

# Memorandum

**To:** CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

**CTC Meeting:** March 24-25, 2021

**From:** MITCH WEISS, Executive Director

**Reference Number:** 4.9, Action

**Prepared By:** Beverley Newman-Burckhard  
Assistant Deputy Director

**Published Date:** March 12, 2021

**Subject:** Adoption of 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural Components, Resolution G-21-30

## **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt the 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components, in accordance with the attached resolution and staff recommendations.

## **Issue:**

The Commission established the 2021 Active Transportation Program as a four-year (fiscal years 2021-22 through 2024-25) program with \$445.56 million in programming capacity.

Assembly Bill 97 (Chapter 14, Statutes of 2017) requires \$4 million in funding be directed toward projects developed and implemented by the California Conservation Corps and Certified Local Community Conservation Corps in fiscal year 2021-22. After deducting for this, \$441.56 million is available for the 2021 Active Transportation Program; \$220.78 million for the Statewide component, and \$44.156 million for the Small Urban & Rural component. Another \$25.161 million in funding was made available for the Statewide component through accumulated savings from past funding cycles bringing the total available for the Statewide component to \$245.941 million. This amount includes the \$4.4 million programmed to eight projects in the Quick-Build Project Pilot Program at the October 2020 Commission meeting, making \$241.541 million available to new projects in the 2021 Active Transportation Program.

Commission staff recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components were released on February 8, 2021. The recommendations are set forth in Attachments B and C, respectively, and summarized below.

Statewide Component: Staff recommends 41 projects for funding, totaling \$241.541 million in Active Transportation Program funding with total cumulative project costs of \$309.004 million. This includes:

- \$241.541 million (100 percent) for 41 projects benefitting disadvantaged communities.
- \$94.363 million (39 percent) for 23 Safe-Routes-to-School projects.
- \$4 million for the Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC), a Caltrans-managed project that is funded each cycle to provide technical assistance to applicants and implementing agencies throughout the state.

Since Commission staff recommendations were released, a scoring error was found for the City of Santa Monica, Stewart-Pennsylvania Safety Enhancement Project. The project score was changed from 90 to 92, and as a result, the project was added to the recommended list. Additionally, the Tulare County Association of Governments informed Commission staff that two projects recommended for funding had overlapping scope. Therefore, the Butterfield Stage Corridor (Henderson Avenue to Date Avenue) project was removed from staff recommendations. This change allowed staff to add the City of Santa Monica's project to the staff recommendations without deleting other projects, and to make additional funds available for National City's Highland Avenue Inter-City Bike Connection project, which is being partially funded due to programming capacity limitations.

Small Urban and Rural Component: Staff recommends nine projects for funding, totaling \$44.156 million in Active Transportation Program funding and valued at approximately \$61.980 million. This includes:

- \$44.156 million (100 percent) for nine projects benefitting disadvantaged communities.
- \$41.956 million (95 percent) for seven Safe-Routes-to-School projects.

The Active Transportation Program uses a sequential project selection process based on the scores the project applications received during the evaluation process. The project recommendation scoring cut-off was 92 points for the Statewide component and 90 points for the Small Urban & Rural component. There is not sufficient funding to fully fund all projects that achieved the cut-off scores in either component. Therefore, consistent with the Active Transportation Program Guidelines, Commission staff used a secondary ranking system to choose which projects to recommend. This secondary ranking consisted of first prioritizing infrastructure projects, secondly project readiness, and thirdly prioritizing projects that scored the highest on Question 2 of the application – Potential for Increased Walking and Biking. The City of Santa Monica's Stewart-Pennsylvania Safety Enhancement Project was included in an updated secondary ranking of projects that scored 92 in the Statewide component. It ranked second out of the seven projects on the list. The City of National City's Highland Avenue Inter-City Bike Connection project ranked fifth out of the six projects that were originally included in the secondary ranking but was lowered to sixth place with the addition of the City of Santa Monica project. The National City project will be partially funded, as outlined in Attachment B.

