MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP
The Active Transportation Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, June 14, 2018
10 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG, Board Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Please take the elevator to the 8th floor to access the meeting room.

Staff Contact: Stephan Vance
(619) 699-1924
stephan.vance@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS

• REGIONAL BIKESHARE COORDINATION

• TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Working Group on any item at the time the Working Group is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form and then present the form to the Working Group coordinator. Members of the public may address the Working Group on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person unless otherwise directed by the Chair. The Working Group may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the Working Group name and meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Working Group meeting should be received by the Working Group coordinator no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official project record, will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting, and will be posted to the agenda file as a part of the handouts following each meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at www.sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications via our e-distribution list either at the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints, and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to the SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900 or (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要, 我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。

请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.

Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.

To access the meeting room, please arrive on the 8th floor.
## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP
Thursday, June 14, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the meeting coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the meeting coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to ATWG members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. ATWG members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ATWG is asked to review and approve the minutes from its December 14, 2017, meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REPORTS

| 4.       | SANDAG 2018 TITLE VI PROGRAM WORKING GROUPS SURVEY (Sam Sanford) |
|          | Staff will distribute a short demographic survey to the members of the ATWG to support the development of the 2018 Title VI Program. As the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, SANDAG is required to update the Title VI Program every three years per Federal Transit Administration Circular 4702.1B. One component of the program is a table summarizing demographic information of working groups that helps inform transportation-related decisions. Members of the ATWG will be asked to complete the voluntary survey to capture this information. |
| +5.      | 2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS (Jenny Russo) | INFORMATION |
|          | The Active Transportation Program (ATP) provides state and federal funding for active transportation projects. The 2019 ATP will distribute more than $890 million in funding over four years through the statewide and regional components of the program. Staff will provide a summary of the 2019 ATP, including the schedule and available funding. |
| 6.       | CALTRANS DISTRICT 11 UPDATE (Seth Cutter, Caltrans) | INFORMATION |
|          | Seth Cutter will provide an update on active transportation projects District 11 is developing and will report on other Caltrans matters of interest. |
| +7.      | REGIONAL BIKESHARE COORDINATION (Marisa Mangan) | DISCUSSION |
|          | Staff will discuss opportunities for regional coordination around bikeshare planning, implementation, and monitoring. |
+8. **TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION**
   (Stephan Vance)
   Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance requires all new congestion relief projects to accommodate the needs of people walking and biking where it is needed and feasible. Rule 21 of Board Policy No. 031 describes how this provision will be implemented. The recent 10-year review of the TransNet program recommended a reevaluation of this process in light of current Complete Streets requirements and best practices. The ATWG is asked to discuss how the process has worked in jurisdictions and discuss potential improvements.

9. **REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK DATA COLLECTION**
   (Josh Clark)
   SANDAG is compiling data on local bike and pedestrian projects that connect to the Regional Bicycle Network. The ATWG is asked to provide updates regarding local projects that have been completed recently or are in the planning phases. Staff will provide an update on efforts to collect Geographic Information System data on local bike projects.

10. **ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**
    The next ATWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 2018.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) was called to order by Vice Chair Everett Hauser, County of San Diego, at 10:10 a.m.

1. **INTRODUCTIONS**
Self-introductions were made.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Patty Talamantes, Account Executive, announced a funding opportunity through the SANDAG iCommute Mini-Grant Program. Projects that promote biking through outreach and education are eligible for grants of up to $3,000. Total funding for the program is $40,000. Applications are due January 14, 2018.

Frank Rivera, City of Chula Vista, informed the ATWG that Anna Marie Gilmore will be leaving the City of Chula Vista after 30 years. Mr. Rivera thanked Ms. Gilmore for her service in Chula Vista and also reported that the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition (SDCBC) recently presented the City of Chula Vista with a golden gear award for their contributions to promoting and improving bicycling.

3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)**

3A. **May 11, 2017, Meetings Minutes**

**Action:** Upon a motion by Kathy Keehan (County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District) and a second by Andy Hanshaw (SDCBC), the ATWG approved the minutes from its May 11, 2017, meeting. Yes: Vice Chair Hauser, Seth Cutter (Caltrans), Maya Rosas (Circulate San Diego), Mr. Rivera, Craig Williams (City of Carlsbad), Allie Scrivener (City of Coronado), Dawn Wilson (City of Imperial Beach), Howard LaGrange (City of Oceanside), Misty Thompson (City of La Mesa), Brian Genovese (City of San Diego), Ms. Keehan, Kristen Haukom (Safe Routes to School Advocate), and Mr. Hanshaw. No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Bike SD, City of Del Mar, City of El Cajon, City of Escondido, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, City of Santee, City of Solana Beach, City of Vista, Civic San Diego, Economic Development, High Schools, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Post-Secondary, Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, and Transit Advocate.
3B. September 14, 2017, Meetings Minutes

Action: Upon a motion by Ms. Keehan and a second by Mr. Hanshaw, the ATWG approved the minutes from its September 14, 2017, meeting. Yes: Vice Chair Hauser, Mr. Cutter, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Williams, Ms. Scrivener, Ms. Wilson, Mr. LaGrange, Ms. Thompson, Mr. Genovese, Ms. Keehan, Ms. Haukom, and Mr. Hanshaw. No: None. Abstain: Ms. Rosas. Absent: Bike SD, City of Del Mar, City of El Cajon, City of Escondido, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, City of Santee, City of Solana Beach, City of Vista, Civic San Diego, Economic Development, High Schools, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Post-Secondary, Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, and Transit Advocate.

REPORTS

4. ELECTION OF A NEW CHAIR FOR THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (APPOINT)

The ATWG sought to select a new Chair. Upon election of Vice Chair Hauser to the Chair position, the ATWG sought nominations for an approval of a new Vice Chair.

Election of A New Chair for the Active Transportation Working Group

Action: Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, recommended Vice Chair Hauser to be the new ATWG Chair. Upon a motion by Mr. LaGrange and a second by Ms. Keehan the ATWG unanimously voted to elect Vice Chair Hauser as the new ATWG Chair. Yes: Vice Chair Hauser, Mr. Cutter, Ms. Rosas, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Williams, Ms. Scrivener, Ms. Wilson, Mr. LaGrange, Ms. Thompson, Mr. Genovese, Ms. Keehan, Ms. Haukom, and Mr. Hanshaw. No: None. Abstain: Ms. Rosas. Absent: Bike SD, City of Del Mar, City of El Cajon, City of Escondido, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, City of Santee, City of Solana Beach, City of Vista, Civic San Diego, Economic Development, High Schools, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Post-Secondary, Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, and Transit Advocate.

Election of A New Vice Chair for the Active Transportation Working Group

Action: Chair Hauser nominated Ms. Scrivener to be the new ATWG Vice Chair. Upon a motion by Mr. LaGrange and a second by Mr. Cutter the ATWG unanimously voted to elect Ms. Scrivener as the new ATWG Vice Chair. Yes: Vice Chair Hauser, Mr. Cutter, Ms. Rosas, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Williams, Ms. Scrivener, Ms. Wilson, Mr. LaGrange, Ms. Thompson, Mr. Genovese, Ms. Keehan, Ms. Haukom, and Mr. Hanshaw. No: None. Abstain: Ms. Rosas. Absent: Bike SD, City of Del Mar, City of El Cajon, City of Escondido, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, City of Santee, City of Solana Beach, City of Vista, Civic San Diego, Economic Development, High Schools, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Post-Secondary, Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, and Transit Advocate.

5. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2019 REGIONAL PLAN (INFORMATION)

Phil Trom, Senior Regional Planner, provided an update on Board actions pertaining to the vision, goals, policy objectives development, unconstrained network, and the revenue constrained transportation network scenarios of San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan. Mr. Trom noted that the active transportation element will be fully funded in the 2019 Regional Plan, stating
that the plan calls for $5 billion towards active transportation including $1 billion for implementation of the bike plan. Mr. Hauser inquired if the plan includes safety measures. Mr. LaGrange asked if the priorities of the Regional Bike Early Action Program would be considered, and if an update to the Regional Bike Plan was planned. Staff responded that an update to the plan was not scheduled but that an evaluation of the Early Action Program could be appropriate as the first group of projects move into construction.


Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner, presented on the draft transportation network performance measures for the Regional Plan, seeking the ATWG’s feedback on the draft performance measures and the ten key questions that guide the development of the measures. Mr. Genovese expressed concern that the terminology of “safe” used in the draft performance measures is absolute and recommended that the language be amended to “safer.” Ms. Keehan thanked SANDAG staff for including all trips and a breakdown by mode share in the draft performance measures. Ms. Keehan asked if SANDAG can monetize and separate out the health benefits of active transportation in the benefit cost ratio of transportation investments included in question 5A, Ms. Kennedy said that she believes it is possible to have that data available. Ms. Keehan stated that it would be beneficial to see the health economic benefits that active transportation brings to the San Diego region.

