

The background of the page features three overlapping rectangular blocks: a large blue block in the center, an orange block in the upper right, and a green block in the lower left.

**2019
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 Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Diego Region.

QUESTIONS

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

Jenny Russo
Jenny.Russo@sandag.org
(619) 699-7314

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.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/>.

CYCLE 4 SCHEDULE

The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the Cycle 4 ATP.

STATEWIDE COMPETITION	
CTC adoption of ATP Guidelines	5/16/2018
Estimated available funding released	5/16/2018
Statewide Call for Projects released	5/16/2018
ATP Workshop at Caltrans	6/20/2018
Application submittal deadline for Statewide Competition	7/31/2018
CTC staff recommendation of projects for Statewide Competition	12/31/2018
CTC approval of recommended projects for Statewide Competition	January 2019
REGIONAL COMPETITION	
Estimated available funding released by CTC	5/16/2018
Staff recommendation of Regional ATP guidelines presented to SANDAG Transportation Committee	6/1/2018
Regional ATP guidelines considered by SANDAG Board of Directors	6/22/2018
CTC considers SANDAG Regional Guidelines for approval	8/15/2018
Regional Call for Projects released	8/17/2018
Application submittal deadline for Regional Competition	9/28/2018
Scoring and ranking of Regional Competition applications	10/8/2018- 1/4/2019
<i>TransNet</i> Swap coordination with applicants (if applicable) for Regional Competition	1/7/2019- 1/18/2019
SANDAG Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviews <i>TransNet</i> /ATP Swap concept (if applicable)	2/13/2019
Deadline for Applicants to submit Resolution	2/1/2019
Publication of recommended ranked project list (through posting of Transportation Committee Agenda) for Regional Competition	2/8/2019
Staff recommendation of Regional Competition ranked projects presented to SANDAG Transportation Committee	2/15/2019
Regional ATP project rankings considered by SANDAG Board of Directors	2/22/2019
CTC considers adoption of ranked project list for SANDAG Regional Competition	June 2019

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.

MASTER AGREEMENT

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: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/lapm.htm>.

BASELINE AGREEMENTS

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. Additional information on Baseline Agreements can be found in the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines, which are available here: <http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/docs/032118-Final-adopted-Accountability-Transparency-Guidelines.pdf>

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://catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/docs/Project_Study_Report_\(PSR\)_Guidelines.pdf](http://catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/docs/Project_Study_Report_(PSR)_Guidelines.pdf). 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 permit 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.

The application must 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 39.34. 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>). San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan defines disadvantaged communities 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. 035:¹**
 - 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

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

Non-Infrastructure Projects

- Innovation: Does the project propose innovative solutions that show the potential to serve as a replicable model to the region/city?

Infrastructure Projects

- 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 innovative solutions that are included in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide or propose solutions that are new to the region/city? Does the project leverage advanced technologies?

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, R/W)
- 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. (Up to 8 points possible)

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

or

- 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, SPINTER, 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)

and/or

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

C. COMPLETES CONNECTION IN LOCAL BICYCLE NETWORK

Up to 10 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 10 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 18 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)
- Creates a new or safer crossing for bicyclists and/or pedestrians across railroad or light rail tracks (6 points).

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

Up to 6 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 through 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/city and if 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, such as:

- Bike signals and beacons
- Intersection treatments (bike boxes, intersection crossing markings, median refuge islands, through bike lanes)
- Bikeway signing and marking (colored bike facilities, bike route wayfinding signage/markings)

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/city. *(Up to 12 points possible)*

- Is this project an Federal Highway Administration or state experimentation effort? (4 points)
- Does this project propose innovative solutions that are included in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide or propose solutions that are new to the region/city? (6 points)
- Does the project leverage advanced technologies? (2 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 6 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). *(Up to 10 points possible)*

- 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)*
- 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 *(Up to 8 points possible)*. 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):
 - 30 percent design completed *(3 points)*
 - 60 percent design completed *(6 points)*
 - 90 percent design completed *(9 points)*
 - 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. (Up to 5 points possible)

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

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- 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. (Up to 10 points possible)

- 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. (Up to 8 points possible)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| • 0% (0 points) | • 24.00 – 31.99% (5 points) |
| • 0.01– 7.99% (2 points) | • 32.00 – 39.99% (6 points) |
| • 8.00 – 15.99% (3 points) | • 40.00 – 47.99% (7 points) |
| • 16.00 – 23.99% (4 points) | • 48.00% and above (8 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 (*).

