PAGE, MATCHING $; PART 6, PROJECT FUNDING; AND PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #7)

*NOTE: SANDAG Contracts and Procurement 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 matching funds will be 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 points possible)
11. PUBLIC HEALTH  
(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #5)

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)

12. USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS  
(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #8)

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 by email at atp@ccc.ca.gov or by phone at (916) 341-3154. Community Conservation Corps can be contacted by email at inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org or by phone at (916) 426-9170.

13. BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY  
(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #1)

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate, with verifiable information, a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a disadvantaged community. To count as providing a benefit, a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

For a project to qualify as having a direct benefit to a disadvantaged community, the project must be located within or in reasonable proximity and have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community served by the project; or the project must be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or is directly adjacent to that disadvantaged community. To qualify as a disadvantaged community, the community served by the project must meet at least one of the criteria listed in the section of these guidelines entitled “Disadvantaged Communities” (page 8).

Points will be distributed as follows:

- The project benefits a disadvantaged community. (up to 10 points)² OR
- The project does not benefit a disadvantaged community. (0 points)

² Scores will be scaled in relation to the severity of and the benefit provided to the disadvantaged community affected by the project.
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INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX

Infrastructure projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the Infrastructure Scoring Criteria Guidance.

Points calculated by SANDAG’s Technical Services Department or Contracts and Procurement staff 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 (21% of total points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.*</td>
<td>Connection to 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>Completes Connection in 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>Completes Connection in 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 2 Pedestrian improvement within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop 4 Pedestrian improvement directly connects to a local transit stop 4 Pedestrian improvement within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station 6 Pedestrian improvement directly connects to a regional transit station</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. SAFETY AND QUALITY OF PROJECT (31% of total points)

<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>A.</td>
<td>Safety and Access Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for increasing bicycle or pedestrian trips at location with documented safety hazard or accident history within the last seven years: 2 1 to 2 correctable crashes involving non-motorized users 4 3 to 4 correctable crashes involving non-motorized users 6 5 or more correctable crashes involving non-motorized users and/or 6 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>B.</td>
<td>Impact and Effectiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures</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?</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td>How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td>How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C. Program Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>How well does the project align with the ATP objectives?</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D. Innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort?</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does the project propose 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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS (4% of total points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A. Complementary Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Are capital improvements accompanied by supportive programs such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, increased enforcement, and/or bicycle parking?</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrated supportive policies such as complete streets or Community Active Transportation Strategy (CATS)?</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em><em>4.</em> DEMAND ANALYSIS USING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (9% of total points)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5. PROJECT READINESS/COMPLETION OF MAJOR MILESTONES (12% of total points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or community active transportation strategy.</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Environmental clearance (CEQA and NEPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Completed right-of-way acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Final design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em><em>6.</em> COST EFFECTIVENESS (6% of total points)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project grant request, divided by score in Categories 1 through 5, ranked relative to each other.</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em><em>7.</em> MATCHING FUNDS (6% of total points)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Approved match grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. In-kind services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<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>USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS (-3% of total points)</td>
<td>0 to -5</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The applicant sought California Conservation Corps or a qualified Community Conservation Corps participation on the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>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>BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY (6% of total points)</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The project benefits a disadvantaged community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The project does not benefit a disadvantaged community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT SCORE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT SUBCATEGORIES

There are three categories of Non-infrastructure ATP Grants: (1) Planning; (2) Education, Encouragement and Awareness (EEA) Programs; and (3) 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 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
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

NON-INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

The following narrative descriptions will be used to assist the evaluation panel in scoring non-infrastructure applications. The Non-Infrastructure Scoring Criteria Matrix on pages 33-34 is a summary of this information. References to the statewide application or Regional ATP Supplemental Questionnaire are shown in green text next to each section heading below.

1. **ALIGNMENT WITH ATP OBJECTIVES**
   **(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #2)**

   Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project aligns with the ATP objectives. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate the potential for measurable impact across multiple objectives. *(Planning: Up to 30 points; EEA Programs: Up to 20 points; Bike Parking: Up to 20 points)*

2. **COMPREHENSIVENESS**
   **(ATTACHMENT G: NON-INFRASTRUCTURE WORK PLAN)**

   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 for the benefit of pedestrians and bicycles; 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**
   **(ATTACHMENT G: NON-INFRASTRUCTURE WORK PLAN)**

   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 35 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 35 points)*
   - **Bicycle Parking:** Projects must demonstrate that they meet guidelines outlined in Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, available at [http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1674_14591.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1674_14591.pdf). 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 15 points)*
4. COMMUNITY SUPPORT
(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #4)

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
(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #3)

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
(REGIONAL ATP SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE)

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; bike sharing programs; bike corrals; bike stations; or bike parking ordinances.

7. DEMAND ANALYSIS (GIS)
(PART 2, GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION)

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**  
   *(COVER PAGE, TOTAL ATP $)*

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 largest quotient will receive 20 points, and the one(s) with the smallest quotient will receive 1 point. *(Up to 20 points)*

9. **MATCHING FUNDS**  
   *(COVER PAGE, MATCHING $; PART 6, PROJECT FUNDING ; AND PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #7)*

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 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**  
    *(PART B, NARRATIVE QUESTION #5)*

Up to 15 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 (4 points)
- Describe the targeted populations and the health issues that the project will address (3 points)
- Assess health data using the online California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) tool available at [http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx](http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx) (4 points)
- Assess the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) available at [http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org](http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org) (4 points)
**NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS**

**NON-INFRASTRUCTURE SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX**

Non-Infrastructure projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the Non-Infrastructure Scoring Criteria Guidance.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>EEA</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alignment with ATP Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Demand Analysis (GIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alignment with ATP Objectives

How well does the proposed project align with the ATP objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comprehensiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand Analysis (GIS)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Effectiveness

Project grant request, divided by score in Categories 1 through 7, ranked relative to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Matching Funds

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Public Health

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS**

| 170 | 170 | 170 |
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-27

APPROVING THE SUBMISSION OF THE CYCLE 3 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
SCORING CRITERIA TO THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FOR USE IN THE
COMPETITION

WHEREAS, the Legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds
for the Active Transportation Program (ATP) under Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359, and Assembly
Bill 101, Chapter 354; and

WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has been delegated the
responsibility for the administration of this grant program, and has established necessary
procedures; and

WHEREAS, the CTC has required in its ATP Guidelines that Metropolitan Planning
Organizations (MPOs) coordinate the competitive selection process to select projects to receive a
portion of the ATP funding; and

WHEREAS, the ATP Guidelines allow MPOs to use a different project selection criteria or
weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged community
for their competitive selection process with CTC approval; and

WHEREAS, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), as the MPO for the
San Diego region, has developed program guidelines that utilize different project selection criteria
and weighting for Cycle 3 of the San Diego regional ATP competition; and

WHEREAS, the CTC requires the Governing Body of the MPO to approve the proposed
program guidelines for submittal to the CTC; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the SANDAG Board of Directors, acting as the MPO Governing
Body, confirms that the Cycle 3 San Diego Regional ATP program guidelines are consistent with the
ATP Guidelines established by the CTC, and hereby recommends the scoring criteria be submitted to
the CTC for consideration.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th of May, 2016.

________________________________________           ATTEST: ________________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove,
National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County,
U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority,
Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
FY 2017 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides one-quarter percent of the state sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and non-motorized transportation projects. SANDAG, as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for the allocation of TDA funds to the region’s cities, county, and transit operators.

Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 99244, a transit operator can be allocated no more in FY 2017 than it was allocated in FY 2016 unless the region’s transportation planning agency determines that the operator made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvement recommendations adopted subsequent to the last triennial TDA audit (completed in July 2013), and also to show productivity. This reasonable effort is determined through the evaluation of three-year trend data and an annual review of actions taken by each operator to address recommendations received during the triennial audit.

Discussion

Productivity Improvement Measures

The TDA Productivity Improvement Program includes all of the performance measures stated in the state TDA Guidebook Section 99246(d). Additionally, SANDAG tracks multiyear trend analysis since it is recognized that steps taken by the transit agencies to improve system performance often take several years to be fully realized. The Productivity Improvement Program for FY 2016 included the evaluation of the following TDA performance measures over a three-year period (Quarter 2 FY 2013 to Quarter 2 FY 2016):

- Operating Cost Per Passenger (adjusted for annual inflation) – measures cost-effectiveness
- Operating Cost Per Revenue Hour (adjusted for annual inflation) – measures cost-efficiency

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors find that Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District made a reasonable effort to implement productivity improvements during FY 2016 and approve continuing this program in FY 2017, which fulfills the requirements outlined in Section 99244 of the Transportation Development Act.
• Passengers Per Revenue Hour – measures service productivity
• Passengers Per Revenue Mile – measures service productivity
• Revenue Hours Per Employee – measures labor productivity
• Farebox Recovery Ratio – measures cost-efficiency

These performance indicators are measured separately for fixed-route services (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS] Trolley, MTS Bus, MTS Rapid, North County Transit District [NCTD] SPRINTER, NCTD COASTER, and NCTD BREEZE Bus) and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) Paratransit services (MTS ADA and NCTD ADA).

The indicators, which are reviewed quarterly by the Regional Short-Range Transit Planning Task-Force, help determine if the agency is obtaining the desired results from the system and if overall performance is improving based on updated regional strategies or service operation plans. These indicators also help the transit agencies determine where improvements can be made. Improvements can then be incorporated into each operator’s Service Implementation Plan, which are included in the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan prepared by SANDAG.

Performance trends were evaluated in FY 2016 to determine whether the transit agencies improved their performance in light of external circumstances (e.g., fuel prices and reduced state funding levels for transit). To facilitate a greater understanding of each individual service (MTS Bus, MTS Rapid, MTS ADA, MTS Trolley, NCTD BREEZE, NCTD COASTER, NCTD SPRINTER, and NCTD ADA), a composite index of the six TDA performance measures is included in the Productivity Improvement Program to help determine overall trends. With the implementation of Rapid services in calendar year 2014, the report has been revised to separate SANDAG TransNet supported routes into a new Rapid category. Rapid services include SuperLoop (Routes 201, 202, 204), Mid-City (Route 215), and Interstate 15 corridor (Routes 235 and 237).

Attachment 1 includes a chart of each of the six performance indicators, as well as the composite evaluation of each service from Quarter 2 of FY 2013 to Quarter 2 of FY 2016. The overall composite charts are followed by charts that specifically illustrate the percent change through the reporting period as discussed below.

**MTS FY 2016 Performance**

The results of the Quarter 2 FY 2013 to Quarter 2 FY 2016 MTS performance trend analysis indicate that:

• MTS Trolley overall composite performance has shown strong performance over the three years due to ridership increases (lower figures prior to FY 2014 were due to the previous passenger counting methodology that underestimated usage).

• MTS Bus overall composite performance remained relatively stable based over the three-year period in all performance areas.
MTS ADA overall composite performance has shown slight improvement over the three-year period, as the operating cost per revenue hour has remained flat, although passengers per revenue hour and passengers per revenue mile have decreased slightly.

Rapid Routes 201, 202, 204, 215, 235, and 237 were included in a separate category last year. Ridership has been steadily increasing, as has the farebox recovery ratio.

MTS farebox recovery rate for fixed route services has remained strong throughout the three-year period, with an average of 42 percent. This is well above the 31.9 percent TDA minimum threshold requirement. MTS Rapid Express maintained an average farebox recovery ratio of 49.3 percent for the monitoring period, which is more than double the 20.0 percent TDA minimum. For ADA services, the farebox recovery rate has averaged 13.5 percent over this period, and is also above the TDA minimum threshold of 10 percent.

NCTD FY 2016 Performance

The results of the Quarter 2 FY 2013 to Quarter 2 FY 2016 NCTD performance trend analysis indicate that:

- NCTD COASTER overall composite performance has increased, especially in the last year. Ridership has remained relatively stable, and the farebox recovery ratio has increased significantly.

- NCTD SPRINTER overall composite performance showed a slight decline over the three-year period. Operating costs have remained stable, and the farebox recovery ratio has increased throughout the evaluation period.

- NCTD BREEZE overall composite performance showed a slight decline over the three-year period. The operating cost per passenger increased slightly, while passengers per revenue hour decreased.

- NCTD ADA overall composite performance declined significantly starting in the 4th Quarter of FY 2014 due mainly to increases in the cost indicators. On July 1, 2011, NCTD commenced LIFT paratransit services under a Coordinated Transportation Services (Brokerage) model. While this change lowered costs and improved productivity through the 3rd Quarter of FY 2014, the contracted operator, due to legal and financial reasons, could no longer commit to its contractual obligations. On April 1, 2014, NCTD transitioned back to the previous service delivery approach using a dedicated fleet of vehicles and operators. This service model is more costly to operate, and as a result, costs have increased 135 percent over the three-year period. Staff will continue to monitor NCTD’s ADA paratransit program over the next year and will explore opportunities for increasing performance.

- NCTD farebox recovery rate for fixed route services has remained relatively steady over the three-year period at 24 percent, which is above the 18.8 percent TDA minimum threshold requirement. For ADA services, the farebox recovery rate has averaged 10.4 percent for the same three-year period, which is above the TDA minimum threshold of 10 percent. However, the farebox recovery ratio for the service has declined since the service model has changed from a brokerage model to a contracted service. For the last quarter (Quarter 2 of FY 2016), the farebox recovery ratio was 8.5 percent.
**TDA Triennial Audit Recommendations**

In addition to the three-year performance monitoring associated with the annual TDA claim, the triennial performance audit included the development of improvement recommendations for the transit agencies. The most recent performance audit completed in July 2013 included some recommendations on possible strategies to improve efficiency and effectiveness for both transit operators. These recommendations have been addressed by both MTS and NCTD. Action plans, the progress made to date to implement them, and updated responses (from Form B of the 2016 TDA Claim) are included in Attachments 2 and 3, respectively.

SANDAG staff will bring the recommendations generated from the latest triennial performance audit (FY 2013 to FY 2015 report to be completed in May 2016) to the Transportation Committee for approval in June 2016.