The recommended projects include a broad range of active transportation infrastructure, including over 24 miles of new or enhanced sidewalks, over 14 miles of new multi-use trails, and over 57 miles of new bikeways. Other examples of improvements include:

- Enhanced crosswalks, with features such as median refuge islands, curb extensions, rectangular rapid flashing beacons, and lighting to enhance safety and visibility.
- Improved sidewalks that are compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).
- Intersection improvements such as bike boxes that allow bicyclists to safely wait for a green light and light timing changes that give pedestrians a head start as they cross.
- Streetscape amenities such as benches, landscaping, shade trees, and drinking fountains.
- Non-infrastructure programs such as bicycle and pedestrian safety classes, walk and bike audits, open streets events, walking school bus programs, and school safety skill events.

#### Development of Staff Recommendations

The Commission received 454 project applications, with projects valued at \$3.4 billion and funding requests totaling \$2.3 billion. The Commission recruited 100 volunteer evaluators, who were divided into teams of two individuals. Each team reviewed nine to ten applications and scored them based on the screening and evaluation criteria set forth in the Commission's adopted 2021 Active Transportation Program guidelines. The evaluator teams consisted of active transportation stakeholders with a wide range of expertise and from a variety of organizations, including local government agencies, regional transportation planning organizations, state agencies, and advocacy organizations. Evaluators were required to attend a training session and sign a conflict of interest form. They were also provided with detailed scoring rubrics, score sheets, and the program guidelines. Evaluator teams provided scores based on consensus for each question within each application and were required to provide constructive comments on all score sheets. Concurrently, Commission staff validated scores on each project application, and Caltrans staff reviewed the applications for eligibility and deliverability. Once the evaluations were complete, Commission and Caltrans staff met with each evaluator team to discuss any scoring discrepancies and significant technical issues.

Five project applications were deemed ineligible because they did not meet the screening criteria set forth in the 2021 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. Additionally, one application was withdrawn by the applicant. The remaining 400 applications are not recommended for funding. However, projects located within the boundaries of one of the ten large Metropolitan Planning Organizations (Fresno Council of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments) that were not selected in the Statewide component will be considered for

funding through the Metropolitan Planning Organization component, which is planned for adoption at the June 2021 Commission meeting.

### Recommended Project Examples

The recommendations include a broad spectrum of projects that will increase walking and biking, improve the safety and mobility of non-motorized users, and enhance public health. Examples include:

- **City of Los Angeles – Connecting Canoga Park through Safety and Urban Cooling (\$30.731 million):** This project will transform seven miles of streets in the heart of Canoga Park, in the City of Los Angeles. The project corridor currently consists of very wide streets with high vehicle speeds that lack basic active transportation infrastructure. The project proposes a broad range of improvements, including Class IV protected bikeways, enhanced crosswalks, repaired sidewalks, and traffic calming features such as mini-roundabouts and speed humps. The project also includes urban cooling elements such as shade structures and trees, drinking foundations, and cool pavement. The project will help the community safely access transit lines, schools, the public library, parks, youth and senior centers, entertainment venues, local businesses, and the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail. The project provides Active Transportation Program funding to a low-income community where up to 25 percent of residents do not have access to a vehicle, and many of these individuals instead rely on biking or walking in dangerous conditions to access jobs and services.
- **City of Oakland – 7<sup>th</sup> Street Connection Project (\$14.180 million):** This project will enhance connectivity and mobility for the West Oakland communities of Acorn, Prescott, and West Oak. 7<sup>th</sup> Street provides one of the only connections between West Oakland and Downtown, and the project area currently includes four to six traffic lanes and minimal active transportation infrastructure. The 7th Street Connection Project proposes to enhance the corridor with protected bike lanes, accessibility improvements, transit boarding islands, pedestrian refuge islands, and shade trees. The project will improve connectivity to critical services, community resources, employment opportunities, and transit options for the surrounding neighborhoods. This project provides Active Transportation Program funding to a low-income community disproportionately impacted by pollution from industrial and freight activities.
- **City of Sacramento – Franklin Boulevard Complete Street Project (\$9.323 million):** Sacramento's Franklin District is home to a low-income, historically-immigrant community and Franklin Boulevard serves as the main street for this disadvantaged community. However, the corridor also operates as a commuter bypass route for State Route 99. Franklin Boulevard currently has four travel lanes with a center turn lane, no bike lanes, sidewalks with no shade, and infrequent marked pedestrian crossings. The Franklin Boulevard Complete Street Project proposes a broad range of active transportation improvements, including Class IV protected bikeways, shade trees,

enhanced crosswalks, accessibility improvements, and lighting. The improvements will enhance accessibility to several key destinations in the community, including schools, shopping, health care providers, bus and rail transit locations, employment opportunities, and other community resources.

