

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: August 15-16, 2024

From: TANISHA TAYLOR, Executive Director

Reference Number: 4.5, Action

Prepared By: Naveen Habib
Associate Deputy Director

Published Date: August 2, 2024

Subject: 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines Adoption,
Resolution G-24-61

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt the proposed 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines, included as Attachment B. The adoption of the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines will initiate the call for projects for the upcoming program cycle, with applications due November 19, 2024.

Issue:

The 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program represents the fourth cycle of this competitive program and will provide two years of funding in fiscal years 2025-26 and 2026-27, for a total of \$480,956,000. The funding capacity for the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program is reduced to accommodate over-programming and account for project savings in previous cycles.

Commission staff prepared the proposed 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines (Attachment B) in consultation with the Interagency Equity Advisory Committee, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Air Resources Board, California Department of Housing and Community Development, regional transportation planning agencies, local agencies, advocates, and other stakeholders.

Following the initial kick-off workshop in December 2023, Commission staff hosted four public workshops to solicit stakeholder feedback to inform the draft guidelines. Workshop materials and recordings are posted on the [Commission's website](#). Commission staff also hosted 24 virtual office hour sessions from March to May 2024 to provide technical assistance to applicants for project nominations for the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines continue to evolve to address state policy goals and fund multimodal projects that relieve congestion in the state's most congested corridors. The initial draft 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines were presented to the Commission at the June 2024 Commission meeting.

Background:

The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, or Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), established the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program and authorizes \$250 million annually to provide funding to regional transportation agencies, county transportation commissions, and Caltrans to reduce congestion throughout the state.

SB 1 requires the Commission develop program guidelines in consultation with Caltrans, regional transportation planning agencies, local agencies, and other stakeholders.

The proposed 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption, and management of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. Program guidelines may be amended by the Commission after conducting at least one public hearing. The proposed guidelines address statutory requirements, incorporate stakeholder feedback, and include Commission procedures for programming and project delivery.

Pursuant to SB 1, on July 12, 2024, the Commission submitted the proposed guidelines to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the transportation policy committees in the California State Senate and Assembly. The Commission also hosted a public hearing for northern California on August 1, 2024, and will host a public hearing for southern California on August 15, 2024, to provide opportunities for additional public comment before these guidelines are adopted.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Resolution G-24-61
- Attachment B: 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines
- Attachment C: Comment Letters

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
2024 SOLUTIONS FOR CONGESTED CORRIDORS PROGRAM
GUIDELINES ADOPTION**

RESOLUTION G-24-61

- 1.1 **WHEREAS**, Streets and Highways Code Section 2396 requires the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to develop and adopt guidelines for the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, and
- 1.2 **WHEREAS**, the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program objective is to fund projects designed to reduce congestion in highly traveled and highly congested corridors through performance improvements that balance transportation improvements, community impacts, and provide environmental benefits, and
- 1.3 **WHEREAS**, the Commission hosted five virtual public workshops and 24 virtual office hour sessions and worked collaboratively with the Interagency Equity Advisory Committee, California Department of Transportation, California Air Resources Board, California Department of Housing and Community Development, regional transportation agencies, local agencies, advocates, and other stakeholders to develop the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines, and
- 1.4 **WHEREAS**, Commission staff presented an initial draft of the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines to the Commission at its June 28, 2024, meeting, and
- 1.5 **WHEREAS**, the Commission submitted the proposed 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines to the required legislative committees in the California State Legislature on July 12, 2024, and
- 1.6 **WHEREAS**, the Commission hosted two public hearings, one for northern California on August 1, 2024, and one for southern California on August 15, 2024.
- 2.1 **NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Commission adopts the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines, and
- 2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the purpose of these guidelines is to identify the Commission's policy, standards, criteria and procedures for the development, adoption, and management of the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, as well as provide guidance to applicants, implementing agencies, and the California Department of Transportation, and
- 2.3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Commission staff is authorized to make minor technical changes to the guidelines, as needed, and
- 2.4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the guidelines do not preclude any project nomination or any project selection that is consistent with the implementing legislation, and
- 2.5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission directs Commission staff to post these guidelines to the Commission's website.

2024 SOLUTIONS FOR CONGESTED CORRIDORS PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Adopted August 15, 2024

Resolution G-24-61





TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
1. Purpose	3
2. Authority	3
3. Schedule	3
II. FUNDING	4
4. Funding and Program Cycle	4
5. Funding Restrictions	4
6. Matching Requirements	5
7. Reimbursement	5
III. ELIGIBILITY	5
8. Eligible Applicants	5
9. Eligible Projects	6
10. Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plans	8
11. Environmental Process	9
12. Delivery Methods	9
13. Project Segmenting	10
14. Multimodal Projects, Modes, and Contracts	10
15. Screening Criteria	11
16. Project Rating Process	11
IV. EVALUATION	12
17. Evaluation Criteria	12
17.1 Congestion Evaluation Criteria	12
17.2 Additional Evaluation Criteria	13
V. PROGRAMMING	17
18. Programming Funds	17
19. Committed and Uncommitted Funds	17
20. Letter of No Prejudice	18
VI. DELIVERY	18
21. Allocation Requests	18
21.1 Review Process	18
21.2 Allocation Requirements	19
22. Timely Use of Funds	19
22.1 Deadlines	19
22.2 Extensions	20
23. Project Amendments	21
24. Project Cost Savings	23
VII. REPORTING	23
25. Project Reporting	23
26. Project Tracking Database	23
27. Project Auditing	23
28. Project Signage	24
29. Workforce Development	24
30. Title VI Requirements	24



VIII. APPENDICES	25
APPENDIX A – Project Nominations.....	25
APPENDIX B – Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Self-Certification Form.....	32
APPENDIX C – Electronic Project Programming Request	35
APPENDIX D – Performance Indicators and Measures	36
APPENDIX E – SB 1 Programs Transportation Equity Supplement.....	40
APPENDIX F – Land Use Efficiency and Prohousing Supplement.....	48
APPENDIX G – State Highway System Project Impact Assessment (Form CTC-0002).....	64



I. INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose

The primary objective of the [Solutions for Congested Corridors Program](#) is to fund projects designed to reduce congestion in highly traveled and highly congested corridors through performance improvements that balance transportation improvements, community impacts, and that provide environmental benefits.

2. Authority

The [Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, or Senate Bill \(SB\) 1 \(Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017\)](#), created the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program and annually appropriates two hundred and fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000) to the Program from the State Highway Account. The California Transportation Commission (Commission) allocates these funds to projects that are designed to achieve a balanced set of transportation, environmental, and community access improvements within highly congested travel corridors throughout the state.

These guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption, and management of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. The Commission may update these guidelines after first giving notice of the proposed changes.

These guidelines were developed in consultation with the Interagency Equity Advisory Committee, California Air Resources Board, California Department of Housing and Community Development, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), regional transportation planning agencies, advocacy groups, and other stakeholders.