Ms. Scrivener asked how reliability is defined for question 5C of the draft performance measures. A member of the public asked if the performance measures are used to evaluate the network or individual projects, to which Ms. Kennedy responded that the measures are network-wide. Ms. Rosas asked if or how the Regional Housing Needs Assessment is being incorporated into the model. She also recommended a breakdown by mode of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries in question 3B as well as a breakdown by mode for questions 6A and 5. Ms. Rosas also recommended that progress toward climate action goals be reported by jurisdiction. Additionally, Ms. Rosas wanted to see a breakdown between transit priority areas (TPAs) and non-TPAs.

7. FIXING AMERICA’S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: SAFETY TARGET SETTING (DISCUSSION)

Ms. Kennedy discussed the safety target options available to SANDAG to be compliant with the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act. Specifically, SANDAG can either choose to support the statewide targets or develop regional targets by February 27, 2018. Ms. Kennedy explained that supporting the statewide targets means that SANDAG will not set a numeric target, but will provide a resolution to Caltrans documenting support and will identify projects that support the statewide targets in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program. Developing regional targets would be based on data from Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) and the Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting System (SWITRS) data for San Diego County and applying methodology to Caltrans. Ms. Kennedy sought feedback from the ATWG on which option to support.

Mr. LaGrange stated there is a year of lag time in data reporting in SWITRS and FARS, a point Ms. Kennedy acknowledged. Ms. Kennedy informed the ATWG that if SANDAG adopts the statewide targets and fails to meet them, then funding restrictions may occur, meaning there would be a need to devote highway funds to safety improvements. Mr. Hauser and Mr. Genovese expressed concern that aggregated safety data would not sufficiently address hotspots as prioritized in Vision Zero goals.
Ms. Keehan would like to see bicycle and pedestrian safety data separated from vehicle safety data. Ms. Keehan and Ms. Rosas supported adopting the statewide targets.

8. CALTRANS DISTRICT 11 UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Mr. Cutter discussed Caltrans Planning Grants, informing the ATWG that Caltrans received 127 applications requesting $31 million when only $12 million was available in the previous funding cycle. For applications to be competitive, Mr. Cutter advised applicants to use maps, photos, and project descriptions; include potential funding sources; explain how the plan would be evaluated and reported on; include demographics of the community served; and detail the consequences of not implementing the plan, which should be data-focused. Mr. Cutter invited applicants to talk to him directly for assistance with individual applications. Mr. Cutter informed the ATWG that the upcoming call for projects will be on January 2, 2018, and applications will be due on February 3, 2018.

9. REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK DATA COLLECTION (DISCUSSION)

Josh Clark, Active Transportation Planner, discussed the efforts made by SANDAG to compile data on local bike and pedestrian projects that connect to the Regional Bikeway Network. Specifically, Mr. Clark talked about Automated Bike Counters (ABCs). Mr. Cutter (Caltrans) inquired about the yearly cost of the ABCs, Mr. Clark said that it varies by technology type, and stated he would find that information and report it to the ATWG.

10. REPORT FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CITY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS CONFERENCE (INFORMATION)

Chris Carterette, Regional Planner, and Mr. Williams reported on the National Association of City Transportation Official Conference, presenting photos of active transportation designs seen in Chicago.

11. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING (INFORMATION)

The next ATWG meeting is scheduled for March 8, 2018, at 10 a.m.

Vice Chair Hauser adjourned the meeting at 12:16 p.m.
# ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

## MEETING ATTENDANCE FOR DECEMBER 14, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Craig Williams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Frank Rivera</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Allie Scrivener</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Kathy Garcia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Ed Deane</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Ali Shahzad</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Juan Larios</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dawn Wilson attended for Imperial Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Misty Thompson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Dave DeVries</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Steve Manganiello</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Howard LaGrange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Brian Genovese</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Everett Hauser</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Mike Rafael</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Minjie Mei</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>Dan Goldberg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Sam Hasenin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic San Diego</td>
<td>Brad Richter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Seth Cutter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Denis Desmond</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>Andy Hanshaw</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate San Diego</td>
<td>Maya Rosas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Kristin Haukom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Department of Education</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ATTENDEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marie Gilmore, City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Carolina Ilic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Crist</td>
<td>Chris Carterette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Burgess</td>
<td>Chris Kluth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Josh Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patty Talamantes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Trom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephan Vance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG STAFF MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
JUNE 1, 2018

CALIFORNIA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
CYCLE 4: REGIONAL CALL FOR PROJECTS

Introduction

The California 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. The CTC adopted the 2019 ATP Guidelines for the fourth cycle of ATP funding on May 16, 2018. The four-year fund is estimated at $890 million statewide. The competition will be held in two stages, beginning with the statewide competition which was initiated in May 2018, followed by the regional competition coming in August 2018. This report provides an overview of the ATP regional competition, including the role of SANDAG, and next steps in the process. Additional information on the ATP statewide competition is provided in Agenda Item No. 5B, and the complete ATP Guidelines are available at http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors adopt Resolution No. 2018-20, in substantially the same form as attached, certifying the submission of the proposed 2019 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Guidelines for the San Diego Regional Competition (Attachment 2) to the California Transportation Commission for use in the 2019 San Diego Regional ATP competition.

Discussion

ATP Funding Distribution and Available Funding

State and federal law separate the ATP into multiple, overlapping components. Approximately $890 million has been budgeted for the 2019 ATP over four years, beginning with FY 2019-2020. This includes $400 million in Senate Bill 1 (Beall, 2017) funding, almost doubling the amount of funding that was available in prior cycles of the program. ATP funds are distributed through three separate competitive programs:

1. **Small Urban/Rural Component**: 10 percent of ATP funds ($87.9 million in total, or approximately $21.9 million per year) 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 Component**: 50 percent of ATP funds ($439.5 million or approximately $109.8 million per year) are distributed to projects competitively awarded by the CTC on a statewide basis.

3. **Regional Component**: 40 percent of ATP funds ($351.6 million or approximately $87.9 million per year) are distributed to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000. The CTC distributes these funds 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. SANDAG is the administrator for the San Diego regional ATP component (San Diego ATP competition). The estimated funding available for the San Diego region is $15.87 million total, or approximately $3.96 million per year. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide component must be considered in the regional component.

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

**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. Other eligible applicants include Caltrans, transit agencies, natural resources or public land agencies, public schools or school districts, tribal governments, and private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations.

**Regional Competition Guidelines and Selection Criteria**

The CTC Guidelines allow an MPO, with CTC approval, to use different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantaged community for its competitive selection process. The regional guidelines must be submitted to the CTC for approval.

For the past three cycles of the ATP, the Board of Directors has approved using the project selection criteria from the *TransNet* Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP) as the basis for the San Diego ATP competition guidelines. Various adjustments have been made to reflect specific CTC requirements and local priorities.

Staff proposes updating the guidelines for the 2019 San Diego ATP competition to incorporate changes made to the ATP Guidelines by the CTC in May 2018, as well as changes recently made to the *TransNet* ATGP as part of the fourth call for projects released in late 2017. A summary of the changes proposed to be made to the ATP Guidelines for the fourth cycle of the San Diego ATP competition are outlined in Attachment 1.

The proposed 2019 ATP Guidelines for the San Diego Regional Competition, including the scoring criteria, are included in Attachment 2.
Next Steps

Pending recommendation by the Transportation Committee, the Board of Directors would be asked at its June 22, 2018, meeting to approve the submission of the proposed 2019 ATP Guidelines for the San Diego Regional Competition to the CTC for use in the 2019 San Diego ATP competition. The regional call for projects would be opened following CTC approval of the proposed 2019 ATP Guidelines for the San Diego Regional competition at its August 15-16, 2018, meeting.

