

2025 Active Transportation Program (Cycle 7)



Stanislaus, Merced & San Joaquin Counties
Branch Workshop
February 20, 2024
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Program Goals



- Increase walking and biking
- Increase safety of non-motorized users
- Help regional agencies meet their SB 375 goals
- Enhance public health
- Ensure disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users

Program Structure



- Competitive funding program
- Funds distributed into the 3 ATP components
 - 50% for the Statewide Component
 - 10% for Small Urban & Rural Component
 - 40% for Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Component
- A minimum of 25% of funds in each of the 3 components must benefit disadvantaged communities



Application Types

Large Infrastructure or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure

- Total Project Cost of greater than \$10 million
- Large applications may apply for Pre-Construction phases only

Medium Infrastructure or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure

- Total Project Cost of greater than \$3.5 million and up to \$10 million

Small Infrastructure or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure

- Total Project Cost of \$3.5 million or less

Non-Infrastructure Only

- Education and Encouragement Activities

Plans

- Community-wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan that encompasses disadvantaged community

Eligible Applicants



- Local, Regional, or State agencies
- Caltrans
 - Caltrans can also partner with other eligible agencies
- Transit Agencies
- Natural Resources or Public Land Agencies
- Public Schools or School Districts
- Tribal Governments
- Private Nonprofit (recreational trail funding)

Program Status



- Anticipate Approximately \$568,700,000 in Funding
- Six Cycles of Projects Selected for Funding
- Over 1,000 Projects Funded
- Most Provide Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities
- Almost 100% Delivery Rate
- All the Cycle 1 Projects are Completed or Under Construction

Program Challenges



- Very Over Subscribed
 - Massive Community Need
 - Not Enough Funding
- Funding Requests are Getting Larger
- Ensure Program is Open to All Geographic Areas Across the State
- Program Funds all Project Phases
- Measuring Performance

Highlights from the 2025 Guidelines



- Program Schedule
- Application Update – Submittable
- Justice40 Initiative
- New Federal Tools
 - [Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool](#)
 - [US DOT Equitable Transportation Community \(ETC\) Explorer](#)
- Quick-Build Program
- Policy Clarifications

Stanislaus County in the ATP



- Submitted 44 projects over six Cycles
- 25 projects have been funded overall (57% success rate):
 - 7 projects funded through the Statewide component
 - 18 projects funded through the MPO component
- Average scores have remained in the 70's each cycle, excluding Cycles 4 and 6.
 - The number of applications submitted has decreased since Cycle 3.
- Highest scoring application was a 97 from Cycle 2.

Stanislaus County in Cycle 6



- 5 applications submitted
 - All 5 applications were funded – 100% success rate
 - Funded in the MPO component
- General Feedback:
 - Narrative did not address how project will not result in displacement.
 - More discussion of disadvantaged community and student's needs. How will project increase walking and biking?
 - Safety/collision data fell outside of project limits or higher collisions were shown outside of project area without explanation.
 - Public participation did not clearly demonstrate engagement. Was community involved? How will they continue to be engaged? Any feedback received?
 - Maps did not clearly show project limits, destinations or crashes.

Merced County in the ATP



- Submitted 30 projects over six Cycles
- 8 projects have been funded overall (27% success rate):
 - 4 projects funded through the Statewide component
 - 4 projects funded through the Small Urban & Rural component
- Average scores have gradually decreased each cycle, along with the number of applications submitted.
- Highest scoring application was a 95 from Cycle 2.

Merced County in Cycle 6



- 1 application submitted by Merced County
 - 0 applications were funded
- General Feedback:
 - Did not address how project directly benefits disadvantaged community. Displacement not discussed.
 - Narrative requires more discussion of local health concerns. Lack of connectivity not addressed. Not clear on how project will address identified needs.
 - Safety/collision analysis was lacking and not clearly tied to countermeasures. Why is project a safety priority?
 - Public participation did not demonstrate community was engaged. Documentation was not included to support narrative.
 - Significant word count was remaining under each sub-question.

San Joaquin County in the ATP



- Submitted 114 projects over six Cycles
- 31 projects have been funded overall (27% success rate):
 - 11 projects funded through the Statewide component
 - 20 projects funded through the MPO component
- Average scores have remained in the 60's each cycle, excluding Cycles 5 and 6.
 - The number of applications submitted has varied drastically.
- Highest scoring application was a 97 from Cycle 6.

San Joaquin County in Cycle 6



- 16 applications submitted
 - 7 applications were funded – 44% success rate
 - 3 funded in the Statewide component
 - 4 funded in the MPO component
- General Feedback:
 - Not clear how DAC requested/supported the project. DAC engagement not discussed.
 - Need question did not adequately address local health concerns, students and how project will increase walking and biking.
 - Safety/collision analysis was lacking. Not clear how proposed improvements will address safety concerns.
 - Public participation appeared outdated and did not explain who was involved in the process. How will community continue to be engaged?
 - Maps were not clear and did not show the key destinations, gap closures, etc.
 - Some application questions were left unanswered. Some questions were copy and pasted from previous questions.

Thank You



Contact Information

Laurie Waters

Laurie.Waters@catc.ca.gov

Beverley Newman-Burckhard

Beverley.Newman-Burckhard@catc.ca.gov

Elika Changizi

Elika.Changizi@catc.ca.gov

[Active Transportation Program Website](#)