**FY 2016 Productivity Improvement Program**

Based on the results discussed above, the conclusion of the performance analysis is that both MTS and NCTD have made reasonable efforts toward achieving their FY 2016 productivity improvements. As mentioned above, the farebox recovery ratio for NCTD ADA services is below the required minimum TDA threshold over the last three quarters. However, NCTD is working to improve the operating efficiency of the ADA service. SANDAG staff will continue to monitor this performance indicator in future reporting.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. FY 2016 Productivity Improvement Results  
2. MTS Annual TDA Claim Form (Form B)  
3. NCTD Annual TDA Claim Form (Form B)

Key Staff Contact: Lisa Madsen, (619) 595-1432, lisa.madsen@sandag.org
FY 2016 Productivity Improvement Results

Figure 1: Fixed Route TDA Performance Composite Index

Figure 2: Fixed Route TDA Performance Composite Index - Percent Change
Figure 7: Passengers per Revenue Hour

Figure 8: Passengers per Revenue Mile
Figure 9: Revenue Hours per Employee (Logarithmic Scale)

Figure 10: Farebox Recovery Rate
ANNUAL TDA CLAIM FORM

STATEMENT OF EFFORTS MADE TO IMPLEMENT PERFORMANCE AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

SANDAG Staff Member: Lisa Madsen

Date Completed: May 1, 2016

Operator: Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)

Date of Last Performance Audit: June 28, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Performance Audit Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Actions Taken to Implement Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Recommendation 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS should identify ways to maintain and improve the cost efficiency of MTS directly operated bus service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTS has been working to mitigate inflationary costs related to directly operated bus service. For example, MTS negotiated comprehensive work rule and benefit changes to all four labor contracts, including unprecedented pension reform that other transit systems are attempting to model. Specifically, all new bus operators and maintenance employees are placed in a defined contribution plan instead of a defined benefit plan. Legacy employees who remain in a defined benefit plan now contribute up to seven percent of pay to their pensions and the contribution level will increase one percent per year to eight percent by 2017. Moreover, the agency has also negotiated “pension cost sharing formulas” with the unions that represent employees who are members of California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS). Since CalPERS restricts the employer’s ability to place new employees in a defined contribution plan, MTS negotiated cost sharing formulas that require employees to automatically increase contributions to offset the employer’s share when certain thresholds are reached.

MTS also negotiated extensive changes to work rules that will improve labor efficiency. For example, MTS directly operated bus employees now earn overtime pay for hours worked over 40 hours in a week instead of after 8 hours in a day, which has resulted in decreased absenteeism. Vacation and sick leave accruals also have been reduced and loopholes in attendance policies have been closed. The effects of these contracts will have a larger impact the next audit period of FY 2013-FY 2015 and are forecasted to save the agency approximately $80 million over the next 30 years.

MTS is restricted in the amount of service it may contract with an outside provider since the passage of California Assembly Bill 117 (AB 117) (Kehoe, 2003). The law essentially prohibits MTS from contracting out service now operated by San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC). New services are not bound by the same restriction; therefore, staff analyzes any new service to determine if the service should be operated in-house by SDTC or contracted out. The analysis includes location of the service and proximity to operations and maintenance facility bases, cost, capability of the entity to expand service, type of vehicles used, fleet compatibility issues if any, etc. For example, new Rapid services implemented in 2014 are operated in-house because it is more cost-effective to do so. However, MTS negotiated with its collective bargaining unit to exchange the new Rapid service for the ability to contract other existing routes that are more cost-effectively operated by a contractor. Four urban and circulator routes were transferred to a contractor for significant cost savings in 2014.
MTS has also driven down costs by consolidating much of its contracted operations under single mile or hour-based contracts, consolidating facilities, and addressing energy costs. For example, in 2011, MTS combined Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and minibus contracts, and purchased a centralized facility with direct freeway access for these services. MTS took advantage of the soft real estate market and performed a few modifications to the former RV sales site. These actions reduced the cost to operate the ADA service by $7.3 million over the seven-year term of that contract, and the minibus service by $4.2 million over the ten-year term of that contract.

MTS also routinely pursues negotiated contracts with suppliers. Regarding energy procurement, for example, MTS negotiated with British Petroleum to receive discounts on compressed natural gas by using credits for green, renewal gas. Furthermore, MTS opted into the California Independent System Operator program to purchase electricity from the state’s wholesale transmission grid, resulting in energy cost savings.

Regarding near-term fleet acquisition, MTS replaced its last diesel articulated buses in 2015, replacing them with new compressed natural gas (CNG)-powered articulated buses. These were the last diesel buses directly operated by MTS; all SDTC service is now on CNG or gasoline-hybrid buses. The remaining diesel transit buses, operated in East County, will be replaced with new CNG models in mid-2016. Lastly, MTS is planning to transition its minibus fleet from gasoline power to propane. In addition to the clean air benefits, MTS expects significant operating cost savings over the life of the vehicles. MTS will continue to seek ways to improve efficiency by reviewing its service operations to determine the best method for service delivery. Operations will be evaluated to determine when opportunities are available for contracting within the confines of AB 117.
STATEMENT OF EFFORTS MADE TO IMPLEMENT
PERFORMANCE AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

SANDAG Staff Member: Lisa Madsen Date Completed: May 2, 2016

Operator: North County Transit District (NCTD)

Date of Last Performance Audit: June 28, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Performance Audit Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Actions Taken to Implement Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38   | **Recommendation 1**  
Develop strategies to improve fare simplification and integration, including with regional partners SANDAG, MTS, Amtrak and Metrolink | This recommendation from the TDA Auditor is important. However, it must be recognized that NCTD does not establish regional fares and does not have the ability to require partnering/connecting agencies to enter into simplified fare agreements. With that said, NCTD has taken the following actions to address the recommendations provided in the TDA FY10-12 Performance Audit of NCTD:

1. **September 2013** – NCTD organized and convened a Fare Simplification Working Group with members from NCTD, MTS, and SANDAG to consider:
   a. Direction of the Fare Simplification Working Group  
   b. Response to FY 10-FY12 Triennial Performance Review of NCTD  
   c. Assessment of fare structure  
   d. Forms of fare media  
   e. Leveraging fare technology  
   f. Fare Policy vs. Fare Technology

2. **September 2013** – NCTD partnered with MTS for NCTD to sell special event tickets (Region Plus Day Pass) through a mobile ticketing application (CooCoo) to allow customers to board both COASTER and Trolley to commute to all 2013 Charger home games.

3. **October 2013** – NCTD entered into a revised Rail2Rail program with Amtrak Pacific that provides San Diego county commuters with additional train options, convenience, value, and fare simplification/interoperability. This program has yielded operating cost savings while generating increased commuter rail options for customers within the San Diego region. Although the National Transit Database does not allow NCTD to report Rail2Rail ridership as additional COASTER boardings, NCTD still believes the value of these increased service options to the region demonstrates a good use of public funds and assets by maximizing the use of existing capacity.

4. **November 2013** – NCTD participated in a fare technology workshop convened by LA Metro to discuss the future of fare revenue systems amongst several transit agencies. The workshop focused on leveraging the economies of scale associated with having fare revenue systems with common or compatible system requirements. This break from the proprietary fare revenue systems operated by agencies today would allow for system administration efficiency improvements, but also allow for compatibility of fares within and across regions.
5. **January 2014** – The Fare Simplification Working Group covered the following items:
   a. Status of implementing recommendations from prior Regional Transit Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study
   b. Evaluate the need for Rural Routes
   c. Consolidation of COASTER zones
   d. Fees for special event fare sales
   e. Raising BREEZE single ride to be commensurate with MTS bus fare (recommended in study)
   f. Transfer from Transit
   g. Availability of RegionPlus Day Pass on MTS bus
   h. Removal of SVCC $1 fare from ordinance since there is no fare to customers in operations due to NCTD subsidy of the fare
   i. Re-naming for RegionPlus and Regional passes
   j. Determined that SANDAG should commission another Fare Study and update the model used for analyzing fare changes on ridership and revenue in FY 2016

6. **March 2014** – NCTD partnered with MTS for NCTD to sell special event tickets (Region Plus Day Pass) through a mobile ticketing application (CooCoo) to allow customers to board both COASTER and Trolley to commute to all 2014 and 2015 Padres home games.