3. Schedule

MILESTONE	DATE
Draft Guidelines Presented to the Commission	June 27, 2024
Guidelines Submitted to the Legislature	July 12, 2024
Guidelines Hearing, North	August 1, 2024
Guidelines Hearing, South	August 15, 2024
Guidelines Adoption and Call for Projects	August 15, 2024
Project Nominations Due	November 19, 2024
Staff Recommendations Released	June 2025
Program Adoption	June 2025



II. FUNDING

4. Funding and Program Cycle

Two hundred and fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000) are available upon appropriation to the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program annually. Any unused balance or savings generated will be added to the available funding in the following cycle. The Commission will program two years of funding in the 2024 Program in fiscal years (FY) 2025-26 and 2026-27.

CYCLE	FISCAL YEAR	FUNDS	NOTES
2018 Program	2017-18, 2018-19 2019-20, 2020-21	\$1 billion	Exceeded programming amount by \$6,089,000. Next cycle's funds reduced to \$493,911,000.
2020 Program	2021-22, 2022-23	\$500 million	Returned \$5,753,000 in project cost savings. Next cycle's funds updated to \$499,664,000.
2022 Program	2023-24, 2024-25	\$500 million	Exceeded programming amount by \$33,148,000. Returned \$13,768,000 in project cost savings. Next cycle's funds updated to \$480,956,000.
2024 Program	2025-26, 2026-27	\$500 million	Funding capacity is \$480,956,000.

5. Funding Restrictions

The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program shall only fund:

- The construction phase of a capital project.
- Projects that are included in a comprehensive multimodal corridor plan by program adoption.
- Projects that are included in a currently adopted regional transportation plan by program adoption.
 - Projects within the boundaries of a metropolitan planning organization must be included in an adopted regional transportation plan that includes a sustainable communities strategy determined by the California Air Resources Board to achieve the region's greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets by program adoption.
- Projects that have completed the environmental process.
- Projects with funding plans which demonstrate complete funding commitments which align to the requirements in [Part V, Section 19](#) of these guidelines. Uncommitted funds may only be from the following competitive programs: Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, Local Partnership Program, or a federal discretionary grant program.
- Projects that have independent utility, meaning they must have standalone benefits specific to a corridor.
- Projects that will be ready to start construction by December 31, 2027.



The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds shall not:

- Be used to supplant other committed funds.
- Fund cost increases. An implementing agency must provide evidence of its ability to absorb any cost overruns and deliver the project with no additional funding from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.
 - For projects jointly nominated by Caltrans and another local agency, the Commission expects the responsibility to pay for cost increases will be negotiated and agreed upon before application submission, and that this agreement will be consistent with program guidelines, and state and federal law; memorialized in the baseline agreement; and adhered to by all parties involved.

Projects on the state highway system and projects implemented by Caltrans require a Caltrans-approved Project Report.

The Commission intends to fund multiple projects throughout the state, with at least one project in a county with a population of 500,000 or less.

6. Matching Requirements

Projects funded by the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program do not require a match.

The Commission encourages nominating projects that leverage committed funding from discretionary private, federal, state, local or regional sources as specified in [Part IV, Section 17.2.7](#). Matching funds will only be considered for the construction phase of the project.

7. Reimbursement

The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program is a reimbursement program for eligible costs incurred. An agency may begin incurring eligible costs upon allocation. However, reimbursement is dependent upon entering into an agreement with Caltrans.

Costs incurred before Commission allocation approval and, for federally funded projects, Federal Highway Administration project approval (i.e., Authorization to Proceed) are not eligible for reimbursement.

III. ELIGIBILITY

8. Eligible Applicants

Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2392, the following are eligible to nominate projects for Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funding:

- A regional transportation planning agency.
- A county transportation commission.



- Caltrans.
- An authority responsible for preparing a regional transportation improvement program under Section 14527 of the Government Code.

The Commission encourages regional agencies and Caltrans to work collaboratively to plan, program, implement, operate, and manage transportation facilities as an integrated system to maximize available resources and overall transportation system performance. To encourage collaboration, priority will be given to projects that are jointly nominated by multiple eligible agencies.

For jointly nominated projects, the implementing agencies assume responsibility for and accountability of the project and the use and expenditure of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds.

The Commission expects collaboration and cooperation between the applicable regional transportation agency and Caltrans for all projects on the state highway system.

9. Eligible Projects

The Commission encourages nominating projects that align with the state's climate goals, manage congestion through innovative strategies, include multimodal solutions, and advance transportation equity.

In accordance with [Executive Order N-79-20](#), the Commission encourages projects that improve clean transportation by supporting infrastructure for zero-emission vehicles and support bicycle, pedestrian, and micro-mobility options by incorporating safe and accessible infrastructure improvements.

Furthermore, pursuant to [Executive Order N-73-20](#), the Commission encourages projects that identify and incorporate the installation of conduit or fiber where appropriate and feasible along strategic corridors.

These improvements may be on the state highway system, local streets and roads, public transit facilities, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities, or required mitigation or restoration or some combination thereof. Applicants are encouraged to consider the incorporation of complete streets elements into nominated projects when they would be beneficial, cost-effective, and practicable to the overall project scope. These elements could include, but are not limited to, elements that improve the quality of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and that improve safety for all users of transportation facilities.



Consistent with program guidelines, and state and federal law, projects eligible for funding include the following:

- Addition of high-occupancy vehicle lanes and managed lanes.
- New or existing transit infrastructure improvements for new or improved service including adding roadway capacity for new or improved transit service, such as bus-only lanes or dedicated bus-on-shoulder facilities; traffic signal priority for a new or improved bus or light rail service; adding rail capacity or implementing other rail improvements; operational or safety improvements that allow for faster transit speeds, more reliable service, or more frequent service; improvements at transit stations that allow for improved safety, operational efficiency, or additional capacity.
- Adding new or improving existing rail infrastructure such as construction of track siding to allow for trains to pass; adding railroad capacity by expanding the number of tracks serving the rail corridor; operational and safety improvements that allow for faster train speeds; improvements at rail stations that allow for improved safety, operational efficiency, or additional capacity.
- Transit hubs for multimodal transportation modes including network fare integration and fare modernization systems to increase linked trips.
- Transit hubs or stations and nearby roadways providing accessibility for first mile and last mile connectivity to public transit systems.
- Acquisition of zero-emission buses, and the cleanest available rail cars, locomotives, vans, or other rolling stock including, where eligible, those necessary for the provision of fixed route or demand responsive transit services including microtransit, paratransit, non-medical transportation (NMT) and non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT).
- Operational improvements such as interchange and ramp modifications, auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges, passing lanes, curve corrections and alignment improvements, truck climbing lanes, signals and intersection improvements, two-way left-turn lanes, channelization, turnouts, railroad at-grade crossings improvements or separations, shoulder widening.
- Closing gaps in the street network including general purpose mainline lanes on local streets and roads.
- Safety improvements such as wet pavement corrections, curve corrections, shoulder widening, high friction treatment, left turn channelization, safety barriers, new guardrail, end treatments and crash cushions, rumble strips, lighting, glare screen, rock fall mitigation, overcrossing pedestrian fencing, or bikeways and crosswalk safety enhancements.
- Direct mitigation or other regulatory requirements of a transportation project or facility funded under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, including restoration or protection of critical habitat and open space.
- Capital projects that employ advanced and innovative technology, including but not limited to Intelligent Transportation Systems, digital signage and wayfinding systems, real-time travel information devices, demand responsive technology necessary for the



provision of microtransit, paratransit, non-medical transportation (NMT) and non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT), and efficient and intelligent parking infrastructure and systems.