- Fresno County – Biola Community Sidewalks (\$1.225 million):** Biola is a small community in Fresno County. The project area lacks sidewalks, curb, and gutter, and on rainy days, students and residents are forced into the flooded streets because the shoulders are too muddy. During the dry summer months, wind can cause hazardous conditions by stirring the dirt from the unpaved shoulders, resulting in unhealthy air quality and low visibility for drivers and pedestrians. The project corridor connects to several key community destinations, including the elementary school, community center, and post office. This is significant, as the U.S. Postal Service does not deliver mail to homes, so residents must travel to the post office to pick up and send mail. The Biola Community Sidewalks project proposes several improvements, including sidewalks, curb and gutter, ADA curb ramps, and lighted crosswalks. The improvements are expected to improve safety for active transportation users and enhance the health and wellbeing of the community. This project provides Active Transportation Program funding to a small community with a significant farm worker population, high rates of unemployment, and low levels of vehicle ownership.
- Karuk Tribe – Happy Camp Complete Streets Project (\$9.971 million):** Happy Camp is a low-income community that serves as the headquarters for the Karuk Tribe. Many of its residents rely on active transportation to access jobs, services, and community resources. State Route 96 serves as the main street of Happy Camp, and there are no sidewalks, no designated bike lanes, little-to-no shoulder, no pedestrian safety lighting, and no safe areas for people using transit. The Happy Camp Complete Streets Project proposes several improvements, including Class II bike lanes, sidewalks, accessibility enhancements, and lighting. The project is expected to improve safety for active transportation users and encourage a shift from vehicle use to walking and biking trips.

#### Programming Recommendations

The following table provides a summary of proposed programming recommendations. The funding amounts are represented in millions:

Component	Projects	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	Total ATP Funding	Total Project Cost
Statewide	41	\$32.496	\$56.827	\$73.266	\$78.952	\$241.541	\$309.004
Small Urban and Rural	9	\$6.647	\$5.344	\$18.211	\$13.954	\$44.156	\$61.980

**Background:**

The Active Transportation Program 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 (Chapter 2031, Statutes of 2017) directs additional funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the Active Transportation Program. Along with the program's overall purpose of encouraging walking and biking, the program aims to increase the share of walking and biking trips, increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users, help regional agencies achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals, enhance public health, ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in program benefits, and provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

In November 2019, the Commission began the process of developing the 2021 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. Commission staff held 21 workshops throughout the state to solicit input from a wide range of stakeholders, including local governments, regional transportation planning agencies, state agencies, non-governmental organizations, and advocacy groups. Additionally, Commission staff visited 60 project sites in 13 counties and 32 cities to provide tailored technical assistance to potential applicants. A summary of program engagement is included in Reference Number 4.28. The 2021 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, which the Commission adopted at its March 25, 2020 meeting, describe the policies, standards, criteria, and procedures for the program's development, adoption, and management.

**Attachments:**

- Attachment A: Resolution G-21-30
- Attachment B: 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide Component Staff Recommendations
- Attachment C: 2021 Active Transportation Program – Small Urban and Rural Component Staff Recommendations
- Attachment D: Comment Letters

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**Adoption of the 2021 Active Transportation Program**  
**Statewide and Small Urban and Rural Components**