7. **May 2014** – NCTD made available a 30-Day SPRINTER/BREEZE Monthly pass. This was the only pass in the region without a 30-Day option, and now provides another option for customers to purchase the fare that best meets their needs.

8. **July 2014** – Made One-way COASTER tickets available for purchase through the CooCoo mobile ticketing application.

9. **July 2014** – Per an agreement between SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD, the program management and administration of the regional fare revenue system (Compass) transferred in its entirety from SANDAG to MTS. This mutually agreed upon transfer has provided the transit operators greater access into the planning, operational, and administrative requirements and challenges of the fare revenue system, which will allow for improved planning and administration for system operations, maintenance, and replacement.

10. **August 2014** – NCTD partnered with MTS and UCSD to allow all UCSD students access to utilize all BREEZE and SPRINTER services at a per student quarterly cost.

11. **September 2014** – NCTD partnered with MTS to conduct a joint procurement for mobile ticketing services. Having one mobile ticketing provider servicing both operators will allow the agencies an opportunity to sell regional fares to customers instead of being limited to agency specific fare options, and allow for potential integration into the primary fare revenue system. MTS is conducting this joint procurement, and the operators anticipate having a mutual contractor in place by January 2016.
12. **April 2015** – SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD have agreed to commission another Fare Study led by SANDAG in FY 2016. The study is intended to:

   a. Simplify fare structure for the customers Metrolink, and Metrolink connecting services.
   b. Reduce number of fares
   c. Improve ability of fare ordinance to be implemented and administered with fare revenue systems (Cubic, CooCoo, etc.)
   d. Solidify basis for fare revenue sharing arrangements based on actual customer travel patterns for COASTER and BRT modes of service

In addition to these actions already taken by NCTD, consideration has been given to the following items:

1. Making Regional Day Passes ($5) available for purchase on Compass Cards in the NCTD service area (Buses and TVM’s) in order to mirror the purchase options available in the MTS service area.

   a. NCTD would not however charge a $2 administration fee to customers purchasing the Regional Day Pass on paper
   b. The capability for NCTD to sell Regional Day Passes ($5) on Compass Cards will become available upon deployment of upgraded Cubic software version to NCTD.

2. Inter-jurisdictional fares valid for NCTD, MTS, Formation of an agreed upon fare structure has been reached by NCTD and Metrolink. However, Metrolink has informed NCTD that discussions of inter-jurisdictional fares and service will not be continued at this time.

Other fare system issues specified in the TDA FY10-12 Performance Audit of NCTD were as follows:

1. “Complicated and confusing due to multiple modes”

   a. Formation of the Fare Simplification Working Group was intended to collaborate towards assessing the current environment and recommending improvements to simplify the fare structure
   b. Commissioning an update of the 2008 fare study will also address this concern

2. “Transfers…have been problematic”

   a. Transit operators are operating under the SANDAG Comprehensive Fare Ordinance which incorporated recommendations from the previous fare study
   b. In October 2011, NCTD had recommended to simplify the transfer for single-ride and round trip COASTER tickets by allowing transfers to Trolley and MTS bus service comparable to the use of the Monthly COASTER Pass. This recommendation was not implemented due to the existence of the Region Plus Day Pass which allows for the same trip.
c. NCTD reinstated the Transfer from Transit trip which provides for discounted single-ride COASTER tickets to customers with Regional fares. This discount is primarily subsidized by NCTD, and utilized by customers mostly at Santa Fe Depot and OTC.

3. “Paper day passes with one operator and not the other”
   
a. NCTD believes that a paper day pass is beneficial to have as a fare instrument particularly for customers who ride infrequently or for special events. MTS recognizes NCTD’s paper pass so there is no issue of interoperability. NCTD’s operation of commuter rail and connections with Metrolink and Amtrak support the need for a paper fare instrument to support interoperability.

4. “Accounting for revenue sharing disagreements for special event discounted fares”

In most special event fares, the transit operators have relied upon the existing Region Plus Day Pass MOU for methodology of revenue distribution (Chargers and Padres games).

39  Recommendation 2
Examine best provisions for performance standards, incentives and disincentives within recent contracts (BREEZE, LIFT) and apply where applicable to contracts for other modes.

Oversight of all operating modes is now consistent. Each mode has a detailed oversight report completed monthly that confirms compliance with contract standards. Each report indicates performance, trends and determines compliance of deliverables and liquidated damages. Each report is provided to executive staff, contractors and maintained within NCTD document control system.

40  Recommendation 3
Provide additional oversight and training to SPRINTER vehicle maintenance staff.

A complete review of the of NCTD’s Sprinter vehicle maintenance program has been completed. The review indicated the need of several enhancements that have been implemented to include; revamping of reactive and preventative maintenance procedures; additional training for the vehicle maintenance staff detailing the maintenance procedures and requirements; and increased oversight by augmenting the oversight program to include the Divisions of Safety and Internal Audit.

40  Recommendation 4
Carefully track Performance Plan adherence for LIFT contractor through regular reporting out on progress and continued customer surveys.

The termination of the ALC contract and transition to First Transit as NCTD’s LIFT and FLEX service provider was completed on April 1, 2014. The performance of First Transit is monitored closely as with all of NCTD’s modes. Current performance is well within standards with OTP, complaints and denials. A detailed oversight report completed monthly that confirms compliance with contract standards.
REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION:  
STATUS REPORT

Introduction

In December 2014, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a Regional Complete Streets Policy\(^1\) (Policy). The Policy was incorporated into San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan upon the plan’s adoption in October 2015.

The Policy (Attachment 1) recognizes that SANDAG’s planning framework is based on smart growth and sustainability. Under this framework, much of the region’s future development will occur within the existing urbanized area and in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing and transportation choices, and help create healthier communities. Complete Streets is an important planning concept within this framework, because it provides a process to ensure the transportation system is safe, useful, and attractive for all users of the transportation network – motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and the movement of freight alike.

The Policy includes seven components, including a policy statement, a description of the applicability of the principles, a section on context sensitivity, emphasis on a well-connected transportation network, a list of situations where exceptions to implementation of the policy might be appropriate, a commitment to measuring performance, and a list of actions to be undertaken in collaboration with member agencies and other affected agencies. This report describes the progress made toward implementing the actions included in the Policy.

Discussion

The following matrix lists each action and summarizes the status of implementation efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Regional Project Development Checklist:</strong> All projects developed by SANDAG are opportunities to improve access and mobility for all modes. Toward that end, SANDAG will create a project development checklist to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local mobility plans and accommodate the needs of all travel</td>
<td><strong>This action has been completed.</strong> A “Regional Complete Streets Project Development Checklist” has been developed. This checklist, included as Attachment 2, is intended for use by SANDAG staff to coordinate across various departments on addressing complete streets elements when designing regional transportation projects. Developing the checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) The Regional Complete Streets Policy was one of the five commitments made by the SANDAG Board of Directors from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modes and the movement of goods to the extent appropriate. Use of the checklist will include coordination between departments and consultation with staff for all modes through participation on the project development team.</td>
<td>involved examining complete streets checklists from around the country. The checklist has three sections, including Existing Conditions, Planning Context, and Project Proposal that SANDAG project managers are required to complete at the start of the project in the scoping document/feasibility study. The checklist requires review and approval from the SANDAG Department Director.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Regional and Local Coordination and Cost-Sharing Protocol**: Develop a process for coordinating the development of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets initiatives and include in that process a protocol for evaluating cost sharing opportunities.