- Identified system and device performance and optimization to support those investments are eligible if they are considered capital costs.
- Projects that include supporting infrastructure for the deployment of current and future technologies, such as zero-emission vehicle charging or hydrogen fueling stations and capital projects to upgrade maintenance facilities supporting zero-emission vehicles.
- Transportation Management Systems and Transportation Demand Management, and those that include broadband installation (conduit or fiber).
- Bicycle facilities such as dedicated bicycle lanes, separated bikeways, bicycle parking, and secure storage.
- Pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks, walkways, paths, driveways, crosswalks, median islands, ramps, pedestrian bridges, and tunnels.

As applicable by law, projects that propose to construct a toll transportation facility must obtain Commission approval to operate the toll facility in accordance with the [Commission's Toll Facility Application Guidelines](#) before the project is programmed in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

Highway lane capacity-increasing projects funded by the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program are limited to high-occupancy vehicle lanes, managed lanes, and other non-general-purpose lanes designed to improve safety for all modes of travel.

General purpose lanes on the state highway system are not eligible for funding in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. If a project nomination includes general purpose lanes as part of the overall project, the nominating agency must certify that no funding from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program will fund the general-purpose lanes. In addition, the benefits and impacts of the eligible and ineligible components must be clearly separated and defined in the application. Further, if the project is programmed in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, the recipient agency must track and report project benefits for both components, including reporting the net overall project benefits and impacts. Projects on railroad corridors that do not serve passenger rail are not eligible for funding.

10. Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plans

All projects nominated for the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program must be included in a comprehensive multimodal corridor plan (CMCP). Comprehensive multimodal corridor plans are an essential tool to promote innovative sustainable transportation solutions in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.



All comprehensive multimodal corridor plans must be prepared in accordance with the [Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Guidelines](#) adopted by the Commission in December 2018. Applicants must submit a Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Self-Certification Form (see: [Part VIII, Appendix B](#)) with the project nomination as instructed in [Part VIII, Appendix A](#).

Commission staff will review all Self-Certification Forms and the corresponding plan information cited to ensure plans are prepared in accordance with the Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Guidelines. Nominated projects may not be selected to compete if Commission staff determines that plans were not prepared in accordance with the Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Guidelines. The Commission retains final eligibility determinations.

11. Environmental Process

A project will only be programmed if, at the time of program adoption, either the project-level environmental process or the final draft of a project-level environmental document is complete in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Federalized projects will only be programmed if, at the time of program adoption, either the project-level environmental process or the final draft of a project-level environmental document is complete in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Environmental clearance must be achieved within six months of program adoption. Funds will not be allocated to any portion of a project until all modes of the project have completed the environmental process. If these requirements are not met, the project will be deleted from the program.

12. Delivery Methods

The Commission supports and encourages innovative delivery methods. Projects using alternative delivery methods such as design-build, progressive design-build, design sequencing procurement, or Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) should be identified in the project nomination, before programming, or as soon as possible before allocation. Due to the non-traditional nature of alternative delivery methods, it is possible that projects using alternative delivery methods might not follow the same procedures as projects utilizing design-bid-build delivery. Flexibility may be requested and approved consistent with programming and allocation capacity, program guidelines, and state and federal law.

For a project expected to use a design-build or design-sequencing delivery method, the Commission will program the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds in the construction component of the project. The allocation however may be a combined amount to include design, right of way, and construction.



When using the Construction Manager/General Contractor delivery method, the project will be programmed and allocated in the same manner as design-bid-build. During the environmental or design phase, Construction Manager/General Contractor contract costs are considered environmental or design phase expenditures. As the project advances in the design phase, it may be desirable to separate the project into packages for efficiencies in the construction delivery. If this is the case, the project may be separated into distinct delivery contracts and the Commission must be notified as soon as possible. The delivery dates and the scope of work must be consistent with the approved baseline agreement.

13. Project Segmenting

Scaling a project into segments because of its size, funding, or delivery schedule may be necessary for certain large corridor projects. When segmenting a project into separate independent segments, the nomination should address the total corridor and the reasons for project segmentation.

A project will be evaluated based on the segment proposed for funding. Therefore, the nomination should: identify the benefits (outputs and outcomes) for the segment proposed for funding, provide a full funding plan of the segment, demonstrate the segment's independent utility, how it will be delivered, and include an estimated timeline of overall project completion for each segment in the corridor.

Proposed projects (or segments) that complete a corridor as defined in a comprehensive multimodal corridor plan will be prioritized for funding.

14. Multimodal Projects, Modes, and Contracts

Project nominations may include multiple modes to be delivered in separate contracts (i.e., roadwork, rail work, bike lanes), referred to as project modes. The project nomination must identify the scope of work for each project mode. The benefits (outputs and outcomes) that will be achieved may be described for all project modes combined in the project nomination. If a proposed project mode does not establish a clear connection or benefit to the corridor, as demonstrated in a comprehensive multimodal corridor plan, the Commission may choose to not fund that individual project mode.

If the scope of a project mode includes multiple independent contracts to achieve the benefits as proposed (e.g., a rail project mode may include tracks, vehicle purchases, station improvements), the project nomination must identify the scope, funding plan, and schedule for each contract (each contract should have a separate electronic Project Programming Request Form), including any contracts that do not request Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds. The nomination should explain the strategy for project delivery. If, after program adoption, the project is divided into independent contracts, it should be reported to the



Commission as soon as possible. To divide a project into independent contracts, a project amendment must be approved by the Commission before allocation.

15. Screening Criteria

The Commission will screen all project nominations for completeness and eligibility before they are moved to the evaluation process. Project nominations that are deemed incomplete or ineligible will not be evaluated.

Agencies that plan to submit multiple project nominations must clearly prioritize those nominations.

Project nominations will be screened for the following:

- A completed Project Nomination prepared and submitted in accordance with the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines and instructions provided in [Part VIII, Appendix A](#).
- The project meets the primary purpose of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program as specified in [Part I, Section 1](#).
- The project is included in an adopted regional transportation plan.
 - Projects within the boundaries of a metropolitan planning organization must be included in an adopted regional transportation plan that includes a sustainable communities strategy determined by the California Air Resources Board to achieve the region's greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.
- The project is included in a comprehensive multimodal corridor plan as specified in [Part III, Section 10](#).
- The project has achieved (or will achieve) environmental clearance at the time of program adoption. If not, confirm that the project will achieve environmental clearance within six months of program adoption as specified in [Part VIII, Appendix A](#).
- The project demonstrates that any negative environmental and community impacts will be avoided or mitigated.
- The project demonstrates that all other funds for the proposed project (segment) are committed.