LAURA COTÉ
Director of Administration

Attachments: 1. Summary of Proposed Changes to the San Diego Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines
2. Proposed 2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines for the San Diego Regional Competition
3. Draft Resolution No. 2018-20: Approving the Submission of the 2019 Regional Active Transportation Program Scoring Criteria to the California Transportation Commission for Use in the Competition

Key Staff Contact: Jenny Russo, (619) 699-7314, jenny.russo@sandag.org
Summary of Proposed Changes
to the San Diego Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines

- Updated the statutory and funding source references to include Senate Bill 1 (SB 1).
- Included a reference to the California Transportation Commission’s (CTC’s) Active Transportation Program (ATP) Guidelines and removed duplicative information throughout the document.
- Updated the schedule to include dates for the 2019 competitive program, including the addition of a joint workshop in June with Caltrans and SANDAG staff.
- Added definitions for matching funds and leveraging funds. Leveraging funds cannot be from any of the CTC’s competitive funding programs (Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, Local Partnership Program, or ATP).
- Clarified the reimbursement language to illustrate that eligible costs are limited to those that meet the ATP purpose and at least one of the ATP goals.
- Clarified that Caltrans ATP projects must be consistent with local and regional priorities and include feedback from the local community in which the Caltrans project is located. Caltrans must also describe why the project is being requested under the ATP rather than through the State Highway Operations and Protection Program.
- Required that projects with a total project cost of $25 million or greater or programmed amount of $10 million or greater complete a Baseline Agreement, as required under the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines.
- Included information about how projects will be designated as State Only Funded.
- Included information about how projects for the development of plans will be prioritized for funding consideration.
- Changed the definition of how a project can qualify as directly benefitting a disadvantaged community to include that the project must either: (1) be located within or reasonable proximity to a disadvantaged community; (2) have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community; or (3) be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects or is directly adjacent to a disadvantaged community.
- Changed the project application requirements to be consistent with the 2019 ATP Guidelines to require that all regional ATP projects must have been submitted through the statewide component (no new projects can be submitted through the regional component).
- Updated the requirements for a TransNet-ATP funding exchange to be restricted to local jurisdiction projects only, and required that local jurisdictions considered for an exchange of funds must have both a locally-adopted Climate Action Plan and Complete Streets Policy, consistent with the requirements in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.
- Added information to describe the process that will be followed to select which project will receive funding if two or more projects are at the funding cut-off level and have the same rank.
- Updated the scoring criteria to include changes made in the recent TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program call for projects.
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ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION
PROGRAM GUIDELINES
FOR THE
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL COMPETITION
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. Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (Chapter 2031, statutes of 2017) added an additional $100 million per year in funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account. The ATP is administered jointly by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans.

State and federal law separate 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. Small urban areas are those with populations of 5,001 to 200,000. Rural areas are those with populations of 5,000 or less. Projects within the boundaries of an MPO with an urban area with a population of greater than 200,000 (e.g. San Diego) are not eligible for funding in the Small Urban or Rural programs.

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.
ATP PROGRAM GOALS

California Senate Bill (SB) 99 established 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 through 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

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101 require the CTC to develop program guidelines for each cycle of the ATP that describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption, and management of the ATP. The Guidelines provide additional information beyond what is described in these guidelines and should be reviewed by applicants prior to submitting an application for ATP funding. The Guidelines are posted on the CTC’s website at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/programs/atp/.
CYCLE 4 SCHEDULE
The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the Cycle 4 ATP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEWIDE COMPETITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTC adoption of ATP Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated available funding released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Call for Projects released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application submittal deadline for Statewide Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC staff recommendation of projects for Statewide Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC approval of recommended projects for Statewide Competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL COMPETITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated available funding released by CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommendation of Regional ATP guidelines presented to SANDAG Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP guidelines considered by SANDAG Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC considers SANDAG Regional Guidelines for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Call for Projects released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application submittal deadline for Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring and ranking of Regional Competition applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Swap coordination with applicants (if applicable) for Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviews TransNet/ATP Swap concept (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Applicants to submit Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of recommended ranked project list (through posting of Transportation Committee Agenda) for Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommendation of Regional Competition ranked projects presented to SANDAG Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP project rankings considered by SANDAG Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC considers adoption of ranked project list for SANDAG Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNDING

Sources
The ATP is funded from various federal and state funds appropriated in the annual State Budget Act.

- 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
- Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (SB 1) funds

All ATP projects must meet eligibility requirements specific to at least one ATP funding source.

Amount of Funding Available
Cycle 4 of the ATP includes funding for four years: 2019-2020, 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023. The amount of funding available for Cycle 4 is estimated as follows:

- Statewide Competition: $439,560,000
- San Diego Regional Competition: $15,874,000

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, 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 & Leveraging funds

- Matching funds are additional federal, state and local funds that are dedicated to the ATP project and will be used for any eligible ATP expenses.

- Leveraging funds include all financial sources, in-kind resources, and/or services that the applicant can secure on behalf of the ATP project. Leveraged funds may be used for any project-related expenses, even if the expenses are not eligible in the ATP.

Matching and leveraging funds are not required. If an applicant chooses to provide matching or leveraging funds, the funds cannot be from any of the CTC’s competitive funding programs (Solutions for Congested
Corridors Program, Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, Local Partnership Program, or Active Transportation Program). Eligible leveraged funds spent or committed to earlier project phases will be considered. Applications must include a complete (phase-by-phase) project funding plan through construction that demonstrates that the ATP and leveraged funding in the plan (local, federal, state, private sources) is reasonably expected to be available and sufficient to complete 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 maximum amount of two percent (2%) of the funds distributed by the regional competition will be available for funding active transportation plans.

**Reimbursement**

The ATP is a reimbursement program for eligible costs incurred. In order for an item to be eligible for ATP reimbursement, that item’s primary use or function must meet the ATP purpose and at least one of the ATP goals. 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 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** - Caltrans nominated projects must be coordinated and aligned with local and regional priorities. Caltrans is required to submit documentation that local communities are supportive of and have provided feedback on the proposed Caltrans ATP project. Caltrans must also submit documentation to support the need to address the project with ATP funds, versus other available funding sources such as the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

- **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, 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.

The 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/lam/lapm.htm.
The CTC requires project Baseline Agreements for ATP projects with a total project cost of $25 million or greater or a total programmed amount of $10 million or greater.

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 the competitive process and must meet one or more of the ATP program goals. Because some of the funds in the ATP are federal funds, projects must be federal-aid eligible unless the project is designated as “State Only Funded” at the time of programming. Refer to the most recent Federal-Aid Project Funding Guidelines available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/STIP.htm for more information on what projects may be eligible for state only funds. The CTC may designate projects as SB 1 funded projects at time of programming.

The CTC encourages applicants to apply for projects that provide a transformative benefit to a community or a region.

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

Project Categories

All eligible projects must apply with an application for one of the following project categories. Applications for plans may not be combined with applications for infrastructure or other non-infrastructure projects.

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 phases proposed for programming, it must provide at least a preliminary estimate of costs for all phases. PSR guidelines are posted on the CTC’s website at http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/stip.htmhttp://catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/. Further guidance can be found in the Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual, which is available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/manuals/pdpm.html.

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. NI projects can be start-up programs or new and/or expanded components of existing programs. All NI projects must demonstrate how the program is sustainable and will be continued after ATP funding is exhausted. The CTC intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure on start-up projects. A project is a start-up when no program currently exists. A project with new and/or expanded components to an existing program must demonstrate how the original program is continuing without ATP funding. ATP cannot fund existing or ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those that benefit school students.

Eligible Education Encouragement, and Awareness 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.

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 that encompasses or is predominately located in a disadvantaged community.

• 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.
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY REQUIREMENT

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. A project is considered beneficial if it fulfills an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant value. The project’s benefits must primarily target low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

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. For a project to qualify as directly benefiting a disadvantaged community, the project must:

- be located within or be within reasonable proximity to, the disadvantaged community served by the project,
- the project must have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community, or
- the project must be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or is directly adjacent to the 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 2012-2016 American Community Survey (<$51,026). 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.

- **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 3.0 (CalEnviroScreen 3.0) 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/GHGInvest/.

- **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/sd/filessp.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.

- **SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan**: 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). For San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, disadvantaged communities are identified as minority, low-income, and senior populations.

  - 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.

- **Native American Tribal Lands**: Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

- **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.
PROJECT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

To apply for the regional competition, all applicants must complete the following items. All projects must have been submitted through the statewide competitive program using the electronic application (no new projects can be submitted for the regional component).

1. **The application utilized for the statewide competition**

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 & leveraging 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. 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.

SUBMITTAL DEADLINE

One electronic (PDF) copy of the application must be received by SANDAG no later than **5 p.m. on Friday, September 28, 2018.** Applications should be addressed to:

Jenny R. Russo  
Regional ATP Administrator  
Jenny.Russo@sandag.org

---

1 The Resolution should be submitted with the Application, but at the very latest, must be received by SANDAG prior to February 1, 2019. The Resolution will be utilized in the event a TransNet-ATP funding exchange is implemented.
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?
    1. Community Active Transportation Strategy/Neighborhood-Level Plan/Corridor Study
    2. Environmental Documentation/Certification
    3. Right-of-Way Acquisition
    4. 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
- Use of appropriate application
- 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.
- Eligibility of project: the project must be one of the four types of projects listed in these guidelines.

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 recommend a list of Regional ATP projects for programming by the CTC 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 4 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 February 2019 for consideration by the CTC in June 2019.