   **This action is underway and is expected to be completed in Fall/Winter 2016/2017.** SANDAG staff has been working with the region’s planning and community development directors and public works directors (through the Regional Planning Technical Working Group [TWG] and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee [CTAC]) on enhancing knowledge and awareness of the Complete Streets Policy and exploring mechanisms to further the implementation of complete streets at the regional and local levels. SANDAG has established a Complete Streets web page at sandag.org/CompleteStreets, discussed complete streets at recent TWG and CTAC meetings, and most recently, held a joint TWG/CTAC workshop focused on highlighting best practices, and identifying barriers and solutions regarding complete streets implementation. With this foundational work in place, next steps include developing a protocol for evaluating cost sharing opportunities.

3. **Local Project Development Checklist Template**: Develop a project development checklist template that local agencies can use to ensure local projects result in Complete Streets.

   **This action has been completed.** A document entitled, “Local Complete Streets Sample Checklist: A Tool for Local Agencies” has been developed and posted to the SANDAG complete streets web page. The local sample checklist, included as Attachment 3, can be adapted to meet local planning goals and used on a voluntary basis for local jurisdictions and others to consider complete streets in the development of local transportation projects. Use of the sample checklist is optional, can be adapted to meet specific local agency goals, and is not a requirement for receiving transportation funds administered by SANDAG.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Regional Database and Mapping Tool:</strong></td>
<td>This action will be started Fall/Winter 2016/2017. Staff will begin working with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a scope for this effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Trainings, Workshops, and Educational Events:</strong></td>
<td>This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. SANDAG staff has created a Complete Streets webpage at sandag.org/CompleteStreets, which contains the Policy, the regional checklist, the local sample checklist, upcoming training workshops, and other resources, including guidance on best practices and innovation in street design. SANDAG also hosts monthly webinars provided by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, and notifies local agencies through the Active Transportation Working Group. In addition, internal interdepartmental training workshops will be held on an ongoing basis to support enhanced understanding of the policy and sustain continued commitment to implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for SANDAG staff, and staff from member agencies, Caltrans, and transit operators to participate in trainings, workshops, and other educational events related to Complete Streets procedures and practices including, but not limited to, transportation safety, multimodal network planning, context-sensitive design, connecting transportation and land use decisions, and evaluating projects and the impact of transportation investments. This will be an ongoing activity to ensure practitioners are well informed about state-of-the-art practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Tools and Reference Materials:</strong></td>
<td>This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. In conjunction with CTAC, TWG, and the transit operators, SANDAG continues to identify best practices and innovative resources, which have been added to the webpage. As more resources are identified, they will be posted to the webpage. Local jurisdictions in the region are pursuing innovative approaches to implement complete streets. SANDAG will continue to highlight these local efforts as examples of best practices that can help inform other local efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop tools and reference materials as needed, such as guidance on best practices and innovation in street design, parking management strategies, storm water best practices, incorporating bike and pedestrian access to transit stops and stations, traffic impact studies, and public engagement tools. SANDAG will make these tools available to other entities on its website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Implementation Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Related Initiatives:</strong> Continue work on related initiatives that support multimodal connections, including the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and Safe Routes to Transit programs.</td>
<td>This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. SANDAG staff continues work on related initiatives that support multimodal connections. A SR2S strategic plan and corresponding implementation plan have been developed, and representation from the SR2S Coalition currently exists on the SANDAG Active Transportation Working Group. Safe Routes to Transit programs also have moved forward with the completion of Safe Routes to Transit typology prototypes for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. In addition, the Regional Plan incorporates a number of other SANDAG strategies and programs that focus on sustainability, including the Smart Growth Concept Map, the Smart Growth Incentive Program, the Active Transportation Grant Program, the Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy, the Regional Bike Plan, and the Regional Mobility Hub Implementation Strategy. Implementation of the Regional Bike Plan is underway through the Regional Bike Early Action Program. These efforts serve as the interconnected building blocks for implementing the regional vision and providing more transportation choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Monitoring:</strong> Develop a benchmarking process for SANDAG project managers to use as a tool for monitoring implementation of this policy.</td>
<td>This action will be started Fall/Winter 2016/2017. SANDAG will evaluate the outcomes of the Complete Streets Policy in concert with regional performance measures, such as those developed for the Regional Plan and future long-range transportation plans. According to the Policy, a biennial review of objective measures will be presented to the Transportation Committee for the Committee to use in evaluating the effectiveness of the Policy. The performance measures are outlined in the Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Report to Board of Directors:</strong> Provide a report to the Board of Directors on the implementation of this policy within one year of its adoption.</td>
<td>This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. A report is scheduled to be presented to the SANDAG Board at its June meeting, and thereafter as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion at the Regional Planning Committee

At its meeting on May 6, the Regional Planning Committee discussed the implementation of the Regional Complete Streets Policy and suggested that SANDAG consider the following in addition to the implementation actions included in the policy:

- Provide guidance on how to manage maintenance costs for landscaping (such as tree-trimming, watering, etc.), including how design and recycled water can help minimize these costs.

- Provide guidance or examples of best practices for how to minimize the impacts of project construction on local businesses.

- Consider how the landscaping that enhances the pedestrian realm can also serve as a strategy for implementing local climate action plans.

- Survey local jurisdictions about roundabouts in the region.

Next Steps

SANDAG will continue to work with member agencies, the transit operators, and Caltrans to implement the Policy. Work this year will focus on identifying additional training opportunities for SANDAG and member agency staff, developing a protocol for evaluating cost sharing of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets efforts, developing a scope for a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans, and monitoring and reporting implementation of this Policy.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director, Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Regional Complete Streets Policy  
2. Regional Complete Streets Project Development Checklist  
3. Local Complete Streets Sample Checklist: A Tool for Local Agencies

Key Staff Contacts: Carolina Ilic, (619) 699-1989, carolina.ilic@sandag.org  
Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

Purpose

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) guides regional planning via a policy framework based on smart growth and sustainability. Under this framework, much of the region’s future development will occur within the existing urbanized area and in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing and transportation choices, and help create healthier communities. Complete Streets is an important planning concept in this policy framework because it is a process for ensuring the transportation system is safe, useful, and attractive for all users of the transportation network – motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and the movement of freight alike. Complete Streets provides valuable flexibility in street design so that the transportation system is appropriate for the current and planned built environment context.

1. Policy Statement

SANDAG seeks to fulfill the regional goal of a safe, balanced, multimodal transportation system that supports compact and sustainable development by adopting a Complete Streets approach in its project development and implementation processes, and by assisting and encouraging local jurisdictions to follow Complete Streets policies and practices. In this way, everyone will be able to safely travel along and across streets and railways to reach destinations within the region, regardless of age, ability, or mode of travel.

2. Applicability

Applicable principles in this Complete Streets Policy should be incorporated into the development of all SANDAG transportation infrastructure projects\(^1\) across the region at all phases of development, including planning and land use decisions, scoping, design, implementation, and performance monitoring. SANDAG will incorporate Complete Streets principles into the development process for all projects in its Capital Improvement Program as appropriate for the project type.