16. Project Rating Process

All project nominations that meet the screening criteria specified in [Part III, Section 15](#) will be evaluated and selected through a competitive process.

Project nominations will be rated using the evaluation criteria specified in [Part IV, Section 17](#). Each evaluation criteria will be rated as:

- High
- Medium-High
- Medium



- Medium-Low
- Low

The highest-rated nominations will be programmed for funding. The Commission may collaborate with the Interagency Equity Advisory Committee (to review the accessibility and community engagement benefits); California Air Resources Board (to review the air quality and greenhouse gas reduction benefits); California Department of Housing and Community Development (to review the efficient land-use and housing benefits); and Caltrans (to review the California Life-Cycle/Benefit-Cost Analysis) to evaluate project nominations.

IV. EVALUATION

17. Evaluation Criteria

Responses in the project nominations must include quantitative and qualitative measures to demonstrate how a project meets the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program policy objectives. Refer to the Performance Indicators and Measures in [Part VIII, Appendix D](#) to respond to the criteria identified in Part IV, Sections 17.1 and 17.2 of these guidelines.

17.1 Congestion Evaluation Criteria

Project nominations must demonstrate how the project meets the primary purpose of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program as identified in [Part I, Section 1](#) by responding to each prompt provided below.

A. Extent of Congestion – Identify the extent of congestion in the corridor, include congestion of all modes.

- Address current community and environmental impacts present within the existing condition.
- Explain how much worse the problem may become under the no-build environmental alternative over a 20-year period from proposed project completion date.
- Identify any other completed or ongoing improvements in the corridor and the impacts of not completing the corridor.
- Identify and discuss other issues present within the corridor.

B. Proposed Solution – Explain the proposed solution in the corridor.

- How will the proposed improvements **reduce** congestion?
- Does the project incorporate multiple modes?
- Will the project reduce or minimize vehicle miles traveled while maximizing person throughput in the corridor? If so, how?
- How is the solution balancing transportation, environment, and community?
- Why is this solution the most beneficial improvement in the corridor?
- What improvements to other modes were considered and why were they not chosen?



- For highway and local road projects, will the project induce demand?
 - Solutions that include the following will be better prioritized for funding: investments in bus and rail transit service, especially those that improve travel time or service frequency, active transportation, complete streets, and highway solutions that improve transit travel times and reliability or generate revenue to fund projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled through employing vehicle demand management strategies.

17.2 Additional Evaluation Criteria

Project nominations must demonstrate the project's consistency with identified co-benefits of the proposed project. Projects funded in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program are expected to provide diverse benefits in a variety of areas, which may include some or all of the criteria identified below.

1. **Safety** – The nomination must address safety issues and concerns in the corridor, including actual reported property, injury, and fatality collisions for the last five full years. Demonstrate how the proposed project increases safety for motorized and non-motorized users. Identify and discuss other safety measures the project will address, including health impacts.
2. **Accessibility** – The nomination must address current accessibility issues and concerns in the corridor and how the proposed project will improve accessibility and connectivity to residents and non-residents that travel or need to travel through the corridor. The nomination should demonstrate how the proposed project will provide access to multimodal choices.
 - Will the project close an existing gap in transit and active transportation?
 - How will the project connect to jobs, major destinations, and residential areas?
 - Include destinations that may be priority destinations for disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities.
 - Describe how the project increases or creates accessibility to key destinations for disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities. This can be demonstrated by utilizing mapping tools that overlay the identified accessibility points with population distribution by various demographics (reference the resources provided in the *SB 1 Programs Transportation Equity Supplement* in [Part VIII, Appendix E](#)).
3. **Community Engagement** – In alignment with the Commission's Racial Equity Statement, nominations will be evaluated based on their ability to create mobility opportunities for all Californians, especially those from disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities. Equitable projects will demonstrate meaningful and effective public



participation in decision-making processes, particularly by disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities.

Refer to the *SB 1 Programs Transportation Equity Supplement* included in [Part VIII, Appendix E](#) and use the indicators and examples provided to respond to this criterion.

- **Identification:** Identify the disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities within the project study area. Provide a demographic profile and metropolitan area map that identify locations of disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities within the project study area.
- **Engagement:** Explain how communities in the project study area were engaged to identify their needs. If there are disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities within the project study area, how did the agency directly engage them? How was community feedback incorporated into the project? How did the agency inform the community about whether their feedback was incorporated into the project?
- **Outcomes:** Describe how the project scope was developed with community feedback. Was the alternatives analysis developed to include community feedback? Can the agency demonstrate its partnership and collaboration with the disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities? Identify any strategies included in the project scope that avoid or minimize impacts on disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities.
- **Impacts:** How did the agency assess if the project would cause any disparate impacts on the basis of race, color, socioeconomic status, gender, sexuality, disability status, or national origin? If disparate impacts were identified, did the agency consider and incorporate alternate options as applicable?

Pre-existing community engagement plans and activities developed and implemented in the project study area in the recent past (at most five years before program guidelines adoption) may be referenced to respond to this criterion. The nomination must explain how and why the pre-existing community engagement plans and activities are still applicable and why developing new community engagement plans and activities was either not feasible or not necessary. Provide the month and year the existing community engagement plans and activities were finalized and implemented. Include information about any community engagement plans and activities that are under development or planned for the near-term future (within two years) specifically for the nominated project.

4. **Economic Development and Job Creation and Retention** – The nomination must address how the proposed project stimulates local economic activity, supports economic development, and creates, increases, or retains access to employment.



- How does the project support economic development and improve access to employment for disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities?
- How does the proposed project improve access to economic opportunities and the movement of goods and services in the region?
- Provide the number and types of jobs created by this project's delivery. Include any efforts to develop local jobs and workforce development opportunities (e.g.: pre-apprenticeship, education, or research programs, etc.) consistent with state and federal laws. For more information about workforce development, visit the California Workforce Development Board's [website](#).
- Identify and discuss other economic impacts the project will have.

5. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases – The nomination must address how the proposed project will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and criteria pollutants and advance the State's air quality and climate goals.

Nominated projects may reduce vehicle miles traveled, improve access to zero-emission vehicle charging or hydrogen fueling infrastructure, or deploy zero-emission equipment and vehicles. Potential strategies may include:

- Constructing or improving transit infrastructure, bicycle facilities, or pedestrian facilities.
- Purchasing zero-emission transit buses, light-rail vehicles, and passenger-rail vehicles.
- Installing charging or hydrogen refueling infrastructure, with public accessibility where feasible.
- Providing zero-emission vehicle fueling infrastructure for transit buses and light-duty zero-emission vehicles to electrify fleets and to improve ridership for users charging their vehicles at transit stations, respectively.

6. Efficient Land Use and Housing – The nomination must address how the proposed project will support and advance transportation efficient land-use or Prohousing principles.