**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 plan for that project contains TransNet funds, there may be an opportunity to implement a funding exchange with projects from local jurisdictions recommended through the regional ATP. This exchange would reduce the administrative burden to local jurisdictions associated with ATP funding requirements, and would consolidate the allocation of ATP funds to as few projects as practicable. Should a funding exchange be proposed, local jurisdiction projects that elect to participate in the exchange would be removed from the regional ATP ranking and be funded through the TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). The TransNet-funded projects would be administered as other TransNet ATGP projects and be subject to the terms and conditions of SANDAG Board Policy No. 035. Projects from applicants other than local jurisdictions are ineligible for the TransNet-ATP funding exchange.

SANDAG staff will make the determination of whether a funding exchange is an option under the Cycle 4 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 4 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.

- Per the adoption of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan and GHG Mitigation Measure 4A included in the Environmental Impact Report, local jurisdictions receiving TransNet ATGP funding must have both a locally-adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP) and Complete Streets (CS) Policy. The CAP and CS Policy must meet the requirements outlined in GHG Mitigation Measure 4A and in the California Complete Streets Act of 2008. Local jurisdictions that do not have an adopted CAP or CS in place at the time the TransNet-ATP exchange is offered will not be eligible for the funding exchange.
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 project applicants for funding under Cycle 4 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 PROCESS

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

- **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.

- **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 Bike 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 Department of Data Analytics and Modeling staff or Contracts and Procurement staff in accordance with the point structures delineated in the scoring criteria. Those criteria 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: (1) objective formula-based points that are calculated by either SANDAG Department of Data Analytics and Modeling staff or Contracts and Procurement staff and (2) 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 added together 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. If two or more project applications receive the same rank that is the funding cut-off score, the following criteria will be used to determine which project(s) will be funded, in order of priority:

- Infrastructure projects
- Construction readiness (i.e. completion of PA&ED, PS&E, RW)
- Highest score on the following question:
  - Infrastructure Projects: Criteria #5 - Project Readiness
  - Non-Infrastructure Projects: Criteria #4 - Methodology
- Highest score on the following question:
  - Infrastructure Projects: Criteria #3C – Alignment with ATP Goals
  - Non-Infrastructure Projects: Criteria #2 - Alignment with ATP Goals

**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 at its meeting in June 2019.
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 26-27 is a summary of this information.

1. DEMAND ANALYSIS

*NOTE: SANDAG Department of Data Analytics and Modeling staff will calculate the points awarded for this criteria 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. Data will be gathered for each of the factors for each project buffer. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (except for vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles (5 equal groups), 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 (highest – lowest)
- Population Density (highest – lowest)
- Employment Density (highest – lowest)
- Intersection Density (highest – lowest)
- Activity Centers (highest – lowest)
- Employment (highest – lowest)
- Vehicle Ownership (lowest – highest)

2. PROJECT CONNECTIONS

A. REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK

*NOTE: The SANDAG Department of Data Analytics and Modeling will calculate the points awarded for this criteria using the Regional Bicycle Network laid out in SANDAG Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bike Plan.

- Will the proposed project connect to part of the existing or planned Regional Bicycle Network? (6 points)
- Will the proposed project construct part of the existing or planned Regional Bicycle Network? (8 points)

Zero points will be awarded to projects that neither build nor connect to the existing or planned Regional Bicycle Network.

B. EXISTING OR PROGRAMMED TRANSIT

*NOTE: The SANDAG Department of Data Analytics and Modeling staff will calculate the points awarded for these criteria. Up to 12 points will be awarded based on proximity to existing or programmed transit facilities included in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (adopted in 2015).

A regional transit station is defined as any station served by COASTER, SPRINT, Trolley, Rapid, or Rapid Express Routes. 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)
- 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)

**C. COMPLETES CONNECTION IN LOCAL BICYCLE NETWORK**

Up to 8 points will be awarded based on how well the project will close a gap between existing local bicycle facilities. Applicant must demonstrate evidence of an existing gap. 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. Projects that do not propose to close a gap between existing local bicycle facilities will receive 0 points.

**D. EXISTING PEDESTRIAN NETWORK**

Up to 8 points will be awarded based on how well the project will 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. Projects that do not propose to close a gap in the existing pedestrian network will receive 0 points.

**3. SAFETY AND QUALITY OF PROJECT**

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. SAFETY AND ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS**

Points for this section will be awarded based on the applicant’s description of safety hazards and/or collision history within the last 7 years, the 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 for creating safe access or overcoming hazardous conditions.

To earn points without collision data, the 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.) Vehicle speed limit and
average daily traffic information will be considered 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)
- Creates access or overcomes barriers in an area where hazardous conditions prohibit safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians (6 points)

**B. IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPOSED BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND/OR TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES**

Up to 5 points are available within each of the three project categories: bicycle, pedestrian, and/or traffic calming measures. Therefore, projects that propose improvements in more than one category are eligible to earn more points *(up to 18 total points possible).* Traffic calming measures that consist of roadway improvements that benefit motorists only will receive 0 points.

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

Points will be distributed based on how well the application addresses the following:

- How well will the proposed traffic calming devices address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation? *(Up to 6 points)*
- How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area? *(Up to 6 points)*
- How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area? *(Up to 6 points)*

**C. ALIGNMENT WITH ATP GOALS**

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

- How well will the proposed project increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking? *(up to 3 points)*
- How well will the proposed project increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users? *(up to 3 points)*
• How well will the proposed project advance the active transportation efforts of SANDAG to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 39? (up to 3 points)
• How well will the proposed project 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? (up to 3 points)
• How well will the proposed project ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the project? (up to 3 points)
• How well will the proposed project benefit many types of active transportation users? (up to 3 points)

D. INNOVATION

Points will be awarded based on the breadth of solutions proposed by the project that are new to the region and how well the project leverages advanced technologies. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide available at http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/design-guide/ will be referred to for examples of innovative improvements. No points will be awarded for facilities or treatments that have received Federal Highway Administration approval (ex. Sharrows), unless they are new to the region. (Up to 6 points possible)
• Is this project an Federal Highway Administration or state experimentation effort? (3 points)
• Does this project propose innovative solutions or propose solutions that are new to the region and can potentially serve as a replicable model? (3 points)

4. 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 plans, policies, and programs.

A. COMPLIMENTARY PROGRAMS

Points will be awarded based on how well the Applicant demonstrated 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. Projects that demonstrate collaboration and integration with the supportive program(s) will be given higher scores. (Up to 3 points possible).

B. GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSION REDUCTIONS

Points will be awarded based on whether the Applicant or relevant local jurisdiction has an adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP) and/or complete streets policy (or the equivalent, including policies in the general plan or other documents adopted by the local jurisdiction).
• The local jurisdiction has an adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP). (1 point)
• The local jurisdiction has an adopted complete streets policy (or the equivalent, including policies in the general plan or other documents adopted by the Applicant or relevant local jurisdiction). (1 point)

Up to 8 points will be awarded based on how well the Applicant demonstrates that the proposed project will directly reduce GHG emissions such as through implementation of a CAP, parking strategies, advanced technologies, and/or other strategies. The highest-scoring projects will provide supportive evidence, including quantitative analyses, that demonstrate the project will directly reduce GHG emissions.

5. PROJECT READINESS/COMPLETION OF MAJOR MILESTONES

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

• Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or community active transportation strategy. (2 points)

• Environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act if appropriate, or evidence that environmental clearance is not required. (4 points)

• Completion of right-of-way acquisition and all necessary entitlements (if appropriate), or evidence that right-of-way acquisition is not required. (4 points)

• Progress toward obtaining final design (plans, specifications, and estimates):
  o 30 percent design completed (3 points)
  o 60 percent design completed (6 points)
  o 90 percent design completed (9 points)
  o Final design completed (10 points)

6. PUBLIC HEALTH

Up to 10 points will be awarded for projects that will improve 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)
7. **USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS**

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

Points will be awarded as follows:

- The applicant sought California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps participation on the project (5 points)
- 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 on a project in which the corps can participate (0 points).

8. **BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY**

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. A project is considered beneficial if it fulfills an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its value. The project’s benefits must primarily target low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

For a project to qualify as directly benefiting a disadvantaged community, the project must:

- be located within or be within reasonable proximity to, the disadvantaged community served by the project,
- have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community, or
- be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or is directly adjacent to the disadvantaged community.

Points will be distributed in relation to the severity of and the benefit provided to the disadvantaged community affected by the project.

- How well the project benefits a disadvantaged community (Up to 10 points)
- The project does not benefit a disadvantaged community. (0 points)
9. MATCHING FUNDS

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

Points for matching funds will be awarded based on the following scale. The matching fund percentage is derived by comparing the total matching funds relative to the total project cost.