No.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE
1.*	DEMAND ANALYSIS		
		Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers. (Up to 15 points)	Up to 15
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 10
D.	Existing Pedestrian Network	How well will the project close a gap in the existing pedestrian network?	Up to 10
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. Will the project create access or overcome barriers in an area where hazardous conditions prohibit safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians? Does the project create a new or safer crossing for bicyclists and/or pedestrians across railroad or trolley tracks?	Up to 18
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

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

C.	Alignment with ATP Goals	How well does the project align with the ATP objectives?	Up to 18
D.	Innovation	Is this project a Federal Highway Administration or state experimentation effort? Does the project propose innovative solutions that are new to the region/city? Does the project leverage advanced technologies?	Up to 12
4.	SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS		
A.	Complementary Programs	Are capital improvements accompanied by supportive programs such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and/or increased enforcement?	Up to 6
B.	Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission Reductions	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?	Up to 10
5.	PROJECT READINESS/COMPLETION OF MAJOR MILESTONES		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or community active transportation strategy. (2 points) • Environmental clearance (CEQA and NEPA) (4 points) • Completed right-of-way acquisition (4 points) • Progress toward obtaining final design 	Up to 20
6.	PUBLIC HEALTH		
		Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?	Up to 10
7.	USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS		
		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?	Up to 5
8.	BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY		
		Does the project benefit a disadvantaged community?	Up to 10
9.*	MATCHING FUNDS		
		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.	Up to 8
10.*	COST EFFECTIVENESS		
		Project grant request, divided by score in criteria 1 through 9, ranked relative to each other.	Up to 10
TOTAL POINTS			200

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 30 points possible; EEA Programs: Not Applicable)*

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

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 possible; EEA Programs: Up to 30 points possible;)*

- 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 through 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 30 points possible)*
- 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 30 points possible)*

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 (Up to 10 points possible):

- 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)
- How well will the proposed effort directly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions? (Up to 8 points possible).

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 possible)*
- 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 possible)*

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 possible; EEA Programs: Up to 15 points possible*)

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 possible*)

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/city. The highest scoring projects will include innovative methods of accomplishing project goals that have not yet been pursued numerous times in the region/city. For innovations that have been implemented in other regions/cities, 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 corrals; bike stations; or bike parking ordinances. (*Plans: Not Applicable; EEA Programs: Up to 15 points possible*)

8. PUBLIC HEALTH

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 (Up to 15 points possible):

- 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 possible)
- 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 20 points possible; EEA Programs: Up to 10 points possible)
- 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.

NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- 0% (0 points)
- 0.01– 4.99% (1 point)
- 5.00 – 9.99% (2 points)
- 10.00– 14.99% (3 points)
- 15.00 – 19.99% (4 points)
- 20.00 – 24.99% (5 points)
- 25.00 – 29.99% (6 points)
- 30.00 – 34.99% (7 points)
- 35.00 – 39.99% (8 points)
- 40.00 – 44.99% (9 points)
- 45.00% and above (10 points)

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 possible*)

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 (*).

No.	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE	
			PLANS	EEA
1*	Demand Analysis			
		Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.	Up to 30	N/A
2.	Alignment with ATP Objectives			
		How well does the proposed project align with the ATP objectives?	Up to 30	Up to 30
3.	Comprehensiveness and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions			
A.	Comprehensiveness	How comprehensive is the proposed project, plan, or program? Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?	Up to 30	Up to 30
B.	Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions	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?	Up to 10	Up to 10
4.	Methodology			
		How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals?	Up to 30	Up to 30
5.	Community Support			
		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?	Up to 15	Up to 15
6.	Evaluation			
		How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?	N/A	Up to 20
7.	Innovation			
		Does the project propose solutions that show the potential to serve as a replicable model to the region/city ?	N/A	Up to 15

NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

8.	Public Health			
		Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?	Up to 15	Up to 15
9.	Use of California Conservation Corps or a Qualified Community Conservation Corps			
		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?	N/A	Up to 5
10.	Benefit to Disadvantaged Community			
		Does the project benefit a disadvantaged community?	Up to 20	Up to 10
11.*	Matching Funds			
		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.	Up to 10	Up to 10
12.*	Cost Effectiveness			
		Total ATP funding request, divided by score in criteria 1 through 11, ranked relative to each other.	Up to 10	Up to 10
		TOTAL POINTS	200	200