In addition, SANDAG supports and encourages Complete Streets implementation by other entities throughout the region. Local jurisdictions, as required by the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, will incorporate Complete Streets into their general plans as they revise their circulation elements. SANDAG encourages local agencies to implement Complete Streets principles if a circulation element revision is not planned in the near future. Adopting a Complete Streets approach provides an opportunity to establish more detailed direction on Complete Streets implementation than would be provided in the context of a general plan. SANDAG also encourages and supports Complete Streets methodologies in the design and construction of all projects in the region developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as appropriate, consistent with Deputy Directive 64-R1, and in the maintenance and operation of all state highway and public transit facilities.

---

\(^1\) The policy will apply to all new projects and projects still in the planning phase at the time the policy is adopted.
Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Extension Ordinance requires all projects constructed under the Ordinance to routinely accommodate pedestrian and bicyclists. Rule No. 21 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 provides guidance for the implementation of that requirement. SANDAG will periodically evaluate the effectiveness of Rule No. 21 to ensure compliance with this provision and to ensure that the rule reflects current best practices in Complete Streets implementation.

3. Design Practices and Context Sensitivity

While every street should be planned, designed, built, operated, and maintained for all foreseeable users, there is no singular design standard for Complete Streets and few streets will have separate accommodations for every mode. Projects should be planned and designed to consider current and planned adjacent land uses and local transportation needs, and to incorporate the latest and best practice design guidance. Each project must be considered both separately and as part of a connected network to determine the level and type of treatment necessary for all foreseeable users.

In order to provide context sensitive solutions that respond to public input, and the need to serve a variety of users, a flexible, balanced approach to project design that utilizes innovative design solutions may be considered provided that an adequate level of safety for all users is ensured. SANDAG will compile a library of best practice design guidance to facilitate this and make it available on its website.

SANDAG encourages local governments and Caltrans to coordinate Complete Streets implementation with broader livable communities planning and integration of land use with transportation. SANDAG will coordinate educational opportunities for jurisdictional technical staff on current design standards and will encourage and support the use of modern best practices in Complete Streets design.

4. Regional Network Principles

A well-connected network provides safe and convenient transitions from one mode of transportation to another, from one jurisdiction to another and from one type of infrastructure to another. A well-connected network also provides more route choices that can disperse traffic across the network, provides alternatives when priority is given to a particular mode along one route, and that provides route alternatives when a link in the network is obstructed. SANDAG will endeavor to provide a continuous, uninterrupted network accessible to all users and modes. A well-connected network considers connectivity throughout the lifespan of a transportation project and takes into account the needs of both current and projected users.

5. Exceptions

All transportation projects constructed or reconstructed should be planned, designed, and constructed for all foreseeable users. For some projects, however, an exception to this standard may be warranted. For projects developed by SANDAG, project managers may propose an exception with supporting data to indicate the basis for the request. The request for an exception will be reviewed by the project manager’s department director before inclusion and/or the next update of the project in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).
Exceptions may be appropriate in the following cases:

5.1 Where specific modes of travel are prohibited by law. In such cases, efforts should be made to accommodate travel by prohibited modes elsewhere, as appropriate for each mode, to ensure network connectivity. Where a proposed project for a limited access facility would cross a major barrier (such as a river, railroad, or highway), consideration should be given to the opportunity to include access across the barrier for otherwise limited modes.

5.2 Where the cost of providing facilities for all travelers, especially pedestrians and bicyclists, would be excessively disproportionate to the need or likely use. Federal guidance defines this as exceeding 20 percent of the total project costs; however, this exception also should be context-sensitive. Where demand is high or a barrier is significant, a cost in excess of 20 percent may be warranted, but where demand is low, 20 percent may not. This exception must consider probable use through the life of the project, a minimum of 20 years.

5.3 Where approved or adopted plans or policies (such as local land use, zoning, or mobility planning) or present and anticipated market conditions indicate an absence of need for both current and future conditions of the anticipated project’s life (a minimum of 20 years for roadways and 50 years for bridges).

5.4 Where unmitigable detrimental environmental impacts outweigh the need for full accommodation of all travel modes. In making this determination, the needs of all modes will be considered, with priorities determined based on the project context.

Exceptions that are recommended for approval will be reported to the Transportation Committee through the RTIP process where a member of the public may present opposition to that recommendation during public comment or in writing in advance of the meeting at which the exception recommendation is included. Exceptions should not be common.

All state, regional, and local agency projects included in the SANDAG programming document (known as the Regional Transportation Improvement Program) should be subject to applicable Complete Streets principles. SANDAG encourages each entity submitting projects to the RTIP to implement a process that allows for public participation and comment on whether those projects follow Complete Streets principles.

6. Performance Measures

SANDAG will evaluate the outcomes of this Complete Streets Policy in concert with regional performance measures, such as those developed for the Regional Comprehensive Plan and future long-range transportation plans. The policy will be subject to a biennial review of objective measures presented to the Transportation Committee for the committee to use in evaluating the effectiveness of the policy. These measures and their objectives include:

6.1 An increase in the number of projects that include multimodal connections to destinations by providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, crossing improvements, traffic calming measures, wayfinding signs or other measures.
6.2 An increase in the miles of new and upgraded bikeways and walkways in the region, and other improvements that improve access for biking, walking, and transit or improve monitoring of those modes.

6.3 An increase in member jurisdictions that have adopted this Complete Streets Policy, or their own separate policies, incorporating Complete Streets principles or that have revised the circulation element of their general plans in compliance with the California Complete Streets Act.

6.4 The number of staff members from SANDAG and local jurisdictions and other transportation agencies participating in training and events that reflect best practices in Complete Streets planning and design.

6.5 Progress in accomplishing activities identified in the “Implementation” section below.

7. Implementation

In addition to the measures described above in this policy, SANDAG will take the following actions in collaboration with member agencies and other affected agencies:

7.1 All projects developed by SANDAG are opportunities to improve access and mobility for all modes. Toward that end, SANDAG will create a project development checklist to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local mobility plans and accommodate the needs of all travel modes and the movement of goods to the extent appropriate. Use of the checklist will include coordination between departments and consultation with staff for all modes through participation on the project development team. (Estimated time to complete: nine months from adoption of the policy.)

7.2 Develop a process for coordinating the development of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets initiatives and include in that process a protocol for evaluating cost sharing opportunities. (Estimated time to complete: one year.)

7.3 Develop a project development checklist template that local agencies can use to ensure local projects result in Complete Streets. (Estimated time to complete: nine months.)

7.4 Collaborate with local jurisdiction, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans. (Estimated time to complete: one year.)

7.5 Provide opportunities for SANDAG staff, and staff from member agencies, Caltrans, and transit operators to participate in trainings, workshops, and other educational events related to Complete Streets procedures and practices including, but not limited to, transportation safety, multimodal network planning, context-sensitive design, connecting transportation and land use decisions, and evaluating projects and the impact of transportation investments. This will be an ongoing activity to ensure practitioners are well informed about state-of-the-art practices.
7.6 Develop tools and reference materials as needed, such as guidance on best practices and innovation in street design, parking management strategies, storm water best practices, incorporating bicycle and pedestrian access to transit stops and stations, traffic impact studies, and public engagement tools. SANDAG will make these tools available to other entities on its website.

7.7 Continue work on related initiatives that support multimodal connections, including the Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit programs.

7.8 Develop a benchmarking process for SANDAG project managers to use as a tool for monitoring implementation of this Policy. (Estimated time to complete: 9 months.)