- 0% (0 points)
- 0.01 – 7.99% (1 point)
- 8.00 – 15.99% (2 points)
- 16.00 – 23.99% (3 points)
- 24.00 – 31.99% (4 points)
- 32.00 – 39.99% (5 points)
- 40.00 – 47.99% (6 points)
- 48.00% and above (7 points)

10. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Ratio of ATP funding request to project score.

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

The ratio is calculated by dividing the total ATP funding request amount by the sum of points earned in criteria 1 through 9. The ratios will be ranked in descending order and the available 10 points will be distributed according to rank. The project(s) with the largest ratio will receive 10 points. All other projects will receive points in the same proportion as their cost effectiveness ratio as compared to the project with the highest ratio. (Up to 10 points possible)
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 Department of Data Analytics and Modeling or Contracts and Procurement staff are marked with an asterisk (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>DEMAND ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers. (Up to 15 points)</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROJECT CONNECTIONS

A.* Regional Bicycle Network | Will the project build or connect to the existing or planned Regional Bicycle Network? | Up to 8 |

B.* Existing or Programmed Transit

- Bicycle improvement within 1 ½ miles of a regional transit station (6 points)
- 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) | Up to 12 |

C. Existing Bicycle Network | How well will the project close a gap between existing bicycle facilities? | Up to 8 |

D. Existing Pedestrian Network | How well will the project close a gap in the existing pedestrian network? | Up to 8 |

3. SAFETY AND QUALITY OF PROJECT

A. Safety and Access Improvements | Potential for increasing bicycle or pedestrian trips at location with documented safety hazard or accident history within the last seven years: | Up to 12 |

B. Impact and Effectiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures | How well will the proposed traffic calming devices, pedestrian improvements, and/or bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation? | Up to 18 |

C. Alignment with ATP Goals | How well does the project align with the ATP objectives? | Up to 18 |
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Innovation</strong></td>
<td>Is this project a Federal Highway Administration or state experimentation effort? Does the project use innovative solutions or propose solutions that are new to the region and can potentially serve as a replicable model?</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Complementary Programs</td>
<td>Are capital improvements accompanied by supportive programs such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and/or increased enforcement?</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission Reductions</td>
<td>How well will the proposed effort directly reduce greenhouse gas emissions such as through implementation of a CAP, parking strategies, advanced technologies, or other strategies?</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. PROJECT READINESS/COMPLETION OF MAJOR MILESTONES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or community active transportation strategy. (2 points)</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental clearance (CEQA and NEPA) (4 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed right-of-way acquisition (4 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress toward obtaining final design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. PUBLIC HEALTH</strong></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS</strong></td>
<td>Did the applicant seek California Conservation Corps or a qualified Community Conservation Corps for participation on the project? Does the applicant intend not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate?</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>Does the project benefit a disadvantaged community?</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>9.</em> MATCHING FUNDS</em>*</td>
<td>Points for matching funds will be awarded based on a scale. The matching fund percentage is derived by comparing the total matching funds relative to the total project cost.</td>
<td>Up to 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>10.</em> COST EFFECTIVENESS</em>*</td>
<td>Project grant request, divided by score in criteria 1 through 9, ranked relative to each other.</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

1. DEMAND ANALYSIS

NOTE: SANDAG Department of Data Analytics and Modeling staff will calculate the points awarded based on a GIS analysis of the project area relative to the seven factors listed below in comparison to all other submitted project applications.

A half-mile buffer will be created around pedestrian improvement projects and a one-mile buffer will be created around bicycle improvement projects. Data will be gathered for each of the factors for each project buffer. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (except for 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 25 points) to lowest (1 point). (Plans: Up to 25 points; EEA Programs: Not Applicable)

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

2. ALIGNMENT WITH ATP OBJECTIVES

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. (Plans: Up to 30 points; EEA Programs: Up to 30 points)

- How well will the proposed project increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking? (Up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed project increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users? (Up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed project advance the active transportation efforts of SANDAG to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals? (Up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed project 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? (Up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed project ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the project? (Up to 5 points)
- How well will the proposed project benefit many types of active transportation users? (Up to 5 points)
3. COMPREHENSIVENESS AND GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSION REDUCTIONS

A. COMPREHENSIVENESS

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

- Plans: 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 20 points)

- EEA Programs: The highest scoring projects will be larger in scope, scale, or duration; reach underserved or vulnerable populations that lack vehicular access; 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 20 points)

B. GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSION REDUCTIONS

Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed effort will directly reduce GHG emissions. The highest scoring projects will directly reduce GHG emissions such as through implementation of a Climate Action Plan (CAP), parking strategies, advanced technologies and/or other strategies. Points will be awarded as follows:

- The local jurisdiction has an adopted CAP. (1 point)

- The local jurisdiction has a complete streets policy or the equivalent, such as policies in the local jurisdiction’s general plan or other documents adopted by the local jurisdiction’s governing body. (1 point)

Up to eight points will be awarded based on how well the proposed effort will directly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

4. METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

Points will be awarded according to the inclusiveness of the planning process and evidence that key stakeholders will be active participants in the process. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate: 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, and 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. (Plans: Up to 15 points; EEA Programs: Up to 15 points;)

6. EVALUATION

Points will be awarded for applications that clearly demonstrate a commitment to monitoring and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the proposed project. The highest scoring projects will have identified performance measures in the application, or will include a task for identification of performance measures in the Scope of Work and/or include specific pre- and post-data collection efforts as part of the project scope, budget, and schedule in support of evaluating the project’s effectiveness. Lower scoring projects will lack meaningful evaluation methods or data collection as part of the project. (Plans: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: Up to 20 points)

7. INNOVATION

Points will be awarded for applications that propose innovative solutions that show the potential to serve as a replicable model for the region. The highest scoring projects will include innovative methods of accomplishing project goals that have not yet been pursued numerous times in the San Diego region. For innovations that have been implemented in other regions, the Applicant must demonstrate that the measure was successful and effective in those cases. Examples of innovative solutions may include, but are not limited to: CiclosDias or Sunday Streets programs; bike sharing programs; bike corral; bike stations; or bike parking ordinances. (Plans: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: Up to 5 points)

8. PUBLIC HEALTH

Up to 15 points will be awarded for projects that will improve 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 (4 points)
- Assess the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) available at http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org (4 points)
9. USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS

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

Points will be awarded as follows:

- The applicant sought California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps participation on the project ((Plans: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: 5 points)

- 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 on a project in which the corps can participate. (Plans: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: 0 points)

10. BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY

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. A project is considered beneficial if it fulfills an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its value. The project's benefits must primarily target low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.

For a project to qualify as directly benefiting a disadvantaged community, the project must:

- be located within or be within reasonable proximity to, the disadvantaged community served by the project,

- have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community, or

- be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or is directly adjacent to the disadvantaged community.

Points will be distributed in relation to the severity of and the benefit provided to the disadvantaged community affected by the project.

- How well the project benefits a disadvantaged community (Plans: Up to 15 points; EEA Programs: Up to 10 points)

- The project does not benefit a disadvantaged community. (0 points)

11. MATCHING FUNDS

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

Points for matching funds will be awarded based on the following scale. The matching fund percentage is derived by comparing the total matching funds relative to the total project cost.
12. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Ratio of ATP funding request to project score.

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

The ratio is calculated by dividing the total ATP funding request amount by the sum of points earned in criteria 1 through 9. The ratios will be ranked in descending order and the available 10 points will be distributed according to rank. The project(s) with the largest ratio will receive 10 points. All other projects will receive points in the same proportion as their cost effectiveness ratio as compared to the project with the highest ratio (Up to 10 points)
## 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 Department of Data Analytics and Modeling or Contracts and Procurement staff are marked with an asterisk (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Demand Analysis</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
<td>PLANS 25  EEA N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Alignment with ATP Objectives</td>
<td>How well does the proposed project align with the ATP objectives?</td>
<td>PLANS 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>How comprehensive is the proposed project, plan, or program? Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?</td>
<td>PLANS 20  EEA 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions</td>
<td>Does the relevant local jurisdiction have an adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) and a Complete Streets Policy (or the equivalent)? How well will the proposed effort directly reduce greenhouse gas emissions such as through implementation of a CAP, parking strategies, advanced technologies, or other strategies?</td>
<td>PLANS 10  EEA 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals?</td>
<td>PLANS 30  EEA 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>Does the planning project include an inclusive process? Does the project involve broad segments of the community and does it have broad and meaningful community support?</td>
<td>PLANS 15  EEA 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?</td>
<td>PLANS N/A  EEA 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Is this project new to the region and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region?</td>
<td>PLANS N/A  EEA 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Use of California Conservation Corps or a Qualified Community Conservation Corps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the applicant seek California Conservation Corps or a qualified Community Conservation Corps for participation on the project? Does the applicant intend 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</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project benefit a disadvantaged community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points for matching funds are awarded based on a scale. The matching fund percentage is derived by comparing the total matching funds relative to the total project cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total ATP funding request, divided by score in criteria 1 through 11, ranked relative to each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-20

APPROVING THE SUBMISSION OF THE 2019 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; Assembly Bill 101,
Chapter 354; and Senate Bill 1 (SB 1); and

WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has been delegated the
responsibility for the administration of this grant program, and has established necessary procedures
in its ATP Guidelines; 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 for the 2019 San Diego Regional ATP that utilize
different project selection criteria and weighting and definition of disadvantaged community to be
consistent with its Regional Transportation Plan; 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 2019 ATP program guidelines for the San Diego regional competition are consistent
with the ATP Guidelines established by the CTC, and hereby recommends the San Diego ATP
Guidelines be submitted to the CTC for consideration.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 22nd of June 2018.