For example:

- Describe how the project's expected benefits are supported by local land-use policies.
- How will future land development, described and enabled by zoning, permitting, or other local land-use policies, maximize the project's potential to reduce congestion?
- Is housing an existing or developing issue for the community in the project area? Why or why not?
- How does the project support residential, mixed-use, and infill development with multimodal choices?

The nomination may also identify 1) local government jurisdictions that will be served by the proposed project and have obtained a Prohousing Designation, or 2) enacted or developing



local land-use policies in the project area which support efficient land-use patterns or incorporate Prohousing criteria. These can include:

- Policies identified in the *Land Use Efficiency and Prohousing Supplement* in [Part VIII, Appendix F](#), developed in partnership with the California Department of Housing and Community Development.
 - Cities or counties that contain proposed projects are encouraged to apply for the California Department of Housing and Community Development's [Prohousing Designation Program](#).
- Any other policies or programs which may support residential, mixed-use, or infill development with multimodal choices.

7. Matching Funds – The project will be evaluated based on the amount of matching funds and the source of funds (see: [Part V, Section 19](#)).

Priority will be given to projects that have committed discretionary federal funds at the time of project nomination. The commitment should be in the form of a letter, full funding grant agreement, or a public announcement issued by the authorizing federal agency. Projects that leverage funding from discretionary private, federal, state, local or regional sources will rate higher. Matching funds will only be considered for the project's construction phase.

With the exception of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, matching funds will only be considered as leveraged funds when not allocated by the Commission on a project basis.

In each contract, the matching funds must be expended concurrently and proportionally to the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds, except as noted below. Costs incurred before allocation will not be counted towards the match.

The Commission may, at the time of programming or allocation, approve non-proportional spending. Adjustments will be made at project closeout to ensure matching funds were spent proportionally to the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds. An implementing agency must provide a project funding plan through construction that demonstrates the supplemental funding in the plan (local, federal, state, private sources) is reasonably expected to be available and sufficient to complete the project.

8. Deliverability – Priority will be given to projects that are ready to start construction and have completed the project design and rights of way components. If the project will be delivered using the design-build method, the start of construction will be the basis for project evaluation.



- 9. Collaboration** – Jointly nominated and jointly funded projects are encouraged. For projects that cross jurisdictions, regions may pool resources to jointly nominate and fund a project. Similarly, regional agencies may pool resources to jointly nominate and fund projects with Caltrans.

For projects on the state highway system, evidence must be provided of cooperation between the applicable regional transportation agency and Caltrans.

- 10. Cost Effectiveness** – Consideration will be given to those projects that provide positive benefits in relationship to the project costs. The Commission will consider measurable benefits using the California Life-Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis (Cal-B/C) or an alternative proposed by the applicant.

V. PROGRAMMING

18. Programming Funds

The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program will be developed consistent with the annual amount of funds available for the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. There are no regional guarantees, minimums, or targets for this program. All nominated projects will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria as specified in [Part IV, Section 17](#). The Commission will not program more than one-half of the funds available each year to projects nominated exclusively by Caltrans.

19. Committed and Uncommitted Funds

The Commission will program funding to the projects in whole thousands of dollars and will include a project only if it is fully funded from a combination of Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds and other committed and uncommitted funds, as identified below.

The Commission will regard funds as committed when they are programmed by the Commission or when the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution.

For federal formula funds, including Regional Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program and federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by Federal Transportation Improvement Program adoption. For federal discretionary funds, the commitment may be by federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval.

Uncommitted funds may only be from the following competitive programs: Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, Local Partnership Program, or a federal discretionary grant program. The applicant must provide a plan to secure a funding commitment, explain the risk of not



securing that commitment, and provide a contingency plan to secure an alternate source of funding should the commitment not be obtained. If a project with uncommitted funds is programmed, all funding commitments must be secured before July 1 of the year in which the project is programmed, or the project will be removed from the program.

Projects programmed by the Commission in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program will not be given priority in other programs under the Commission's purview.

20. Letter of No Prejudice

The Commission will consider approval of a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) to advance a project programmed in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. Approval of the Letter of No Prejudice will allow the agency to begin work and incur eligible expenses before allocation. The Letter of No Prejudice Guidelines were adopted in October 2017 and are available on the [Commission's website](#).

VI. DELIVERY

21. Allocation Requests

21.1 Review Process

- When an agency is ready to implement a project or project phase, the agency will submit an allocation request to Caltrans. The typical time required, after receipt of the request, to complete Caltrans review and recommendation and Commission allocation is 60 days.
 - If the project or project component is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, the allocation request must be signed by the implementing agency.
 - Include a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency.
- Caltrans will review the allocation request and then provide its recommendation to the Commission for action.
- The recommendation from Caltrans will include:
 - Determination of project readiness.
 - Availability of appropriated funding.
 - Availability of all identified and committed supplementary funding.
 - Consistency with the executed Baseline Agreement, if applicable.
 - Certification from Caltrans verifying that a project's plans, specifications, and estimate (PS&E) are complete, environmental and Right-of-Way (ROW) clearances are secured, and all necessary permits and agreements (including railroad construction and maintenance) are executed. Caltrans considers these projects Ready to List (RTL).
- Commission staff may request additional information as part of the Commission's review.



21.2 Allocation Requirements

- In compliance with Section 21150 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission will not allocate funds for construction before documentation of environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a matter of policy, the Commission will not allocate funds for construction of a federally funded project before documentation of environmental clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act.
 - The Commission, as a Responsible Agency, must approve the environmentally cleared project for future funding consideration. The submission forms for this approval are available on the [Commission website](#).
- A project will only be placed on the Commission's agenda for an allocation of construction funds if the project is ready to advertise.
- The Commission will approve an allocation in whole thousands of dollars. If there are insufficient program funds to approve an allocation, the Commission may delay the allocation of funds to a project until the next fiscal year without requiring an extension.
- When Caltrans is the implementing agency, construction support costs must be allocated separately from construction capital costs.
- An implementing agency must not award the construction contract for a project until the Commission has approved an allocation of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds for the project.
- An agency should not request an allocation of construction funds unless it is prepared to award contract(s) related to the allocation within six months of allocation approval.
- If an agency has Commission approval to use more than one contract to deliver the programmed project scope, then it must request separate allocations for each independent contract.
- If a project or project component is ready for implementation earlier than the fiscal year in which it is programmed in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, an implementing agency may request an allocation in advance of the programmed year. The Commission may approve an allocation in advance of the programmed year if the allocation will not delay availability of funding for other projects.

22. Timely Use of Funds

The Commission expects certain deadlines to be met as programmed projects are implemented. If the expected deadlines are not met and a time extension is not approved before the expiration of a deadline (see [Part VI, Section 22.2](#)), the project will be deleted from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

22.1 Deadlines

1. **Allocation Deadline** – Allocation for a programmed project phase must be requested in the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed. Funds programmed to a project expire on June 30 of the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed. An allocation request



must be placed on a Commission meeting agenda no later than the June Commission meeting of the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed. If programmed funds are not allocated within the fiscal year programmed, or within the time allowed by an approved extension, the project will be deleted from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

At the time of fund allocation, an implementing agency may request that the Commission extend the deadline for completion of work and the liquidation of funds, if necessary, to accommodate the proposed expenditure plan for the project.