7.9 Provide a report to the Board of Directors on the implementation of this policy within one year of its adoption.
Regional Complete Streets Project Development Checklist

Introduction

On December 19, 2014, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors adopted a Regional Complete Streets Policy (Policy). The Policy defines Complete Streets as it will be used to guide SANDAG in its role as an implementer of regional transportation projects and as the regional planning agency that programs transportation funds, sets long-range regional transportation policy, and provides technical assistance and support to local agencies. The Board action directed implementation action items such as this project development checklist and others to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local complete streets initiatives and accommodate the needs of all travel modes. The Policy document is available at:


Background and Resources

In 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors established a Smart Growth Strategy for the region’s future growth and development. The strategy is illustrated on the Smart Growth Concept Map (SGCM), which was first adopted by the Board of Directors in 2006. The SGCM shows the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas as well as planned habitat and open space. Projects located in a smart growth area must support walking and biking access, especially as it relates to transit. The Smart Growth in the San Diego Region (sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_296_13993.pdf) brochure provides descriptions of the seven smart growth place types. More details about the SGCM are available at:

sandag.org/resources/smartgrowth/index_gmap.asp

Guidance on applying smart growth principles to transportation projects can be found in Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region (sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=344&fuseaction=projects.detail).

Transportation design guidance for Complete Streets is available from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, those listed below:

- **Riding to 2050 (see Chapter 7, Bicycle Design Guidelines)**
  sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_353_10862.pdf

- **Planning and Designing for Pedestrians**
  sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_713_3269.pdf

- **Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000**

- **NACTO Urban Street Design Guide**
  nacto.org/usdg
• NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide  
nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide

• Active Transportation Implementation Strategy & Safe Routes to School Typologies  
sdforward.com/pdfs/RP_final/AppendixU16-ActiveTransportationImplementationStrategy.pdf

• SANDAG Transit Design Guidelines

Local bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school plans, and Community Active Transportation strategies should all be consulted where they exist. Contact local jurisdiction planning and engineering departments in the project area to identify local plans.

Using the Checklist

There are two occasions for employing the Complete Streets checklists.

1. The Project Initiation Complete Streets Checklist is completed and approved at the start of the project initiation process in the scoping document/feasibility study before the project is added to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

2. If changing project scope, the Project Amendment Complete Streets Checklist must be completed and approved prior to amending the project in the RTIP. This is necessary because any exceptions to complying with this policy must be reported to the Transportation Committee as part of the RTIP approval process.

If all modes of travel cannot be accommodated in the project consistent with local and regional plans, the checklist requires an explanation of the circumstances that justify that decision. Discuss the issue with your Director to determine if the project should be submitted for review by the SANDAG Active Transportation Working Group. Be sure the project does not preclude design features that could be added in the future if funds become available.

Project Managers preparing the Checklist should consult with planners in the Land Use Coordination section to assist with the planning context and answer any specific questions for clarification.
Project Initiation Complete Streets Checklist

Project Title: ________________________________

Project Location: ________________________________

Contact Name, Phone, and Email: ________________________________

Existing Conditions (To be completed by SANDAG Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. What accommodations for people walking or riding bikes exist in the project area? Include accommodations on any existing transportation facility, and any facilities that the project will intersect or cross. See GIS Senior Analyst for any questions.

   SANDAG Regional Bike Map: gis1.sandag.org/BikeMap2015/index.html

   SANDAG Sidewalk Map: M:\RES\GIS\Sidewalks\SanDiegoSidewalkNetwork_6_17

   City of San Diego Sidewalk Inventory: (website available in 2016)

   Google Maps: www.google.com/maps

2. If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?

3. Describe the existing level of pedestrian or bicycle activity along the project corridor based on available data from the Regional Bike Counter Network and/or baseline data collection. See Bike Program Manager for baseline data collection.

   Regional Bike Counter Network webpage:

   sandag.org/index.asp?classid=34&projectid=496&fuseaction=projects.detail

4. What trip generators (existing and planned) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others? See GIS Senior Analyst for any questions.

   Land Use Database Connections: \dc.pila.LIS.ago.sde\lis.GIS.Land\lis.GIS.ludu2014

5. What existing challenges or barriers could the proposed project address for people walking or bicycling in the vicinity of the proposed project?

6. What is the crash history in the project area? If the crash history of the site is high, what proposed project strategies will address public safety?

   Transportation Injury Mapping System: tims.berkeley.edu/page.php?page=tools
**Planning Context (To be completed by Planning Staff working with Project Manager)**

1. Is the project in a Smart Growth Area as defined by the Smart Growth Concept Map? See Land Use Principal Planner for any questions.


2. What local or regional plans will be consulted in the development of the project? (Include bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school and safe routes to transit plans, community active transportation strategies, streetscape enhancement plans, community plan mobility elements, and other relevant plans provided by local agencies).

   SANDAG Intergovernmental Review Resource List:

   sandag.org/index.asp?classid=12&projectid=379&fuseaction=projects.detail

3. Where the project can contribute to the implementation of local plans, has a local jurisdiction contribution been identified and included in the project budget?

**Proposed Project (To be completed by Project Manager)**

1. How will the project development process respond to the mobility plans of local agencies?

2. Briefly describe the existing and future travel demand for all modes and how the proposed project will serve that demand.

3. Will the project sever existing access for any modes? If so, describe the circumstances and how the project will mitigate that loss of access. If the lost access cannot be mitigated, explain why not.

4. What accommodations are proposed for people walking or riding bikes in the project design?

5. Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block access? If yes, how will that access be restored?

6. If the proposed project would not provide both bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, or if the proposed project would hinder non-motorized access, describe the circumstances that create this constraint.

7. If cost is assumed to be a factor in limiting access for people walking or riding a bike, explain how costs for the walking and biking improvements were allocated, and describe the key cost elements and their costs in relation to the overall project cost.

8. If existing right-of-way is a constraint, has acquisition of additional right-of-way been considered?

9. How will the project development process ensure access for people walking or riding bikes is maintained during project construction?

10. Have all parties responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility been identified?
Complete Streets Certification

This project does/does not accommodate all users as requested by Complete Streets policy.

Completed by: ______________________________________________________________________________

Name                  Title                  Date

Reviewed and approved by: ___________________________________________________________

Name                  Title                  Date

Department Director

If this project will not meet the needs of all modes of travel that are not prohibited access by law, report this outcome to the Transportation Committee as part of the RTIP approval process with an explanation of the factors that led to that decision.
Project Amendment Complete Streets Checklist

Project Title: ________________________________________________________________

Project Location: _____________________________________________________________

Contact Name, Phone, and Email: ______________________________________________

Existing Conditions (To be completed by SANDAG Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. If the land use or transportation context for the project changed since project initiation, explain how, and how those changes are affecting the plan, design, and estimated cost. Has observed pedestrian or bicycle activity along in the project area changed since the project was initiated, and if so, by how much? Has the project plan or design been modified to reflect that change? See Bike Program Manager for baseline data collection

   Regional Bike Counter Network webpage: sandag.org/index.asp?classid=34&projectid=496&fuseaction=projects.detail

2. Has the crash history in the project area changed since the initial assessment? If so, how? Does the current project design respond to any changes in the crash history?

   Transportation Injury Mapping System: tims.berkeley.edu/page.php?page=tools

Planning Context (To be completed by Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. Have any new local or regional plans been completed, or have any existing plans been updated since the project was initiated? (Include bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school and safe routes to transit plans, community active transportation strategies, streetscape enhancement plans)

2. How does the current proposed project respond to these new plans?

Current Project Proposal (To be completed by Project Manager)

1. Have there been any changes in how the proposed project will accommodate people walking or biking, the movement of private vehicles, transit, or freight? Address access along the project corridor and across it.

2. Has the cost of accommodating any mode changed significantly? (If so, by how much? Dollar amount or percent change.) Will the completed project, as currently proposed, fully accommodate all modes? If not, why not?

3. What is the current estimated cost of including full accommodation for all modes?

4. If the proposed project would not provide both bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, or if the proposed project would hinder non-motorized access, describe the circumstances that cause this.
5. If cost is assumed to be a factor in limiting access for people walking or riding a bike, explain the factors that impact the cost, and how those costs were allocated.

6. If existing right-of-way is a constraint, has acquisition of additional right-of-way been considered? If so, what is the estimated cost of that right-of-way?
Complete Streets Certification

This project does/does not accommodate all users as requested by Complete Streets policy.

Completed by:  ____________________________________________________________

Name  Title  Date

Reviewed and approved by:  ____________________________________________  Department Director

Name  Title  Date

If this project will not meet the needs of all modes of travel that are not prohibited access by law, report this outcome to the Transportation Committee as part of the RTIP approval process with an explanation of the factors that led to that decision.
Local Complete Streets Sample Checklist:  
A Tool for Local Agencies

Introduction

This Complete Streets Sample Checklist is designed as a tool for local agencies to use in developing their own internal process for evaluating whether new transportation projects plan for and accommodate all modes of travel to the extent warranted. Use of the local sample checklist is optional, can be adapted to meet specific local agency goals, and is not a requirement for receiving any transportation funds administered by SANDAG.

Using the Checklist

The Complete Streets Sample Checklist is a tool that can be used when a transportation project is initiated to ensure that all modes are considered in the initial scoping and budgeting of the project. When evaluating existing and potential facilities for each mode, it is often useful for the project to take a holistic approach and consider the corridor context or surrounding transportation network. Because it may not be necessary or feasible to accommodate all modes in every project, the sample checklist provides a mechanism for exploring the application of complete streets solutions in the broader project area and documenting the circumstances that explain the decision.

Project Initiation Complete Streets Checklist

Project Title: _____________________________________________________________

Project Location: __________________________________________________________

Project Manager, Phone, and Email: ___________________________________________

Existing Conditions

What infrastructure currently exists to support each mode of travel?

☐ Auto
☐ Transit
☐ Pedestrian facilities
☐ ADA compliant?
☐ Bike facility/facilities
☐ Lighting
☐ Storm water
☐ Auto parking
☐ Bike parking

Total number of travel lanes _________
Route numbers/headways ____________
Transit stops/amenities ______________
Transit priority measures _____________
Sidewalk - width and condition ______
Sidewalk - both sides of street? ______
Adequate street crossings ____________
Sidewalk shading / street trees ________
Deficiencies _________________________
Type(s) _____________________________
Street lighting? ____ Pedestrian lighting? ____
Number of spaces _________________
Number of spaces _________________

Add details as necessary to describe any infrastructure deficiencies, walking and biking conditions, and/or challenges for transit performance.
What is the existing level of demand to the extent data are available?

- Auto ADT _____
- Transit Passengers per day by route _____
  Passengers per day by stop _____
- Pedestrians* _____
- Bikes* _____

* In the absence of existing demand data for bike and pedestrian traffic, document the surrounding land uses that are likely to attract significant traffic by these modes.

What is the safety record over the last five years for the project area?

- Auto-involved crashes _____
- Pedestrian-involved crashes _____
- Bicycle-involved crashes _____
- Pedestrian and bicycle-involved crashes within ¼ mile of transit stops _____

Coordination with transit agencies

- What existing challenges could the proposed project address for transit routes in the vicinity of the proposed project? What transit priority measures could improve transit performance? (Recommendation: Coordinate with the Metropolitan Transit System [MTS] or North County Transit District [NCTD])

  Recommendations:

  - Test existing and potential future bus turn movements using “auto-turn” software to accommodate 45-foot coach buses
  - Minimize corner bulb-outs that conflict with bus movements; avoid installing bulb-outs on corners with bus stops or with bus turns; consider creating in-lane bus stops as an alternative
  - Work with transit operators to assess impacts of roadway capacity reductions to buses
  - Work with transit operators to assess impacts of traffic calming measures to buses
  - Provide separate travel ways for bike and bus traffic whenever possible
  - Ensure 11-foot minimum lane widths for travel lanes used by buses
  - Avoid traffic calming measures on bus travel lanes that are incompatible with buses (e.g., speed bumps, speed tables, etc.)
  - Coordinate proposed bus stop relocations with MTS/NCTD
  - Provide safe path of travel to/from bus stops (adequate sidewalks, crosswalks)
  - Ensure vertical/horizontal clearances for buses
  - Coordinate with transit operators on need for existing or future transit priority measures such as transit signal priority in future transit-only lanes
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**Planning Context**

*Have the following documents been checked for planned facilities?*

- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Community Active Transportation Strategy
- Community Plans and Facility Financing Plans
- Climate Action Plan
- SANDAG Regional Plan (highway, transit, rail, transportation demand management)
- SANDAG Regional Transportation Improvement Program
- SANDAG Regional Bike Plan
- SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map (to help determine context)
- Pending local development proposals

Briefly describe relevant planned facilities and development proposals. Is there an opportunity to enhance this transportation project beyond existing plans to provide an enhanced walking, biking, or transit experience for future users of this corridor?

**Forecasted travel demand**

- Auto ADT _____ Forecast year ___
- Transit _____ Forecast year ___
- Pedestrian* _____ Forecast Year ___
- Bike* _____ Forecast Year ___

*If forecasts do not exist for future bike and pedestrian traffic, identify significant future land uses or other conditions that would influence demand.

**Proposed Project**

*Will the proposed transportation project adequately and safely accommodate all modes, or are there opportunities to adequately and safely accommodate all modes through the larger project area?*

- Auto
- Auto parking
- Transit
- Pedestrian
- Bike
- Bike parking
- ADA Compliant

For the proposed transportation project: Briefly describe the proposed accommodations or traffic calming measures for each mode and the features that will make the accommodations more friendly to people walking, biking, and using transit including urban greenery such as street trees, buffers from high speed traffic, street lighting, transit stop amenities, transit priority measures, etc.
For any mode not adequately accommodated through the proposed transportation project, describe the constraints or justify the lack of demand. Describe any relevant alternative access.

**Complete Streets Certification**

This project does/does not accommodate all modes of travel as outlined in the [local guiding policy].

Completed by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviewed and approved by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Resources**

The following documents are useful resources for how to plan and design Complete Streets:

*Smart Growth in the San Diego Region*, a brochure that provides descriptions of the seven smart growth place types and the Smart Growth Concept Map.

*Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*, provides guidance on applying smart growth principles to transportation projects in smart growth areas.

Transportation design guidance for Complete Streets is available from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, those listed below:

- *Riding to 2050* (see Chapter 7, Bicycle Design Guidelines)
- *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians*
- *Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000*
- *NACTO Urban Street Design Guide*
- *NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide*
- *NACTO Transit Street Design Guide*
- *NCTD Bus Stop Development Handbook*
- *SANDAG LRT Design Criteria*
- *Active Transportation Implementation Strategy & Safe Routes to School Typologies*

Local bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school plans, and Community Active Transportation strategies should be consulted where they exist. Contact local jurisdiction planning and engineering departments in the project area to identify local plans, and local transit agencies to identify and collaborate on potential transit priority measures and transit stop amenities.