ATTEST:

CHAIR

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.
CALIFORNIA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CYCLE 4: File Number 3300200
SANDAG PROJECTS FOR STATEWIDE COMPETITION

Introduction
The California 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. The CTC adopted the 2019 ATP Guidelines for the fourth cycle of ATP funding on May 16, 2018. The four-year fund is estimated at $890 million statewide. The competition will be held in two stages, beginning with the statewide competition which was initiated in May 2018, followed by the regional competition coming in August 2018. Additional information on the ATP regional competition is provided in Agenda Item No. 5A.

Discussion

SANDAG Statewide Active Transportation Program Application

Consistent with action by the Board of Directors in September 2013, which called for seeking additional funding to support implementation of the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP), SANDAG staff recommends the submission of four capital infrastructure projects and one non-infrastructure project to the ATP statewide competition (Attachment 1). The factors considered in recommending these bike projects include project readiness, benefits to disadvantaged communities, need, and safety.

Proposed Infrastructure Projects:

University Avenue Bikeway

This project builds 2.9 miles of urban bikeway in the City of San Diego, along University Avenue, between Estrella Avenue and 70th Street with connections to other regional bikeways in the North Park and Mid-City communities. The project currently is in final design and is partially funded for construction; this grant request would provide full funding for the construction phase. SANDAG also has been awarded approximately $5.8 million in Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program funds for the construction of several transit islands along this portion of University Avenue, which will complement the bikeway and pedestrian components of the project.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2018-21, approving the submission of the proposed active transportation projects for the fourth cycle of the California Active Transportation Program grant program.
**Eastern Hillcrest Bikeway**  
**Estimated Grant Request: $5 million**

This project builds 1.1 miles of urban bikeway in the City of San Diego, along University Avenue, east of State Route 163 and along Normal Street, connecting to other bikeways in the Uptown, North Park, and Mid-City communities. The ATP grant request would be for the project's construction phase. The project currently is in final design and funds are included in the FY 2019 SANDAG Program Budget.

**Inland Rail Trail – City of Vista segments**  
**Estimated Grant Request: $12 million**

This project builds the remaining two miles of the Inland Rail Trail, a Class 1 shared use path eventually connecting from the City of Escondido to the City of Oceanside, largely along the SPRINT rail corridor. SANDAG currently is constructing segments in the County of San Diego and cities of Vista and Oceanside. However, construction of the two-mile gap in the City of Vista remains unfunded. The project currently is in final design.

**Downtown Mobility Plan**  
**Estimated Grant Request: $10-20 million**

Approved by the City of San Diego City Council in 2016, the Downtown Mobility Plan emphasizes the development of an active transportation network and improvements to the biking and walking environments in the downtown core. Implementation of this plan also is important to the success of several Regional EAP routes that connect in downtown, including the Uptown Fourth and Fifth Avenues Bikeway, Pershing Bikeway, Imperial Bikeway, and the Bayshore Bikeway. The first phase of the plan currently is funded and under design by the City. The ATP grant request would be for construction funding for the final two phases. SANDAG and the City currently are discussing whether or not to pursue this opportunity.

*Proposed Non-Infrastructure Projects:*

**Regional Bikeway Education and Encouragement Start-up**  
**Estimated Grant Request: $1 million**

Currently, the Regional Bikeway program includes engineering, environmental, design, and construction on 24 capital infrastructure projects, or 69 miles of bikeways that are scheduled to open to the public between now and FY 2022. As projects are opened, especially in the more densely populated urban corridors, this program will target specific messaging in order to educate people biking, walking, and driving.

Through the first three cycles of the ATP, SANDAG secured more than $38 million for six EAP projects.

**Active Transportation Program Regional Competition**

SANDAG submittals that are not successful in the statewide competition automatically are entered into the regional competition (see Agenda Item No. 5A).
**Next Steps**

A timeline for the statewide competition is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2018</td>
<td>CTC released statewide call for projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2018</td>
<td>Transportation Committee considers approval of SANDAG project list for the statewide competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2018</td>
<td>Statewide competition applications due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 2018</td>
<td>CTC staff recommendations posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>CTC adopts statewide awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2019</td>
<td>MPO recommendations on the regional competition due to CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>CTC adopts regional awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attachments:  
1. Map of Proposed SANDAG Statewide ATP Applications  
2. Resolution No. 2018-21: Approving SANDAG’s Applications for Active Transportation Program Funds (Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359, and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354) to the California Transportation Commission

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, linda.culp@sandag.org
APPROVING SANDAG'S APPLICATIONS FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS
(SENATE BILL 99, CHAPTER 359, AND ASSEMBLY BILL 101, CHAPTER 354)
TO THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds for the California Active Transportation Program; and

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

WHEREAS, the San Diego Association on Governments (SANDAG), if selected, will enter into an agreement with the State of California to carry out the development of the proposed capital projects; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the SANDAG Transportation Committee, acting as the Governing Body:

1. Approves the filing of an application to fund the following projects:
   a. University Avenue Bikeway;
   b. Eastern Hillcrest Bikeway;
   c. Inland Rail Trail– City of Vista segment;
   d. Downtown Mobility Plan; and
   e. Regional Bikeway Education and Encouragement Start-up.

2. Certifies that SANDAG, as the applicant, will assume responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds; and

3. Certifies that SANDAG is able to comply with all the federal and state laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement); and

4. Appoints the Executive Director, or designee, as agent to conduct all negotiations, and execute and submit all documents including but not limited to applications, agreements, payment requests, and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project(s).

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 1st day of June 2018.

ATTEST: 

CHAIR 

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 Chairman's Association, and Mexico.
Introduction

In support of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (2015 Regional Plan), SANDAG developed a Regional Mobility Hub Implementation Strategy to describe how shared mobility services, like bikeshare, can enhance access to transit and other community destinations. Since launching in the City of San Diego in 2015, bikeshare has been growing across the region. New bikeshare models are making it a more convenient and attractive travel option for many trip types. Dockless bikeshare has launched in Imperial Beach, National City, and San Diego, including at UC San Diego. Additionally, the North Coast Corridor cities are jointly evaluating the possibility of launching a dockless bikeshare pilot project later this year, and Chula Vista is developing a bikeshare program to allow bikeshare vendors to operate within city limits. SANDAG staff will discuss opportunities for regional coordination around bikeshare planning, implementation, and monitoring.

Discussion

Bikeshare aims to provide convenient, affordable, on-demand access to bikes for short-term use before they are returned to the system. Bikeshare may be attractive to people who would rather not own a bike because of the risk of theft or vandalism, a lack of parking storage, and maintenance costs. Bikeshare providers use technology to automate locking/unlocking, collect payment, and identify the location of bikes. Technological improvements have led to dockless bikeshare systems that allow members to park and lock a bike wherever they want within a designated zone. Dockless bikeshare is expanding rapidly due to the minimal amount of capital investment required to launch a system. Some bikeshare programs offer convenient monthly or annual membership options, some of which may be discounted for disadvantaged communities.

Bikeshare also may help reduce traffic congestion, air pollution, and demand for vehicle parking. As bikeshare options increase within the San Diego region, it will be important to coordinate around data collection and sharing, public outreach and education, and tracking bikeshare impacts in the form of increased biking and transit ridership. Member agency staff discussed opportunities for regional bikeshare coordination at other SANDAG working group meetings. Topics included bikeshare data collection, parking strategies, incentives, public outreach, and vendor agreements.
Next Steps

SANDAG working groups may continue to be leveraged as a forum to discuss bikeshare planning and implementation practices in addition to experience with various bikeshare models and providers. SANDAG staff will contribute to the effort by compiling bikeshare regulation and policy best practices. Jurisdictions also can work to ensure data provided by bikeshare vendors informs both near- and long-term mobility network planning and transportation demand management policies and programs.