2. Contract Award Deadline – Construction contracts must be awarded within six months of an approved allocation.

Implementing agencies must not award the contract for a project until the Commission has allocated funds for the project.

3. Project Completion Deadline – After award of the construction phase contract(s), an implementing agency has up to 36 months to complete (accept) the contract(s). The implementing agency must invoice Caltrans for these costs no later than 180 days after the expenditure or completion deadline.

22.2 Extensions

The Commission may extend the deadlines listed in [Part VI, Section 22.1](#) under the following conditions:

- An unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred to justify the extension.
- Extension requests should describe the specific unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance and identify the delay directly attributable to the circumstance.
- No deadline will be extended more than once.
- Each deadline extension request will be considered separately for each programmed project or project component.
- The extension will not exceed the period of delay directly attributed to the extraordinary circumstance.
- The extension request cannot exceed the maximum period of delay identified in this section.
- An implementing agency must submit a time extension request to Caltrans at least 60 days before the Commission meeting in which the extension needs to be approved.
 - An allocation extension request must be approved by the Commission before June 30 of the fiscal year the funds are programmed.



- Except for the allocation of funds, time extension requests must be received by Caltrans before the expiration dates indicated in [Part VI, Section 22.1](#).
- Caltrans will review and prepare a written analysis of the proposed extension request and forward the written analysis and recommendation to the Commission for action.
- The Commission will consider a time extension request when it receives a time extension request with a recommendation from Caltrans.
- If a time extension is not approved before the expiration of a deadline, the project will be deleted from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

The following types of extensions may be requested in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program:

- 1. Allocation Extension (12 months maximum)** – May be requested if a project phase cannot be allocated before June 30 in the fiscal year it is programmed.
- 2. Contract Award Extension (12 months maximum)** – May be requested if the construction contract(s) cannot be awarded within six months of the approved allocation of funds.
- 3. Project Completion Extension After Allocation (20 months maximum)** – May be requested if, after allocation, an implementing agency finds that project completion will not occur within 36 months of the construction contract award.

23. Project Amendments

The following types of project amendments may be considered for the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program:

- 1. Cost Changes** – While cost changes to a project may occur after the project is programmed, the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program will not program additional funds to accommodate any cost increases to a project. Any cost increases must be funded from other fund sources. If there is a change in the cost estimate, the Commission must be notified immediately in writing to explain the change and the plan to cover the increase. A revised electronic Project Programming Request form which identifies the source of the additional funding must also be included. If a fund source is not identified to cover the cost increase, the project will be deleted from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.
- 2. Schedule Changes** – Schedule changes to a project will not be considered unless a time extension was approved as specified in [Part VI, Section 22.2](#). For projects programmed in the last year of the 2022 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, the agency may request by December 1, 2024, to reprogram the project only once with a justification. The



request must include a cover letter from all the implementing agencies involved with the project; a clear and concise explanation for the request; the extraordinary circumstances that led to the request; consequences if the request is not approved; and an updated electronic Project Programming Request. The Commission may approve the request only if an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred to justify the change at the time the 2024 Program is adopted.

- 3. Scope Changes** – The Commission may consider minor changes to the scope of the project if there are no impacts to the project benefits or the scope change increases the benefits of the project. If the proposed scope changes are significant, and the project benefits are decreased, the Commission will evaluate the proposed changes and decide whether to continue funding the project or to delete the project from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

The Commission may approve a project amendment request only if an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred to justify the amendment at the time of program adoption.

Amendment requests must be submitted as soon as an implementing agency has identified a need for one and must include documentation that supports the requested change and its impact on the scope, cost, schedule, and benefits (outputs and outcomes). Project amendment requests must be submitted as follows:

- Implementing agencies must notify Caltrans in writing of proposed project amendments.
- The written notification to Caltrans must include:
 - Detailed explanation of the proposed change.
 - Reason for the proposed change. Provide documentation as applicable.
 - Impacts to the project benefits (outputs and outcomes).
 - Comparison between the proposed benefits (outputs and outcomes) and those submitted in the initial project nomination, noting an increase, decrease, or no change and an explanation of the methodology used to develop the comparison.
 - Revised electronic Project Programming Request form documenting the proposed changes and the amendment request.
- Caltrans will coordinate all amendment requests and utilize the electronic Project Programming Request to help document the change.
- Caltrans will review the proposed amendment and present the agency's proposal along with Caltrans' written analysis and recommendation to Commission staff for the Commission's approval.
- Project amendments requested by implementing agencies must include approval of all partner and funding entities before presentation to the Commission.
- Commission staff will present recommended changes deemed by staff to be minor changes, such as those with little or no impact to project benefits or which increase the



benefits of the project, to the Commission as a part of the project allocation request. Staff will present all other amendment changes to the Commission as project amendments.

24. Project Cost Savings

Savings at contract award may be used to expand the scope of the project only if the expanded scope provides additional quantifiable benefits. The expanded scope must be approved by Commission staff before contract award. All other contract award savings will be returned proportionally and made available for redistribution in subsequent programming cycles.

Savings at project completion must be returned proportionally except when an agency has, after project programming, committed additional funds to the project to fund a cost increase. In such instances, savings at project completion may be returned to other fund types first, until the proportions match those at programming. Any additional savings must be returned proportionally, through a Commission action, and made available for programming in subsequent programming cycles.

When used in reference to project cost savings the word “proportionally” means that savings will be returned to each funding source based on the amount contributed from the respective source.

VII. REPORTING

25. Project Reporting

Pursuant to SB 1, the Commission must track and report the progress of projects funded by the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. The reporting requirements as outlined in the [Commission's Accountability and Transparency Guidelines](#) are required for all projects programmed in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

26. Project Tracking Database

Caltrans maintains an electronic database of the adopted Solutions for Congested Corridors Program and Commission actions. The database includes project specific information, including project description, location, cost, scope, schedule, status, and a map. The project information from the database is accessible at www.RebuildingCA.ca.gov.

27. Project Auditing

The audit requirements are outlined in the [Commission's Accountability and Transparency Guidelines](#) and will be required for all projects programmed in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.



28. Project Signage

An implementing agency must include construction signage stating that the project was made possible by [SB 1 - The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017](#) (or Rebuilding California Funds) and include the Commission's official logo which can be requested from the [Clerk of the Commission](#). The signage should comply with applicable federal and state laws, and Caltrans' manual and guidelines, including but not limited to the provisions of the [California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices](#). Reference Caltrans' [Construction Project Funding Identification Sign](#) webpage for additional details and requirements about project construction signage.

29. Workforce Development

Implementing agencies may track and report any information about how they participate in, invest in, or partner with, new or existing State of California approved pre-apprenticeship training programs following the requirements specified in [Part VII, Section 25](#).

30. Title VI Requirements

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq. ("Title VI") prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity that receives federal funds or other federal financial assistance.

All projects programmed for Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds shall comply with Title VI requirements, as follows:

- The implementing agency assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants and implementing agencies must comply with all relevant federal and state laws, regulations, policies, and procedures.
- The implementing agency will ensure that no person or group(s) of persons shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, limited English proficiency, or income status, be excluded, or otherwise subject to discrimination, related to projects programmed and allocated by the Commission, regardless of whether the programs and activities are federally funded. The implementing agency will comply with all federal and state statutes and implementing regulations relating to nondiscrimination.
- A current list of Title VI nondiscrimination and related authorities is available on the [Commission's website](#).



VIII. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – PROJECT NOMINATIONS

Submittal Requirements

- ⇒ Project nominations must include a hyperlinked table of contents, listing all sections using the lettering convention outlined below. The table of contents should list and hyperlink all corresponding subsections and appendices separately for clarity, as applicable.
- ⇒ Each project nomination is limited to 35 pages, excluding information requested in appendices.
- ⇒ Any letters of support included as attachments must be preceded by a cover sheet which numerically lists all letters in the order they are attached. For congressional and legislative letters include the member(s) names and district numbers in the cover sheet.
- ⇒ Applicants must email one (1) electronic copy of the nomination package to SCCP@catc.ca.gov.
- ⇒ Project nominations and supporting documentation must be submitted to the Commission by 11:59 PM on Tuesday, November 19, 2024.
- ⇒ Nominations will be treated in accordance with California Public Records Act requirements and information may be publicly disclosed subject to those requirements.

A. Cover Letter

The cover letter must include a brief non-technical description of the project scope, cost, schedule, benefits (outputs and outcomes), and requested funding amount. If the project includes multiple project modes, each project mode must be described. Specifically include a “project purpose and need” section to describe how the project meets the primary purpose of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program as specified in [Part I, Section 1](#) of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Guidelines. If multiple nominations are submitted, identify each nominated project and its priority.

- If proposing a segment of a corridor, the applicant should discuss the entire corridor and why the project is being segmented. The project must demonstrate the segment proposed for funding has independent utility and include a narrative of the plan to complete the remaining improvements of the corridor.
- If proposing the last segment of the corridor, the nomination should discuss the benefits that have been achieved through the completion of all other segments and the overall benefits of completing the corridor. The cover letter should address the impacts of not completing the segment(s). The analysis should be coordinated with other jurisdictions if the corridor crosses multiple jurisdictions.

The cover letter must be addressed to the California Transportation Commission’s Executive Director and identify the nominating agency or agencies on a formal letterhead.



Nominations from regional agencies must include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or another authorized officer of the agency. Nominations from Caltrans must include the signature of the Director of Transportation, or a person authorized by the Director to submit the nomination. Jointly nominated projects must have the duly authorized signatures of both agencies.

If a project will be implemented by an agency or multiple agencies other than the nominating agency, the nomination must include the signature(s) of the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer(s) of the implementing agency or agencies, and documentation of the agreement between the project nominator and implementing agency.

B. Fact Sheet

- A one- or two-page fact sheet describing the project. The fact sheet must include:
 - The project title.
 - A brief narrative of how the project 1) would impact greenhouse gas emissions, 2) considers transportation equity, and 3) mitigated or avoided negative community impacts to result in better outcomes. The narrative must be in “plain language” to enable a non-technical audience to understand it.
 - A high-quality project picture or rendering of at least 300 Dots Per Inch (DPI).
 - A high-quality picture or rendering of the nominating agency’s logo. If there are multiple nominating agencies, each agency’s logo must be included.
- The fact sheet will be posted on the Commission’s website and therefore must meet the latest state and federal web accessibility laws and standards.

C. Screening Criteria

- Provide high-quality project location map(s).
- Confirm that any capacity-increasing project or a major street or highway lane realignment project was considered for reversible lanes pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 100.15.
- Describe how the project furthers the goals, performance measures, and targets of the region’s regional transportation plan and sustainable communities strategy.
 - Provide active, publicly accessible links to the approved regional transportation plan and sustainable communities strategy where the project is included and provide page number(s) and project identification number(s) for direct reference.
 - Provide a signed letter from the applicant’s metropolitan planning organization stating that the project cost, scope, and schedule are consistent with that metropolitan planning organization’s regional transportation plan and sustainable communities strategy.
- Describe the comprehensive multimodal corridor plan as required in [Part III, Section 10](#) and explain how the proposed project is consistent with the objectives of the comprehensive multimodal corridor plan.



- Describe how the comprehensive multimodal corridor plan is consistent with Streets and Highways Code 2391-2394 as explained in Section 9.1 of the 2018 Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Guidelines.
 - Specify how and where the proposed project is included in the comprehensive multimodal corridor plan, include page number(s) and project identification number(s) for direct reference.
 - Provide an active, publicly accessible link to the comprehensive multimodal corridor plan.
 - A Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan Self-Certification Form (see [Part VIII, Appendix B](#)) must be completed and signed by the director of the agency that prepared the comprehensive multimodal corridor plan.
- Confirm that the project has achieved (or will achieve) environmental clearance at the time of program adoption.
 - If not, the project must achieve environmental clearance within six months of program adoption. In detail, explain how this will be accomplished and include an anticipated process timeline to ensure the project will meet this deadline.
- Describe environmental and community impacts as identified in the environmental document. A link to the final or draft environmental document must be included for all project modes.
- Confirm that the project is ready for construction or will be ready for construction by December 31, 2027.
- Confirm that the project has complete funding commitments which align to the requirements in [Part V, Section 19](#) of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines. Uncommitted funds may only be from the following competitive programs: Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, Local Partnership Program, or a federal discretionary grant program.

D. Evaluation Criteria

A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the proposed project compared to the no-build environment. All information requested for each criterion identified in [Part IV, Section 17](#) of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines must be addressed and in the order provided below. Additional instructions for some criteria are provided below for reference.

- i. Congestion Evaluation Criteria
 - a) Extent of Congestion
 - b) Proposed Solution
- ii. Additional Evaluation Criteria
 - 1) Safety
 - 2) Accessibility



- 3) Community Engagement – Refer to the *SB 1 Programs Transportation Equity Supplement* in [Part VIII, Appendix E](#) to respond to this criterion. Provide an active, publicly accessible link to the community engagement plan(s) and activities referenced to respond to this criterion and include relevant page number(s) for direct reference. If a link is not available, include the community engagement plan(s) and activities as an attachment in your application.
- 4) Economic Development and Job Creation and Retention
- 5) Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
- 6) Efficient Land Use and Housing - Refer to the *Land Use Efficiency and Prohousing Supplement* in [Part VIII, Appendix F](#) to respond to this criterion.
- 7) Matching Funds and 8) Deliverability – Provide a combined response for these criteria.
 - Provide a total project cost estimate which includes the amounts and sources of all funds committed to the project and the basis for concluding that the funding is expected to be available. Include a funding table that lists all projects costs separated out by project element (if applicable), phase, cost, funding amount, funding source, and funding status.
 - Uncommitted funds may only be from those programs identified in [Part V, Section 19](#). If uncommitted funding is proposed, the nomination must address the plan to secure a funding commitment, explain the risk of not securing that commitment, and provide a contingency plan and alternate funding table to secure an alternate source of funding in case the commitment is not secured.
 - Cost estimates should be escalated to the year of construction and be approved by the Chief Executive Officer or another authorized officer of the implementing agency.
 - Confirm and demonstrate the ability to absorb any cost overruns and deliver the proposed project with no additional funding from the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. For Caltrans implemented projects, Caltrans must demonstrate the plan to secure alternate source(s) to fund potential cost overruns.
 - Describe the project delivery plan, identify any known risks that could impact successful project implementation and provide a response plan to manage or avoid known risks. This can include any risks associated with deliverability and engineering issues, and funding commitments.
- 9) Collaboration



- 10) **Cost Effectiveness** – Demonstrate project benefits in relationship to project costs. If the nominated project has multiple project elements, include a table to clearly illustrate the benefit-cost ratio of each element.

If responses to criteria are incomplete or left blank, the project may not be funded in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

The required performance metrics in [Part VIII, Appendix D](#) must support and be consistent with the criteria narrative.

E. Additional Information

- **Private Infrastructure** – Where an investment is proposed to improve private infrastructure, the project nomination must document an assessment of public and private benefits to demonstrate that the share of public benefit is commensurate with the share of public funding. The investment of public funding must be tied to public benefits as demonstrated through a public or private benefit-cost analysis. The benefit-cost analysis should consider who owns the asset once the project is completed.
- **Rail Infrastructure** – Rail investments documentation should acknowledge and describe how the private railroads, regional agencies, and appropriate state agencies will agree upon public and private investment levels and resulting benefits.

F. Other Optional Project Information Areas

If applicable, project nominations may include information about the following emerging areas in transportation planning and delivery as outlined below. This information is requested as a part of project nominations. This information is not evaluated; however, it is captured for project informational purposes.

- **Climate Change Resilience and Adaptation** – The project identifies and includes project features that mitigate the impacts of climate change. Climate change poses many threats to California's environment, economy, and the resilience of the transportation system. Resilience refers to the capacity of any entity to prepare for disruptions (e.g., wildfire, flood, heat wave), recover from shocks and stressors, and adapt and grow from a disruptive experience. Project nominations may evaluate multiple resilience and adaptation strategies and provide sufficient evidence for choosing certain strategies over others. Consultation with a climate change adaptation expert (or related specialty) is recommended.

Examples of climate change resilience and adaptation strategies:

- Providing expanded throughput or transportation options in corridors that have been identified to support emergency evacuation. This improves resilience to climate change related disasters like wildfires and storms.



- Including roadway warning systems for extreme weather events.
 - Realigning or relocating transportation infrastructure that is impacted by sea-level rise.
 - Considering nature-based solutions to mitigate flooding impacts near sea level, such as restoring coastal wetlands or dunes.
 - Including transit shelters with shade, water, or other means of cooling in locations expected to see temperature increases.
 - Replacing wooden infrastructure with fire-resistant infrastructure and employing other fire-hardening techniques in areas vulnerable to wildfire. For example, if replacing wooden infrastructure with fire-resistant infrastructure is infeasible, ensure that the area immediately surrounding wooden structures are impervious surfaces free of vegetation.
 - Including zero-emission energy storage solutions to both safeguard against the loss of power and support electric vehicles in case of climate-related grid disruptions, which can include public safety power shutoffs (PSPS).
 - Incorporating ‘Complete Street’ elements, such as street trees, to provide cooling and shade for pedestrians and bicyclists.
 - Considering and planning for the impacts of climate change on active transportation options in transportation projects, as well as on public transit infrastructure.
 - Prioritizing conservation of roadside fire-resistant native plant species that may reduce wildfire ignition risk or serve as natural fuel breaks in the event of a wildfire.
 - Integrating fire-resistant native vegetation, rocks, and other hardscaping features to reduce the prevalence of flammable invasive grasses.
 - Road placement that can serve as fire break to limit fire spread in communities vulnerable to wildfire.
- **Protection of Natural and Working Lands, and Enhancement of the Built Environment** – The project minimizes the impact on natural and working lands (e.g., forests, rangelands, farms, urban green spaces, wetlands, and soils) or incorporates natural and green infrastructure. Consultation with an expert in conservation, landscape architecture, environmental engineering (or a related specialty) is recommended. Consider whether the project includes strategies to conserve, restore, and manage California's natural and working lands or integrates natural or green infrastructure, such as:
 - Employing land conservation measures such as:
 - Prioritizing preservation of large uninterrupted land areas that serve as wildlife habitat, particularly in any environmentally sensitive areas. This reduces habitat fragmentation, which harms many species. Strategies to



- avoid habitat fragmentation may include locating construction along existing transportation corridors.
 - Prioritizing projects that avoid crossing habitats and avoid construction practices that impact local ecosystems.
 - Avoiding invasive species expansion. This may involve preserving or enhancing native plant species whose removal may encourage invasive species expansion.
 - Designing structures that reduce stressors such as erosion and sedimentation that may impact nearby water bodies.
 - Incorporating wildlife crossings that meaningfully conserve habitat connectivity, support biodiversity, and increase road safety by reducing collisions.
 - Natural or Green Infrastructure Solutions
 - Projects should evaluate whether natural or green infrastructure solutions are available to integrate into the design. These are natural processes and features that are engineered to supplement traditional built infrastructure, providing benefits such as water catchment, infiltration, and surface cooling. Examples of this hybrid use of natural infrastructure include planting trees along streets and walkways and creating urban greenspaces, such as public parks or gardens.
- **Public Health**
 - Public health has many aspects and can be described in both quantitative and qualitative terms. The facets most easily connected to transportation planning include the categories of physical activity and mental health; traffic safety; environmental quality and pollution exposure; and accessibility to health-promoting goods and services.
 - These guidelines collect information about public health in the following performance metrics, which are also evaluation criteria: safety performance metric, the air quality performance metric, and the accessibility performance metric. In addition, the community engagement evaluation criterion requires applicants to consider health impacts to communities disproportionately burdened by air pollution.
 - In addition to these measures, project designs that remove or alleviate conflicts between vehicles and other travel modes are encouraged. The inclusion, for example, of protected intersection designs or signal phasing in locations with existing vehicle and active transportation conflicts would improve safety and support physical activity.
 - Project evaluators will consider the need to reduce toxic air pollutants in the most polluted and vulnerable populations. This will be reflected in the evaluation of the air quality and community engagement evaluation criteria.



APPENDIX B – COMPREHENSIVE MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR PLAN SELF-CERTIFICATION FORM

In accordance with the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) Guidelines, applicants must submit a **Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan (CMCP) Self-Certification Form** with the nomination package.

This form documents the applicant's certification that the CMCP is consistent with the California Transportation Commission's [2018 Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Planning Guidelines](#).

Commission staff will review all CMCPs and reserve the right to deny self-certification. