

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: June 23-24, 2021

From: MITCH WEISS, Executive Director

Reference Number: 4.7, Action

Prepared By: Beverley Newman-Burckhard
Assistant Deputy Director

Published Date: June 11, 2021

Subject: Adoption of 2021 Active Transportation Program – Metropolitan Planning Organization Component, 9 of 10 Large Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Resolution G-21-46

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt the 2021 Active Transportation Program – Metropolitan Planning Organization component for nine of the ten large metropolitan planning organizations, in accordance with the attached resolution and programming spreadsheet. Commission staff recommendations align with Metropolitan Planning Organization recommendations. The recommendations include the following metropolitan planning organizations:

- Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG)
- Kern Council of Governments (KCOG)
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
- Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG)
- Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO)
- Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG)

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 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 as follows:

- Statewide component - \$245.941 million. This total includes the \$220.78 million assigned to the Statewide component in the 2021 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate and an additional \$25.161 million in accumulated savings from previous cycles. From this total, \$4.4 million was programmed to eight quick-build projects at the October 2020 Commission meeting, and \$241.541 million was programmed to 41 projects at the March 2021 Commission meeting.
- Small Urban & Rural component - \$44.156 million. The Commission programmed this funding to nine projects at its March 2021 meeting.
- Metropolitan Planning Organization component - \$176.624 million. Recommendations for nine of the ten large metropolitan planning organizations were released on May 28, 2021. The recommendations do not include San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) as they are still finalizing their 2021 Active Transportation Program Metropolitan Planning Organization component recommendations. The recommendations for Fresno Council of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, and Tulare County Association of Governments are set forth in Attachment B and summarized below.

Metropolitan Planning Organization Component Recommendations

Staff recommends 54 projects for funding, totaling \$172.970 million in Active Transportation Program funding with total cumulative project costs of \$489.786 million. This includes:

- \$162.786 million (94.1 percent) for 47 projects benefitting disadvantaged communities. Pursuant to Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and the 2021 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, a minimum of 25 percent of overall program funds and funds distributed to each metropolitan planning organization must benefit disadvantaged communities.
- \$66.005 million (38.2 percent) for 25 Safe-Routes-to-School projects.

San Joaquin Council of Government's funding capacity of \$3.547 million will be programmed at a future Commission meeting. Additionally, Stanislaus Council of Governments is fully funding two projects with \$2.555 million in Active Transportation Program funding, which is \$107,000 less than the \$2.662 million available in the 2021 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate. Unfortunately, the remaining \$107,000 was not sufficient to partially fund another project. The remaining funds will be included in Stanislaus Council of Governments' Metropolitan Planning Organization component share if the 2021 Active Transportation Program receives augmented funding.

Commission staff recommendations are consistent with the Metropolitan Planning Organization component project selection process set forth in the 2021 Active Transportation

Program Guidelines (Section 41, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) With Large Urbanized Areas) and the following:

- Funding levels identified in the 2021 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate.
- Eligibility for the program
- Adopted 2021 Active Transportation Program Regional Guidelines, if applicable.
- Statutory requirements

The recommended projects include a broad range of active transportation infrastructure improvements and non-infrastructure programs, including over 28 miles of new or enhanced sidewalks, over 19 miles of new multi-use trails, over 93 miles of new bikeways, and 12 projects that include a variety of non-infrastructure programs, classes, training sessions, and events. Other examples of improvements include:

- Intersection improvements such as bike boxes that allow bicyclists to safely wait for a green light, light timing changes that give pedestrians a head start as they cross, bike detection loops that alert the signal to the presence of a bicycle, and green conflict pavement that increases the visibility of safety features.
- 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).
- Traffic calming features such as speed cushions, traffic diverters, and narrowed traffic lanes.
- Streetscape amenities such as benches, bike racks, landscaping, shade trees, and drinking fountains.
- Non-infrastructure programs such as bicycle and pedestrian safety classes, walk and bike audits, walking school bus programs, and school safety skill events.

Metropolitan Planning Organization Evaluation Process

The Commission adopted the 2021 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban and Rural Components on March 24, 2021. Projects not programmed in the Statewide competitive component were distributed for funding consideration to the ten large metropolitan planning organizations based on location.

Under the 2021 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, a metropolitan planning organization may delegate its project selection to the Commission using the Statewide competition project selection criteria; or, with Commission approval, a metropolitan planning organization may use different project selection criteria, weighting, minimum project size, and match requirement. Additionally, a metropolitan planning organization may issue a supplemental call for projects for its regional competition.

The Commission approved the 2021 Active Transportation Program Regional Guidelines allowing different project selection criteria for the following metropolitan planning organizations:

Fresno Council of Governments, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments. Of these metropolitan planning organizations, all except Tulare County Association of Governments issued supplemental calls for projects.

The Kern Council of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization did not propose regional 2021 Active Transportation Program Regional Guidelines. For these metropolitan planning organizations, the next highest-ranking projects from the Statewide component within their region are recommended for funding, except in cases where limited funding would not allow for a project with a sufficiently-funded scope.

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:

Fresno Council of Governments

- **City of Fresno – Cross, Walk & Roll! SRTS in Central Fresno (\$1.274 million):** This project will provide safe-routes-to-school improvements to two of Fresno’s most disadvantaged elementary schools, where 95 percent of students receive free or reduced-price school meals. Currently, students must navigate dangerous streets to walk or bike to school, including crossing wide streets that are equivalent to interstate widths with multiple lanes of traffic. The project proposes to add a pedestrian-activated beacon to control motorized traffic at a marked, unsignalized crosswalk, as well as a pedestrian-only crossing phase at a signalized intersection. Additionally, the project will establish inaugural bicycle and pedestrian safety education weeks at both schools, with the aim of strengthening active transportation knowledge, skills, and safety behaviors among students and their families.

Kern Council of Governments

- **City of Tehachapi – SRTS Dennison Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Corridor Improvement Project (\$2.432 million):** Tehachapi has a median household income below the state average, and many residents rely on walking and biking to get to schools, jobs, and services because they lack access to vehicles. Dennison Road is the primary connection to Tehachapi’s middle and high schools but currently lacks active transportation facilities. Students who walk to school are forced onto a narrow dirt shoulder, close to traffic, and students who bike to school must share the lane with fast-moving vehicles. This project proposes to add sidewalks and Class II bike lanes, providing dedicated spaces for students to travel to school safely. The new facilities will

also give residents safer access to shopping, recreational opportunities, health care facilities, places of worship, and transit.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

- **Alameda County – E. Lewelling Boulevard Safe and Complete Street for Active Transportation (\$2.996 million):** East Lewelling Boulevard serves as the main east-west connection through the community of Ashland, which includes several neighborhoods with median household incomes below the state average. Many residents in these neighborhoods do not have access to vehicles and rely on walking and biking for their daily transportation needs. The corridor currently has significant safety challenges, including no bikeways and sidewalk gaps that force pedestrians into the street. The E. Lewelling Boulevard Safe and Complete Street for Active Transportation project proposes to close sidewalk gaps, construct protected Class IV bikeways, and enhance existing crosswalks with safety and visibility features. The project will connect residents to several key destinations, including schools, transit, health care facilities, places of worship, and the community center.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

- **Yuba County - Garden Avenue Safe Route to School Project (\$2.320 million):** The Garden Avenue Safe Route to School Project is located in the Yuba County community of Linda, which has a median household income well below the state average. Linda has high levels of unemployment, an issue that is worsened by the community's low access to vehicles. The project area currently lacks sidewalks, bikeways, and proper drainage facilities, and roadside ditches, power poles, and fences force bicyclists and pedestrians into the travel lane. The project proposes to build Class II bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, ADA-compliant ramps, curbs, and gutters. Once complete, the project will provide residents with a critical connection to employment centers, schools, transit, grocery stores, parks, and places of worship.

San Diego Association of Governments

- **San Diego Association of Governments – Inland Rail Trail Gap Connector (\$12.057 million):** Located in the City of Vista, the Inland Rail Trail Gap Connector project will serve several low-income neighborhoods with high levels of unemployment and residents below the federal poverty level. The project proposes to close a 2.2-mile gap in the Inland Rail Trail network, providing residents with a safe connection to transit centers, schools, the downtown business district, and recreational opportunities. The improvements include a paved Class I path, landscaping with irrigation, safety lighting, and intersection enhancements.

Southern California Association of Governments

- **Orange County – OC Loop Coyote Creek Bikeway (Segment O) (\$4.644 million):** The proposed Coyote Creek Bikeway project will complete Segment O of the OC Loop,

a region-wide, 66-mile active transportation network. The project will provide active transportation and recreational facilities to several disadvantaged neighborhoods with high pollution levels and serve as a commuting route for industrial workers employed at packing and logistics centers adjacent to the path. The project will construct a 1.1-mile Class I path, ADA-compliant ramps, a bridge, and an undercrossing. In addition to employment centers, the project will connect residents to parks, schools, hospitals, transit stations, and beach access.

Stanislaus Council of Governments

- **Stanislaus County – Robertson Road Elementary Safe Crossing and Active Transportation Connectivity Project (\$1.609 million):** The Robertson Road neighborhood is located in unincorporated Stanislaus County, which has a median household income below the state average. The project area currently lacks sidewalks and drainage facilities, forcing students to walk to school in flooded streets when it rains. The Robertson Road Elementary Safe Crossing and Active Transportation Connectivity project proposes to construct new ADA-compliant, multi-use side paths and enhanced crossings, providing safe connections to two elementary schools. Additionally, the project will connect residents to parks, employment opportunities, and the health center.

Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

- **Placer County – Kings Beach Western Approach Project (\$750 thousand):** The Kings Beach Western Approach project will serve a disadvantaged neighborhood with a median household income well below the state average. Many of these residents do not own vehicles and rely on active transportation to access jobs and services. The project will include a complete streets corridor with Class II bike lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian islands, and a roundabout. The project will connect residents to employment centers, public services, and the grocery store.

Tulare County Association of Governments

- **California Department of Transportation – Ivanhoe Safe Routes to School (SR 216) (\$1.070 million):** This project proposes safe-routes-to-school improvements for Ivanhoe, a disadvantaged community in Tulare County with a median household income well below the state average. Many Ivanhoe residents cannot afford to own and maintain a vehicle and instead rely on walking and biking to get to jobs, schools, and services. The Ivanhoe Safe Routes to School project will construct sidewalks, safe railroad crossings, bicycle parking facilities, intersection improvements, and a transit waiting area. In addition to schools, the project will connect residents to the community center, shopping, employment centers, and the post office.

Programming Recommendations

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

MPO	# Proj.	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	Total ATP Funding	Fund Est. Target	Under / (Over) Target
FCOG	5	\$52	\$697	\$1,859	\$2,207	\$4,815	\$4,815	\$0
KCOG	4	\$1,347	\$2,087	\$911	\$0	\$4,345	\$4,345	\$0
MTC	8	\$13,288	\$8,059	\$12,010	\$3,649	\$37,006	\$37,006	\$0
SACOG	7	\$1,607	\$4,390	\$5,776	\$0	\$11,773	\$11,773	\$0
SANDAG	2	\$1,416	\$375	\$3,407	\$10,821	\$16,019	\$16,019	\$0
SCAG	23	\$21,154	\$15,134	\$13,930	\$43,201	\$93,419	\$93,419	\$0
StanCOG*	2	\$15	\$128	\$803	\$1,609	\$2,555	\$2,662	\$107
TCAG	2	\$120	\$181	\$0	\$1,987	\$2,288	\$2,288	\$0
TMPO	1	0\$	\$260	\$490	\$0	\$750	\$750	\$0
TOTAL	54	\$38,999	\$31,311	\$39,186	\$63,474	\$172,970	\$173,077	\$107

The following table shows the amount of funding benefitting disadvantaged communities for each Metropolitan Planning Organization. The funding amounts are represented in thousands:

MPO	# DAC Projects	Total DAC Funding	DAC Fund Estimate Target*	Under/(Over) Target	Percentage of Funding to DAC
FCOG	5	\$4,815	\$1,204	\$(3,611)	100%
KCOG	4	\$4,345	\$1,086	\$(3,259)	100%
MTC	7	\$35,345	\$9,252	\$(26,093)	96%
SACOG	4	\$6,454	\$2,943	\$(3,511)	55%
SANDAG	2	\$16,019	\$4,005	\$(12,014)	100%
SCAG	20	\$90,215	\$23,355	\$(66,860)	97%
StanCOG	2	\$2,555	\$666	\$(1,889)	100%
TCAG	2	\$2,288	\$572	\$(1,716)	100%
TMPO	1	\$750	\$188	\$(562)	100%
TOTAL	47	\$162,786	\$43,271	\$(119,515)	94%

*The DAC Fund Estimate Target for each metropolitan planning organization equals 25 percent of that metropolitan planning organization's total apportionment in the 2021 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate. This figure represents the minimum funding threshold for projects benefitting disadvantaged communities that each Metropolitan Planning Organization must meet.

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. 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-21-46
- Attachment B: 2021 Active Transportation Program – Metropolitan Planning Organization Component Recommendations

2021 Active Transportation Program - Metropolitan Planning Organization Submittals – Available on our website ([Click Here](#))

2021 Active Transportation Program Regional Guidelines – Available on our website ([Click Here](#))

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Adoption of the 2021 Active Transportation Program
Metropolitan Planning Organization Component
9 of 10 Large Metropolitan Planning Organizations**

RESOLUTION G-21-46

- 1.1 **WHEREAS**, Streets and Highways Code Section 2384 requires the California Transportation Commission (Commission) 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**, 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
- 1.7 **WHEREAS**, the Commission adopted the 2021 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components at its March 2021 meeting; and
- 1.8 **WHEREAS**, the staff recommendations for nine of the ten large metropolitan planning organizations for the 2021 Active Transportation Program – Metropolitan Planning Organization component were published and made available to the Commission, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), regional transportation agencies, and the public on May 28, 2021; and
- 1.9 **WHEREAS**, the staff recommendations conform to the 2021 Guidelines and other statutory requirements for the Active Transportation Program; and

- 1.10 **WHEREAS**, the Commission considered the staff recommendations and public testimony at its June 23-24, 2021 meeting; and
- 1.11 **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 – Metropolitan Planning Organization component for nine of the ten large metropolitan planning organizations, as indicated in Attachment B; and
- 2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that having a project included in the adopted 2021 Active Transportation Program – Metropolitan Planning Organization component 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 – Metropolitan Planning Organization component 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
 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Component
 9 of 10 Large MPOs
 Staff Recommendations
 (\$1000s)

MPO	Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Recommended ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW SUP ²	ROW	CON SUP ²	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Regional Score or Rank*	State Score
FCOG	6-Clovis, City of-1	Fresno	Sierra Vista Elementary Area Sidewalk Improvements	\$ 997	\$ 997	\$ 25	\$ 96	\$ 876	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 96	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 876	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	74.5	79
FCOG	6-Coalinga, City of-1 ^A	Fresno	Coalinga East Polk Street Bike/Ped Safety and Connectivity Initiative	\$ 1,770	\$ 218	\$ -	\$ 23	\$ 144	\$ 51	\$ 23	\$ 144	\$ -	\$ 51	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x		71.33	85
FCOG	6-Fresno, City of-3 ¹	Fresno	Cross, Walk & Roll! SRTS in Central Fresno	\$ 1,512	\$ 1,274	\$ 2	\$ 129	\$ -	\$ 1,143	\$ 2	\$ 119	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ 1,122	\$ 21	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	80	91
FCOG	6-Orange Cove, City of-1	Fresno	Bike Lane, Sidewalk and Crossing Improvement Project	\$ 973	\$ 973	\$ 25	\$ 109	\$ 839	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 109	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 839	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	74.17	79
FCOG	6-Reedley, City of-1 ^F	Fresno	Jefferson Elementary Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,428	\$ 1,353	\$ -	\$ 340	\$ -	\$ 1,013	\$ -	\$ 125	\$ -	\$ 215	\$ -	\$ 1,013	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	72.4	N/A
KCOG	6-Bakersfield, City of-2 ^A	Kern	Chester Avenue (4th Street to Brundage Lane)	\$ 791	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 210	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	80	80
KCOG	6-Delano, City of-2	Kern	ATP-5 Bike Lane and Sidewalk Gap Improvement Project	\$ 925	\$ 911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 716	\$ 75	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	81	81
KCOG	6-Kern Council of Governments-1	Kern	Safe Routes for Cyclists in Kern County's Disadvantaged Communities	\$ 826	\$ 792	\$ 792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 792	\$ -	Non-Infrastructure	x		84	84
KCOG	9-Tehachapi, City of-1	Kern	SRTS Dennison Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Corridor Improvement Project	\$ 2,437	\$ 2,432	\$ 345	\$ 2,087	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ 2,087	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		86	86
MTC	4-Alameda County-2	Alameda	E. Lewelling Boulevard Safe and Complete Street for Active Transportation	\$ 9,233	\$ 2,996	\$ -	\$ 2,996	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,996	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	100	84
MTC	4-Emeryville, City of-2	Alameda	40th Street Protected Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 13,915	\$ 1,374	\$ 1,374	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,374	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		96	87
MTC	4-California Department of Transportation-3	Contra Costa	Central Avenue I-80 Undercrossing Ped/Bike Improvements	\$ 4,333	\$ 3,833	\$ 535	\$ 1,050	\$ -	\$ 2,248	\$ 535	\$ 677	\$ 148	\$ 225	\$ 477	\$ 1,771	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		97	83
MTC	4-Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)-1	Marin	Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Shared Use Path Gap Closure	\$ 5,612	\$ 4,302	\$ 4,302	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,302	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		101	80
MTC	4-San Francisco County Transportation Authority-1 ^S	San Francisco	Yerba Buena Island Multi-use Pathway Project	\$ 89,400	\$ 3,800	\$ -	\$ 3,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		93	73
MTC	4-San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency-1 ^{AS}	San Francisco	Folsom Streetscape Project	\$ 38,981	\$ 7,040	\$ 7,040	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,040	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		92	90
MTC	4-San Mateo, City of-1	San Mateo	Delaware Street Safe Routes to School Corridor	\$ 1,661	\$ 1,661	\$ 37	\$ 213	\$ 10	\$ 1,401	\$ 37	\$ 213	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ 1,401	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	93	72
MTC	4-Santa Rosa, City of-1 ^S	Sonoma	Santa Rosa US Highway 101 Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing	\$ 27,100	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	93	88
SACOG	3-Placerville, City of-1 ^S	El Dorado	Placerville Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	\$ 26,913	\$ 1,220	\$ -	\$ 1,220	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,040	\$ -	\$ 180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	85	80
SACOG	3-Citrus Heights, City of-1 ^T	Sacramento	Old Auburn Road Complete Streets - Phase I	\$ 12,096	\$ 2,115	\$ 609	\$ -	\$ 1,506	\$ -	\$ 609	\$ 914	\$ -	\$ 592	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			80	71
SACOG	3-Elk Grove, City of-1	Sacramento	Laguna Creek Inter-Regional Trail Crossing at State Route 99	\$ 7,770	\$ 504	\$ 504	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 504	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			81	79
SACOG	3-Sacramento, City of-2 ^F	Sacramento	American River Bridge Shared-use Path	\$ 7,000	\$ 2,700	\$ -	\$ 2,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,700	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			85	N/A
SACOG	3-West Sacramento, City of-3 ^F	Yolo	Sycamore Trail (Phase 3)	\$ 2,689	\$ 2,500	\$ 80	\$ 420	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 80	\$ 320	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	80	N/A
SACOG	3-Winters, City of-1 ^A	Yolo	SR128/I-505 Overcrossing (Br. 22-0110)/ Russell Blvd Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 9,953	\$ 414	\$ 414	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 414	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		77	74

California Transportation Commission
 2021 Active Transportation Program
 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Component
 9 of 10 Large MPOs
 Staff Recommendations
 (\$1000s)

MPO	Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Recommended ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW SUP [±]	ROW	CON SUP [±]	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Regional Score or Rank*	State Score
SACOG	3-Yuba County-2	Yuba	Garden Avenue Safe Route to School Project	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,320	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 2,270	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,270	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	82	85
SANDAG	11-La Mesa, City of-1^	San Diego	La Mesa Bike and Sidewalk Connection Project	\$ 4,488	\$ 3,962	\$ 180	\$ 375	\$ 3,407	\$ -	\$ 180	\$ 375	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,407	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		2	47
SANDAG	11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-4 [§]	San Diego	Inland Rail Trail Gap Connector	\$ 15,825	\$ 12,057	\$ 1,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,821	\$ -	\$ 1,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,821	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	1	86
SCAG	11-EI Centro, City of-1^	Imperial	EI Centro Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 1,771	\$ 882	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 882	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 882	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	94	74
SCAG	7-EI Monte, City of-1^	Los Angeles	Traffic Calming for Parkway Dr/Denholm Dr	\$ 5,350	\$ 401	\$ 401	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 401	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		96	91
SCAG	7-Huntington Park, City of-1	Los Angeles	Huntington Park's Safe Routes and Childhood Obesity Project	\$ 3,757	\$ 3,757	\$ 325	\$ 3,432	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,405	\$ 27	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	101	91
SCAG	7-Long Beach, City of-4	Los Angeles	Pine Avenue Bicycle Boulevard	\$ 4,087	\$ 3,678	\$ 90	\$ 475	\$ 514	\$ 2,599	\$ 90	\$ 475	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,599	\$ 514	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		101	91
SCAG	7-Los Angeles, City of-10 [§]	Los Angeles	Mission Mile: Sepulveda Visioning for a Safe and Active Community	\$ 49,900	\$ 39,670	\$ 4,958	\$ -	\$ 2,125	\$ 32,587	\$ 4,958	\$ 2,125	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,587	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		100	91
SCAG	12-Brea, City of-1^	Orange	Tracks at Brea - Gap Closure	\$ 14,046	\$ 1,787	\$ -	\$ 1,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		105	85
SCAG	12-Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)-1 [§]	Orange	Garden Grove-Santa Ana Rails-to-Trails Gap Closure	\$ 42,397	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		107	87
SCAG	12-Orange County-1	Orange	OC Loop Coyote Creek Bikeway (Segment O)	\$ 6,605	\$ 4,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,644	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		111	91
SCAG	12-Santa Ana, City of-3	Orange	Raitt Street Protected and Buffered Bike Lane	\$ 5,499	\$ 5,499	\$ 81	\$ 808	\$ 4,610	\$ -	\$ 81	\$ 808	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,610	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		110	90
SCAG	8-Cathedral City, City of-1	Riverside	Downtown Cathedral City Connectors: Gap Closure & Complete Streets Improvement	\$ 5,566	\$ 4,383	\$ -	\$ 4,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,383	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		110	90
SCAG	8-Desert Hot Springs, City of-1	Riverside	Palm Drive Improvements	\$ 4,905	\$ 3,700	\$ 3,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,700	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		106.5	86.5
SCAG	8-Eastvale, City of-1	Riverside	Southeast Eastvale SRTS Equitable Access Project	\$ 1,420	\$ 1,420	\$ 150	\$ 1,270	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,270	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			101	87
SCAG	8-Riverside County-1	Riverside	Safe Routes for All - Hemet	\$ 636	\$ 348	\$ -	\$ 348	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 348	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	91	91
SCAG	8-Wildomar, City of-1	Riverside	Bundy Canyon Active Transportation Corridor	\$ 3,990	\$ 1,454	\$ 1,377	\$ 77	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,377	\$ 77	Infrastructure + NI - Medium			99	79
SCAG	8-Apple Valley, Town of-1	San Bernardino	Yucca Loma Elementary School Safe Routes to School Phase 2	\$ 986	\$ 838	\$ 191	\$ 647	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85	\$ -	\$ 106	\$ -	\$ 647	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	107	87
SCAG	8-Barstow, City of-1^	San Bernardino	Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), Barstow	\$ 6,902	\$ 6,406	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,406	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,406	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	106	86
SCAG	8-Fontana, City of-4	San Bernardino	Date Elementary School Street Improvements Project	\$ 1,808	\$ 1,808	\$ 71	\$ 128	\$ -	\$ 1,609	\$ 71	\$ 128	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,591	\$ 18	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	108	88
SCAG	8-San Bernardino County-1	San Bernardino	Santa Ana River Trail - Phase III	\$ 6,880	\$ 1,105	\$ 1,105	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,105	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		107	87
SCAG	7-Southern California Association of Governments-2 [#]	Various	Sustainable Communities Program	\$ 4,670	\$ 4,670	\$ 4,670	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,670	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	N/A	N/A
SCAG	7-Oxnard, City of-1	Ventura	SRTS Safety and Enhancements Project	\$ 1,981	\$ 1,981	\$ 202	\$ 1,779	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 202	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,480	\$ 299	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	101	86

California Transportation Commission
 2021 Active Transportation Program
 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Component
 9 of 10 Large MPOs
 Staff Recommendations
 (\$1000s)

MPO	Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Recommended ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW SUP [†]	ROW	CON SUP [‡]	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Regional Score or Rank*	State Score
SCAG	7-Oxnard, City of-2 [^]	Ventura	4th Street Mobility Improvements	\$ 6,900	\$ 650	\$ 650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		85	75
SCAG	7-Ventura County-3 [^]	Ventura	Santa Rosa Road Bike Lane Improvement and Pedestrian Project (SRRBLP)	\$ 1,103	\$ 330	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 330	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 330	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			82	67
SCAG	7-Ventura, City of-1	Ventura	Cabrillo Segment Multi-Use Path Gap Completion	\$ 1,008	\$ 1,008	\$ 183	\$ -	\$ 825	\$ -	\$ 68	\$ 110	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ 825	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		100	90
StanCOG	10-Stanislaus County-1	Stanislaus	Robertson Road Elementary Safe Crossing and Active Transportation Connectivity Project	\$ 1,997	\$ 1,609	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,609	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,609	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	89.5	89.5
StanCOG	10-Waterford, City of-1	Stanislaus	Waterford Safe Routes to School Project - Yosemite Boulevard	\$ 946	\$ 946	\$ 15	\$ 128	\$ 803	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ 88	\$ -	\$ 803	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	81	81
TCAG	6-California Department of Transportation-7	Tulare	Ivanhoe Safe Routes to School (SR 216)	\$ 1,788	\$ 1,070	\$ 120	\$ 181	\$ -	\$ 769	\$ 120	\$ 90	\$ 22	\$ 69	\$ 165	\$ 604	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	96	69
TCAG	6-Tulare County-3 [^]	Tulare	Tipton Sidewalk Improvements Project	\$ 3,430	\$ 1,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,218	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	94.33	73
TMPO	3-Placer County-1 [^]	Placer	Kings Beach Western Approach Project	\$ 8,330	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ 260	\$ 490	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 260	\$ -	\$ 490	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		81	81
				\$ 489,786	\$ 172,970																

Notes
*Regional scores and ranks are on various scales (and not necessarily out of 100). Individual scoring systems are outlined in each MPO's guidelines. [†] Applicant reduced the cost and/or scope of project that was originally submitted to the state when submitting the project to the regional competition. [^] Project is receiving partial funding. [^] Project was not submitted to the state competition. [§] Project requires baseline agreement. [†] ROW SUP (right-of-way support) and CON SUP (construction support) phases are listed separately for Caltrans-implemented projects only.

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