Key Staff Contact(s): Marisa Mangan, (619) 595-5614, marisa.mangan@sandag.org
TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION  

File Number 1500200

Introduction

Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance requires all new congestion relief projects to accommodate the needs of people walking and biking where it is needed and feasible. Rule 21 of Board Policy No. 031 describes how this provision will be implemented. The recent 10-year review of the TransNet program recommended a reevaluation of this process in light of current Complete Streets requirements and best practices. The ATWG is asked to discuss how the process has worked in jurisdictions and discuss potential improvements.

Attachment(s):  
1. Board Policy No. 031 TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules  
2. TransNet Triennial Performance Audit - 2018

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
**TransNet ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES**

This excerpt from Board Policy No. 031 been adopted aby the SANDAG Board of Directors in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The purpose of the rules in Policy No. 031 is to implement the provisions of the original TransNet Ordinance (87-1) and the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01) and amendments thereto.
**Rule #21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians**

**Adoption Date:** February 22, 2008

**Text:** Adequate provisions for bicycle and pedestrian travel is determined within the context of the roadway type, its existing and planned surrounding land uses, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, and current or planned public transit service. When addressing the access needs dictated by land use, the responsible agency must consider demand created by current and expected land uses (as determined by the local general plan) within the useful life of the TransNet project. The table Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures provides a guide to appropriate accommodation measures for each transportation facility type and land use context. In the table, “urban” means within the urbanized area as defined by U.S. Census Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Urban Highway**     | • Required facility type will be based on the recommendations for any regional bikeway corridors in urban highway alignments developed through the 2007 Regional Bicycle Plan. Pending completion of this plan, appropriate bicycle accommodation will be developed on a project by project basis by local and regional authorities in consultation with appropriate stakeholders.  
  • Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads. | • Continuous sidewalks and marked crosswalks through freeway interchanges where sidewalks exist or are planned on the intersecting roadway.  
  • Where new freeway construction severs existing pedestrian access, grade separated pedestrian crossings with no more than 0.3 mile between crossings. |
| **Transit Project**   | • Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand.  
  • Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.  
  • Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access. | • Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks.  
  • Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no more than 0.3 miles between crossings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Urban Street</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways(^2), both sides of the street with marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways(^2), both sides of the street with marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(design speed &gt;35 mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td>crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway. Where planned average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 6,500, the outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways(^2) both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(design speed ≤35 mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Local Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways(^2) both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Collector Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• Not required with no fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where a local jurisdiction has a bicycle or pedestrian master plan adopted by the city council or Board of Supervisors and approved by SANDAG, the local agency may use that plan to determine the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum provide the facilities called for in the plan. These plans must be updated and approved no less than every five years to qualify as a means of satisfying this provision.

**Best Available Standards.** All bicycle facilities must be designed to the standards established in the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000. Bicycle parking facilities should conform to the guidelines established in the Regional Bicycle Plan adopted by SANDAG. Shared roadways on collector streets should have a curb lane or curb lane plus shoulder that measures at least 14 feet. Where parallel parking is in place, consideration should be given to installing the shared lane pavement marker. All sidewalks must be designed consistent with the design standards established in the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, the Department of State Architect's California Access Compliance Reference Manual, and the U.S. Department of Transportation ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG). Consistency with the design recommendations in SANDAG's *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians* is encouraged.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation in Reconstruction Projects.** Street and road reconstruction is the time to re-evaluate the function of a road and its context, and to reallocate the right-of-way if appropriate to meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. An agency is not required to acquire additional right of way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. However, the agency should consider reduced motor vehicle lanes and lane widths, and reduced median widths as a means of providing the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facility. While such an evaluation is recommended for reconstruction projects of any size, compliance with these guidelines is required for “major” reconstruction projects meeting the definitions established under Rule 18 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 regarding the guidelines for implementing the “70/30” requirement.
When Provisions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians Accommodation May Be Excluded. Section 4(E)(3) is based on the premise that pedestrians and bicyclists need safe and convenient access to the same destinations as other users of the public right of way. Consequently, those portions of the transportation network where pedestrians and bicyclists need not be accommodated are the exception, and the decision not to provide for them in a construction or major reconstruction project must be made by the responsible agency for good cause such as severe topographic or biological constraints. Any impacts on the roadway’s motor vehicle capacity that result from providing for pedestrian and bicycle access would not, in themselves, justify excluding bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, these impacts and their mitigation costs should be considered in determining if the cost of providing the facilities is disproportionate to the probable use.

This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of 1-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 031) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

The cost of providing for bicycle and pedestrian access can vary significantly relative to the overall project cost. For this reason, specifying a proportional or absolute limit on spending for bicycle or pedestrian improvements relative to probable use would not allow the kind of discretion necessary to make a significant investment in facilities when necessary, or to withhold an investment when the benefits are marginal. Therefore, the decision to exclude accommodations for bicyclist and pedestrians must be a policy-level decision made by the Board or city council based on the body of information about context, cost, and probable use available at the time. Such a decision must be made in the public hearing required by Section 5(A) of the Ordinance.

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.

Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.

Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects.
When an agency determines not to include bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the Ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects as part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its
comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee in approving the TransNet Program of Projects must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

**Effective Implementation.** This rule will be effective for projects added to the TransNet Program of Projects subsequent to their adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Within three years of their adoption, the rule will be re-evaluated by SANDAG to ensure they are effectively encouraging provision of a balance transportation network without imposing an excessive cost burden on projects funded under the program.
Task 6:
Draft Report (Excerpt)

April 2018
Chapter 4: Local Street and Road

The 2004 TransNet Extension Ordinance allocated 29.1 percent of annual sales tax revenues to the 19 local jurisdictions to fund improvements on the local street and road network. With approximately $714 million provided through June 2017, this program is the second largest TransNet Program after major corridor capital construction.

**Key Results**

Absent standard performance outcome data, improvements to the local street and road network were limited to the reporting of pavement condition as a measure of road quality. Additionally, both the Ordinance and SANDAG Board policy requirements pertaining to local jurisdictions’ compliance with bike and pedestrian accommodations and the applicability of splitting local funding 70/30 for congestion relief and maintenance need to be reevaluated.

- Over the last three years, pavement condition decreased by one percent. This follows the trend since the start of TransNet where pavement condition in the San Diego region declined from a good condition to the current at-risk condition rating.
- 70/30 congestion relief and maintenance project split may not allow local jurisdictions sufficient flexibility in linking TransNet monies to current individual infrastructure needs at the local level.
- While the SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21 requires local jurisdictions to provide appropriate accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian travel when building new or reconstructing existing local streets and roads, compliance with the rule is not regularly monitored by SANDAG—except for a review performed in 2014, that identified continued efforts were required to ensure compliance. Yet, in light of SANDAG’s Complete Streets policy emerging at the same time, Rule 21 compliance has since not been further pursued by SANDAG and has been deferred to monitoring efforts as part of the Complete Streets policy implementation.

**Recommendation Highlights**

- Revisit the TransNet Extension Ordinance congestion relief and maintenance split to be more relevant with local needs as the TransNet lifecycle matures by considering elimination of the 70/30 split, change to the percentage limitations, or modification of the categorical definitions within the TransNet Extension Ordinance limitations.
- Use results from SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, local Rule 21 review to make identified changes to the Ordinance definitions and follow-up on areas of noncompliance noted during the review.
- Work with locals to determine a method to demonstrate compliance with Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21.
- Amend or establish a SANDAG Board Policy to require local jurisdictions to track and report on the number of bike and pedestrian facilities implemented using TransNet funds.
- Conduct another review of local projects and considering whether any adjustments are warranted in light of SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy.

Pavement in the San Diego region is considered in at-risk condition and has declined over recent years. But recent pavement rehabilitation efforts by the City of San Diego will result in improved conditions over the next few years.