**RESOLUTION G-21-30**

- 1.1 **WHEREAS**, Streets and Highways Code Section 2384 requires the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to adopt a program of projects to receive allocations under the Active Transportation Program; and
- 1.2 **WHEREAS**, the Commission must adopt a program of projects for the Active Transportation Program at least every two years, with each program covering four fiscal years; and
- 1.3 **WHEREAS**, the 2021 Active Transportation Program Guidelines were adopted on March 25, 2020; and
- 1.4 **WHEREAS**, the guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development and management of the 2021 Active Transportation Program funding cycle; and
- 1.5 **WHEREAS**, the 2021 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate provided over \$445 million in Active Transportation Program programming capacity to be apportioned to Statewide (50 percent), Small Urban & Rural (10 percent), and Metropolitan Planning Organization (40 percent) components in fiscal years 2021-22 through 2024-25; and
- 1.6 **WHEREAS**, Assembly Bill 97 (Chapter 14, Statutes of 2017) requires \$4 million in fiscal year 2021-22 to be directed toward projects developed and implemented by the California Conservation Corps and Certified Local Community Conservation Corps; and
- 1.7 **WHEREAS**, the Commission awarded \$4.4 million of the Statewide programming capacity to eight projects in the Quick-Build Project Pilot Program on October 21, 2020; and
- 1.8 **WHEREAS**, Commission staff identified \$25.2 million in accumulated savings from previous program cycles to include in the programming capacity for the Statewide component; and
- 1.9 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to Streets and Highway Code Section 2382 subdivision (c), no less than 25 percent of overall program funds will benefit disadvantaged communities during each program cycle; and

- 1.10 **WHEREAS**, the Commission received 454 project applications seeking approximately \$2.3 billion in Active Transportation Program funding; and
- 1.11 **WHEREAS**, the staff recommendations for the 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components were published and made available to the Commission, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), regional transportation agencies, and the public on February 8, 2021; and
- 1.12 **WHEREAS**, the staff recommendations conform to the 2021 Guidelines and other statutory requirements for the Active Transportation Program; and
- 1.13 **WHEREAS**, the Commission considered the staff recommendations and public testimony at its March 24-25, 2021 meeting; and
- 1.14 **WHEREAS**, projects included in the staff recommendations must comply with all California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements.
- 2.1 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Commission adopts the 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components, as indicated in Attachments B and C, respectively, to Reference 4.9; and
- 2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that having a project included in the adopted 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components, is not an authorization to begin work on that project. Contracts may not be awarded, nor work begin until an allocation is approved by the Commission for a project in the adopted program; and
- 2.3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a project included in the adopted 2021 Active Transportation Program must comply with the Active Transportation Program Guidelines; and
- 2.4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the project amounts approved for funding shall be considered as a “not to exceed amount” and that any increases in cost estimates beyond the levels reflected in the adopted program are the responsibility of the appropriate agency; and
- 2.5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that if available funding is less than assumed in the Fund Estimate, the Commission may be forced to delay or restrict allocations using interim allocation plans, or, if available funding proves to be greater than assumed, it may be possible to allocate funding to some projects earlier than the year programmed; and



- 2.6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that staff, in consultation with Caltrans, is authorized to make further technical changes in cost, schedules, and descriptions for projects in the 2021 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components in order to reflect the most current information, or to clarify the Commission's programming commitments, and shall request Commission approval of any substantive changes; and
- 2.7 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission directs staff to post the 2021 Active Transportation Program of projects on the Commission's website.

**California Transportation Commission**  
**2021 Active Transportation Program - Statewide Component**  
**Staff Recommendations**  
**(\$1000s)**

Reference No. 4.9  
March 24-25, 2021  
Attachment B

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Recommended Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
Active Transportation Resource Center	Various	Active Transportation Resource Center	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000	Non-Infrastructure	N/A	N/A	N/A
3-Sacramento, City of-1	Sacramento	Franklin Boulevard Complete Street Project	\$ 16,265	\$ 9,323	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,323	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,323	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		99
4-Oakland, City of-1 <sup>§</sup>	Alameda	7th Street Connection Project	\$ 21,037	\$ 14,180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,180	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		98
6-Huron, City of-1	Fresno	City of Huron Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Improvement Project	\$ 1,969	\$ 1,769	\$ 25	\$ 100	\$ 1,644	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ 1,644	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	98
8-Perris, City of-1	Riverside	City of Perris Bike and Pedestrian Network Project	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,931	\$ 35	\$ 1,896	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,896	\$ 35	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x		97
8-San Bernardino County-2	San Bernardino	Muscoy Area Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Improvements Project	\$ 2,355	\$ 1,881	\$ 112	\$ 463	\$ -	\$ 1,306	\$ 112	\$ 160	\$ 303	\$ 1,271	\$ 35	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	97
6-Fresno County-1	Fresno	Biola Community Sidewalks	\$ 1,498	\$ 1,255	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,255	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,255	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	96
7-Los Angeles, City of-3	Los Angeles	SRTS Carver Middle, Ascot Avenue and Harmony Elementary Schools	\$ 6,700	\$ 6,030	\$ 801	\$ -	\$ 290	\$ 4,939	\$ 801	\$ 290	\$ -	\$ 4,939	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	96
7-Los Angeles, City of-5	Los Angeles	SRTS Panorama City Elementary School Project	\$ 6,832	\$ 6,149	\$ 756	\$ -	\$ 329	\$ 5,064	\$ 756	\$ 329	\$ -	\$ 5,064	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	96
3-Sacramento County-2	Sacramento	South Sacramento County Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 1,946	\$ 1,946	\$ 95	\$ 390	\$ 1,461	\$ -	\$ 95	\$ 190	\$ 200	\$ 1,381	\$ 80	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	96
8-Ontario, City of-1	San Bernardino	Vine Ave & B St Bike Boulevard Project	\$ 4,881	\$ 4,392	\$ 45	\$ 468	\$ 3,879	\$ -	\$ 45	\$ 468	\$ -	\$ 3,879	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		96
5-Watsonville, City of-1 <sup>§</sup>	Santa Cruz	Safer Access to Pajaro Valley High School and Beyond	\$ 15,823	\$ 11,709	\$ 1,168	\$ 10,541	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 521	\$ 10,541	\$ 647	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	96
7-Long Beach, City of-1	Los Angeles	Downtown Long Beach Walkable Corners	\$ 8,771	\$ 7,893	\$ 768	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 6,675	\$ 225	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 6,675	\$ 543	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		95
7-Maywood, City of-1	Los Angeles	City of Maywood Active Transportation Plan	\$ 263	\$ 263	\$ 263	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 263	Plan	x	x	95
10-Mariposa County-1	Mariposa	Mariposa Elementary School Connectivity Project	\$ 1,900	\$ 1,900	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ 1,800	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,800	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	95
10-Mariposa County-2	Mariposa	Mariposa Creek Parkway	\$ 5,176	\$ 4,415	\$ 200	\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 3,015	\$ 200	\$ 450	\$ 750	\$ 3,015	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		95
8-Riverside County-10	Riverside	Riverside County Safe Routes for All - San Jacinto	\$ 600	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	95
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-1	San Diego	Orange Family Friendly Street Project	\$ 5,660	\$ 4,317	\$ -	\$ 4,317	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,317	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	95
5-San Luis Obispo County-1 <sup>§</sup>	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo County-Bob Jones Trail Gap Closure	\$ 23,414	\$ 18,248	\$ 2,295	\$ 15,953	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 321	\$ 1,974	\$ 15,953	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		95
2-Redding, City of-2	Shasta	Turtle Bay to Downtown Gap Completion Project	\$ 3,935	\$ 2,665	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 2,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 2,462	\$ 153	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	95
4-Fairfield, City of-1 <sup>§</sup>	Solano	West Texas Street Complete Streets Project	\$ 16,922	\$ 10,903	\$ -	\$ 955	\$ 9,948	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 838	\$ -	\$ 9,948	\$ 117	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	95
3-West Sacramento, City of-2	Yolo	Sycamore Trail (Phase 2) Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing	\$ 11,538	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		95
6-Fresno, City of-1	Fresno	Kids Crossing: Safe Routes to School in South Fresno	\$ 1,636	\$ 1,636	\$ 141	\$ 14	\$ 1,481	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 138	\$ 14	\$ 1,441	\$ 40	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	94
1-Arcata, City of-1	Humboldt	Arcata Annie & Mary Trail Connectivity Project	\$ 5,286	\$ 4,220	\$ 67	\$ 495	\$ 3,658	\$ -	\$ 67	\$ 240	\$ 255	\$ 3,658	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		94
7-South El Monte, City of-1	Los Angeles	South El Monte Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Safety Project	\$ 1,637	\$ 1,637	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ 1,497	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 1,497	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	94
11-Oceanside, City of-1	San Diego	Laurel Elementary Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,535	\$ 1,522	\$ 287	\$ 160	\$ 1,075	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ 1,075	\$ 127	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	94
6-Porterville, City of-4	Tulare	Butterfield Stage Corridor (W North Grand Ave to College Ave)	\$ 7,750	\$ 7,100	\$ -	\$ 7,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,100	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		94

California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program - Statewide Component  
Staff Recommendations  
(\$1000s)

Reference No. 4.9  
March 24-25, 2021  
Attachment B

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Recommended Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
4-Contra Costa County-2	Contra Costa	North Bailey Road Active Transportation Corridor	\$ 6,845	\$ 6,159	\$ 499	\$ -	\$ 5,660	\$ -	\$ 499	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,660	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	93
6-Delano, City of-1	Kern	ATP-5 SRTS Intersection Enhancement and NI Work Plan	\$ 1,178	\$ 1,164	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ 1,024	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ -	\$ 949	\$ 75	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	93
7-Bell Gardens, City of-1	Los Angeles	Bell Gardens Complete Streets Improvements - Phase 1	\$ 6,999	\$ 6,499	\$ 200	\$ 6,299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,299	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		93
7-Long Beach, City of-2	Los Angeles	Pacific Avenue Cycle Track	\$ 8,332	\$ 7,498	\$ 225	\$ 1,533	\$ -	\$ 5,740	\$ 225	\$ 675	\$ -	\$ 5,740	\$ 858	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		93
7-Los Angeles, City of-11 <sup>§</sup>	Los Angeles	Connecting Canoga Park Through Safety and Urban Cooling	\$ 38,655	\$ 30,731	\$ 3,567	\$ -	\$ 1,921	\$ 25,243	\$ 3,567	\$ 1,921	\$ -	\$ 25,243	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		93
7-Los Angeles, City of-4	Los Angeles	SRTS Berendo Middle and 3 Feeder Elementary Schools Safety Project	\$ 11,057	\$ 9,951	\$ 188	\$ -	\$ 1,588	\$ 8,175	\$ 188	\$ 1,588	\$ -	\$ 8,175	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	93
4-Santa Clara County-1	Santa Clara	Active and Safe Routes to a Healthier City	\$ 2,510	\$ 2,510	\$ 2,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,510	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	93
5-Santa Cruz, City of-2	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segment 7 Phase 2 Construction	\$ 12,030	\$ 9,184	\$ 9,184	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,634	\$ 550	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	93
4-Oakland, City of-2 <sup>§</sup>	Alameda	East Oakland Neighborhood Bike Routes	\$ 21,859	\$ 17,269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,269	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		92
3-El Dorado County-3	El Dorado	Pollock Pines - Pony Express Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,440	\$ 1,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,440	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		92
11-Imperial Beach, City of-1	San Diego	9th St Active Transportation Corridor	\$ 3,354	\$ 3,018	\$ 539	\$ 2,479	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 539	\$ -	\$ 2,479	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	92
7-Santa Monica, City of-2*	Los Angeles	Stewart-Pennsylvania Safety Enhancement Project	\$ 4,000	\$ 3,196	\$ 3,196	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,171	\$ 25	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		92
7-Ventura County-2	Ventura	El Rio Pedestrian Improvement and Safe Route to School Project	\$ 6,960	\$ 6,195	\$ 222	\$ 884	\$ 5,089	\$ -	\$ 222	\$ 884	\$ -	\$ 5,089	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	92
11-National City, City of-3 <sup>†</sup>	San Diego	Highland Avenue Inter-City Bike Connection	\$ 1,897	\$ 1,343	\$ 58	\$ 260	\$ 1,025	\$ -	\$ 58	\$ 260	\$ -	\$ 1,025	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		92
			\$ 309,004	\$ 241,541													

\*The City of Santa Monica’s Stewart-Pennsylvania Safety Enhancement Project was added to the staff recommendations after a scoring error was identified.

†The City of National City requested \$1,895,000 for the Highland Avenue Inter-City Bike Connection project. However, only \$1,343,000 in programming capacity remains. This amount is higher than the original amount included in the staff recommendations released on February 8, 2021, due to other changes to the staff recommendations. Commission staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

§Project requires a baseline agreement. Please see the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines for more information.

Note: The City of Porterville’s Butterfield Stage Corridor (Henderson Avenue to Date Avenue) project was included in the staff recommendations released on February 8, 2021. This project has been removed from the recommendations because its scope is encompassed in the scope of the City of Porterville’s Butterfield Stage Corridor (W North Grand Ave to College Ave) project.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms
CON: Construction Phase
DAC: Disadvantaged Community
NI: Non-Infrastructure
PA&ED: Environmental Phase
PS&E: Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase
ROW: Right-of-Way Phase
SRTS: Safe Routes to School

**California Transportation Commission**  
**2021 Active Transportation Program - Small Urban and Rural Component**  
**Staff Recommendations**  
**(\$1000s)**

Reference No. 4.9  
March 24-25, 2021  
Attachment C

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Recommended Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
2-Redding, City of-1	Shasta	Victor Ave & Cypress Ave Active Transportation (VCAT) Project	\$ 10,409	\$ 7,822	\$ 1,352	\$ 740	\$ -	\$ 5,730	\$ 1,352	\$ 338	\$ 402	\$ 5,643	\$ 87	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	92
1-Clearlake, City of-1	Lake	Dam Road Extension & South Center Drive Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 997	\$ 997	\$ 82	\$ 915	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 82	\$ -	\$ 915	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	91
5-Seaside, City of-1 <sup>§</sup>	Monterey	Broadway Ave Complete Street Corridor	\$ 14,001	\$ 12,041	\$ 1,576	\$ -	\$ 10,465	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,576	\$ -	\$ 9,450	\$ 1,015	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	91
2-Karuk Tribe-1	Siskiyou	Happy Camp Complete Streets Project	\$ 12,221	\$ 9,971	\$ 600	\$ 1,901	\$ -	\$ 7,470	\$ 600	\$ 800	\$ 1,101	\$ 7,470	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	91
2-Siskiyou County Transportation Commission-1	Siskiyou	Siskiyou- Regional Active Transportation Plan	\$ 212	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 202	Plan	x		91
10-Tuolumne County-1	Tuolumne	Jamestown Community Connectivity Project	\$ 2,300	\$ 2,071	\$ 198	\$ 147	\$ 140	\$ 1,586	\$ 198	\$ 147	\$ 140	\$ 1,586	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	91
6-Corcoran, City of-1	Kings	Corcoran Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,998	\$ 1,998	\$ 15	\$ 220	\$ 1,763	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 220	\$ -	\$ 1,763	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	90
5-Santa Barbara, City of-3	Santa Barbara	Upper De La Vina Street Gap Closure and Safe Crossings	\$ 1,998	\$ 1,998	\$ 290	\$ -	\$ 37	\$ 1,671	\$ 290	\$ 29	\$ 8	\$ 1,671	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		90
2-Shasta County-3 <sup>§†</sup>	Shasta	Cottonwood Active Transportation Trunk Line Express (CATTLE) Network	\$ 17,844	\$ 7,056	\$ 1,197	\$ 2,556	\$ 76	\$ 3,227	\$ 1,197	\$ 1,796	\$ 760	\$ 3,227	\$ 76	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	90
			<b>\$ 61,980</b>	<b>\$ 44,156</b>													

<sup>§</sup>Project requires a baseline agreement. Please see the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines for more information.

<sup>†</sup>Shasta County requested \$14,273,000 for this project. However, only \$7,056,000 in programming capacity remains. Commission staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms
<b>CON:</b> Construction Phase
<b>DAC:</b> Disadvantaged Community
<b>NI:</b> Non-Infrastructure
<b>PA&amp;ED:</b> Environmental Phase
<b>PS&amp;E:</b> Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase
<b>ROW:</b> Right-of-Way Phase
<b>SRTS:</b> Safe Routes to School

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT 10 DIRECTOR

P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201

(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BOULEVARD 95205)

PHONE (209) 948-7943

FAX (209) 948-3895


TTY 711

www.dot.ca.gov

*Making Conservation  
a California Way of Life.*

February 23, 2021

Laurie Waters  
Associate Deputy Director  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street, MS 52  
Sacramento, CA 95814



Dear Ms. Waters:

Please accept this letter as formal support for the Mariposa Elementary School Connectivity Project Active Transportation Program Application. As California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 10 Director, I am pleased to support the County of Mariposa's pursuit of funding for a project that will benefit Mariposa's community health, access, and economy.

The community of Mariposa is the largest in the county and the project is located near Mariposa Elementary School and Mariposa County High School. Creating a walkable "complete street" in an older mountainous community is uniquely challenging. Within the project limits, the existing streets lack curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Roadside ditches, power poles, mailboxes, parked vehicles, and fences force pedestrians into the traveled lane. Additionally, steep terrain in some project locations cause visibility challenges between motorists and non-motorists within the corridor. The Mariposa Elementary School Connectivity Project is located on Bullion Street between Jones Street and 12th Street; Bullion Street between 8th Street and 5th Street; 6th Street between Bullion Street and Jones Street; 7th Street between Bullion Street and Jones Street, and Jones Street between 6th Street and 7th Street. Project scope includes construction of 3,200 linear feet of new sidewalk, ADA compliant ramps, storm drains, curbs, gutters, crosswalks, retaining walls, school zone striping, and signage. In addition to separating children from vehicular traffic, the project provides access to transit facilities and the downtown commercial district, promotes active transportation, decreases vehicle speeds, decreases the number of motorized vehicle trips, increases pedestrian trips, improves air

Laurie Waters, Associate Deputy Director  
February 23, 2021  
Page 2

quality, and improves public health. The project would represent the completion of a primary goal established in the Mariposa County Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan.

This project would also contribute to state and national goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving physical and community health. As Caltrans is committed to promoting multimodal options while reducing emissions, we encourage the development of more active transportation options to promote a healthier and more resilient environment.

Caltrans is pleased to support the Mariposa Elementary School Connectivity project. This project will benefit students, residents, and visitors of Mariposa by providing a safe and scenic opportunity for active transportation.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (209) 948-7943, or Marlon Regisford, Deputy District Director of Planning, Local Assistance, and Environmental, at (209) 986-5762 or by e-mail sent to [marlon.regisford@dot.ca.gov](mailto:marlon.regisford@dot.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Dennis T. Agar*  
DENNIS T. AGAR  
District 10 Director

c: Marlon Regisford, Deputy District Director, Planning, Local Assistance and Environmental

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT 10 DIRECTOR  
P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201  
(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BOULEVARD 95205)  
PHONE (209) 948-7943  
FAX (209) 948-3895  
TTY 711  
www.dot.ca.gov



*Making Conservation  
a California Way of Life.*



February 23, 2021

Laurie Waters  
Associate Deputy Director  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street, MS 52  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Waters:

Please accept this letter as formal support for the Mariposa Creek Parkway Project Active Transportation Program Application. As California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 10 Director, I am pleased to support the County of Mariposa's pursuit of funding for a project that will benefit Mariposa's community health, access, and economy.

The community of Mariposa is the largest in the county and the project is located along Mariposa Creek in downtown Mariposa between 8th and Joe Howard Street, and includes a critical connection through the former 11th Street right of way. The project will implement a .4-mile extension to the existing off-street active transportation facility, close a sidewalk gap along Jessie Street, and establish a critical active transportation link to the Parkway through the 11th Street Paseo from high-traffic areas in the heart of Mariposa. The project will facilitate active transportation access to essential community destinations while allowing users to bypass high-stress, high-collision areas, connect and complement existing and planned multi-modal facilities, and facilitate safe, easy access to and from cultural and commercial destinations within the Town of Mariposa.

The project directly aligns with multiple existing plans, including the Mariposa Town Plan, the Mariposa County Economic Vitality Strategy, Regional Transportation Plan, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. It also responds to extensive public engagement guided by a broad base of constituents. Most importantly, this project implements key recommendations in

Laurie Waters, Associate Deputy Director  
February 23, 2021  
Page 2

the Mariposa Creek Parkway Master Plan and the Town of Mariposa Transportation Center and Active Transportation Feasibility Study, which solicited diverse perspectives throughout the community to articulate an inclusive and comprehensive vision for the project. While primarily a resource for active transportation mobility and connectivity, it will also serve as a recreation resource, in particular to vulnerable populations like the elderly and lower income residents.

This project would also contribute to state and national goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving physical and community health. As Caltrans is committed to promoting multimodal options while reducing emissions, we encourage the development of more active transportation options to promote a healthier and more resilient environment.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (209) 948-7943, or Marlon Regisford, Deputy District Director of Planning, Local Assistance, and Environmental, at (209) 986-5762 or by e-mail sent to [marlon.regisford@dot.ca.gov](mailto:marlon.regisford@dot.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Dennis T. Agar*  
DENNIS T. AGAR  
District 10 Director

c: Marlon Regisford, Deputy District Director, Planning, Local Assistance, and Environmental