Note: ^1 Refer to Report Exhibit 2 for TransNet allocations of nearly $714 million for Local Street and Road Program.
Chapter Introduction

Local streets and roads feed the highway system, provide paths for transit, and provide neighborhood-level transportation access. As such, TransNet set aside 29.1 percent of sales tax collections to fund improvements on the region’s approximate 7,800 center line miles of local streets and roads. Specifically, TransNet stipulated that local jurisdictions propose a variety of congestion relief and maintenance projects through the biennial Regional Transportation Improvement Program for spending TransNet money and committing other state, federal, and local funds allocated. To deliver these projects, local jurisdictions followed common public construction project delivery and procurement methods and employed a mix of in-house and consultant staff to plan, design, and oversee projects. Capital construction was still typically outsourced, while routine maintenance of assets was generally performed in-house by designated public works crews. Since 2008, nearly $714 million was provided to local jurisdictions for their streets and roads making it the second largest TransNet Program after major corridor capital construction.34

Pavement Condition Declined, but Recent Efforts may Reverse Trend

Given the lack of local street and road performance outcome data to demonstrate congestion relief improvements and greater mobility, local street and road performance outcome communication was limited to the reporting of road quality. A typical measure of road quality is the pavement condition index (PCI) initially developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This measure rates of pavement distress with scores ranging from 0 (failed) to 100 (perfect). Points are deducted from 100 for distress such as cracking, rutting, and other distortions. Thus, the higher a PCI score, the better average road condition. Typically, an index of 70 to 100 indicates good or excellent condition, 50 to 69 is at-risk condition, and 49 and below is poor to failed condition.

While this data was not tracked or analyzed by SANDAG at the regional level, external reports indicated the average PCI for roads in cities within San Diego County dropped from a PCI rating of 66 to 65 between 2014 and 2016 as shown in Exhibit 33. This is part of an overall declining trend where San Diego pavement condition dropped from a PCI of 74 in 2008, indicating a good condition, when TransNet started.35

![Exhibit 33. Biennial Pavement Condition Index for Californian Comparison Counties, 2014 and 2016](image)

Source: League of California Cities Biennial California Statewide Local Street and Road Needs Assessment reports.

34 Refer to Report Exhibit 2 for TransNet allocations of nearly $714 million for Local Street and Road Program.

35 Based on the League of California Cities biennial California Statewide Local Street and Road Needs Assessment Report showing PCI ratings for all California counties.
Individual local jurisdiction pavement survey results showed improving conditions

To capture most current pavement condition at the local jurisdictional level, we surveyed the 19 local jurisdictions. While not all jurisdictions used TransNet funds to maintain their roadways, survey responses from 14 local jurisdictions showed the average current PCI for the San Diego region was 71, which is considered a “good” condition. This number differed from the results presented by the California Statewide Local Street and Road Assessment in its 2016 report perhaps due to timing of the City of San Diego reported data. Recently, the City of San Diego invested significant TransNet resources and other funding sources to improve its roadways and reported an increased PCI of 71 in 2017 based on road condition survey results conducted in 2016. Given that streets and roads in the City of San Diego account for approximately 38 percent of the roadways in San Diego County, an increase in PCI for the City of San Diego will likely positively reflect on the overall PCI for San Diego County in future League of California Cities’ reports.

Congestion Relief and Maintenance Split May Need to Be Revisited

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires that at least 70 percent of the revenues provided for the Local Street and Road Program be spent on congestion relief projects and no more than 30 percent spent on maintenance projects—commonly known as the “70/30 Split Rule.” Examples of each category are shown in Exhibit 34. While SANDAG Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules provided a mechanism for local agencies to request an exemption to the 30 percent maintenance limitation with justification, some local jurisdictions expressed that the process was cumbersome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Relief (70%)</th>
<th>Maintenance (30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New or widened roads and bridges</td>
<td>Lane removal for bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement overlay <strong>1-inch thick or greater</strong></td>
<td>Pavement overlay <strong>less than 1-inch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge retrofit</td>
<td>Bridge replacement for aesthetic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New traffic signals or upgrades</td>
<td>Traffic signal replacement or software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossings and lighting</td>
<td>Light bulb replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the past, local jurisdictions conveyed that these definitions established in 2006 have restricted their use of TransNet funds because the 70/30 Split Rule did not adequately reflect their needs, particularly for pavement rehabilitation projects. Some jurisdictions felt they must wait until a roadway deteriorated to meet eligibility definitions as a 70 percent congestion relief project. Based on interviews conducted during the current and prior performance audits, local jurisdictions have voiced preferences for a more flexible approach on how TransNet monies can be spent for local projects. Some jurisdictions were fairly built-out and felt that the 70/30 split prohibits them from using TransNet monies on other needed maintenance projects. Even jurisdictions with space for congestion relief projects may welcome a different split allowing

---

36 The following local jurisdictions did not respond to the survey—Del Mar, Imperial Beach, National City, and Solana Beach.
for larger allocations towards maintenance as maintenance will become a more significant issue for locals over the next decade as congestion relief improvements begin to deteriorate as well.

Recently passed California Senate Bill 1 legislation is likely to help in this area by providing nearly $1.5 billion statewide to local jurisdictions for maintenance needs. This influx of funds will certainly help rebuild the region’s roadway infrastructure, but there could still be areas that have greater maintenance needs while having fewer capital projects that meet the current TransNet congestion relief definitions. While there is a mechanism to get approval for changes to the 70/30 split, it appears to be cumbersome and time-consuming. To allow local jurisdictions more flexibility on how to best spend TransNet monies on local project needs, the SANDAG Board may want to consider modifying the rule’s definitions or changing the 1-inch or thicker requirement for congestion relief-type pavement overlays.

**Continued Effort is Needed to Ensure Compliance with Bike and Pedestrian Accommodations**

In February 2008, the SANDAG Board added Rule 21 to its Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules requiring local jurisdictions to provide appropriate accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian travel during street and road reconstruction for new projects or major reconstruction projects. The rule also allowed for exceptions where bike and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the facility or where the costs of including bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Compliance and requested exceptions were tracked through self-certifications made during biennial Regional Transportation Improvement Program updates by selecting a check-box in the electronic ProjectTrak system and written requested exceptions presented to SANDAG’s Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee. SANDAG performed a detailed evaluation of bike and pedestrian accommodations in 2014; yet, continued efforts are needed to ensure compliance with this policy.

Specifically, to determine whether the rule was effectively encouraging a balanced transportation network, SANDAG staff conducted a three-part evaluation in 2014 consisting of surveying local public works staff to collect data on how they implement the requirement, determining which projects included the accommodations, and conducting a field review of those projects to determine compliance with the requirement. Those efforts found that not all street maintenance overlay projects included the minimum bicycle and pedestrian accommodations or project accommodations did not cover the entire length of the projects. However, it was difficult to evaluate the impact of the rule on the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure since only six local agencies tracked bike facilities funded with TransNet and only three agencies tracked pedestrian facilities. From this review, SANDAG identified that additional types of projects should be subject to Rule 21 and should be added to the policy such as median landscape projects and traffic signal installation projects. Additionally, the review determined that a checklist to evaluate projects was needed and learned that local agencies had compliance questions.

While the compliance review was a sound practice employed, it was only completed once in 2014 and has not been regularly performed on an ongoing basis. Moreover, SANDAG did not follow-up on the evaluation’s results to revise the Rule 21 definitions, develop the evaluation checklist, or work with the local agencies. 37 Board Policy No, 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules, Rule 21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians.
jurisdictions to solve perceived compliance issues. According to SANDAG, it did not make changes because the SANDAG Board approved the Complete Streets Policy at the same time that committed to a process that ensures the needs of people using all modes of travel are considered on every street or network of streets. However, SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy is applicable only to SANDAG infrastructure projects whereas locals are required by the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 to incorporate a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highway elements into their general plans. Further, SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy stated that SANDAG would periodically evaluate the effectiveness of Rule 21 to ensure compliance with the provision and that the rule reflects current best practices in Complete Streets implementation.

Thus, SANDAG should follow through with the results from the Rule 21 evaluation conducted in 2014 and continue to monitor compliance with the rule, until otherwise amended. Further, SANDAG should require local agencies to track and report on the number of bike and pedestrian facilities implemented using TransNet funds.

**Recommendations**

To better understand whether Local Street and Road Program spending is delivering projects that result in the best performance outcomes and value for taxpayer investment, the ITOC should request the SANDAG Board to direct staff to perform the following:

11. Revisit the Ordinance congestion relief and maintenance split to be more relevant with local needs as the TransNet lifecycle matures by considering elimination of the 70/30 split, change to the percentage limitations, or modification of the categorical definitions within Ordinance limitations.

12. Continue to monitor compliance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21, until otherwise amended, by implementing the following:

   a. Following-up on the results from the SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21 evaluation conducted by SANDAG in 2014.

      1. Use results from SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, local Rule 21 review to make identified changes to the Ordinance definitions and follow-up on areas of noncompliance noted during the review.

      2. Work with locals to determine a method to demonstrate compliance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21.

      3. Amend or establish a SANDAG Board Policy to require local jurisdictions to track and report on the number of bike and pedestrian facilities implemented using TransNet funds.

   b. Conducting another review of local projects and considering whether any adjustments are warranted in light of SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy.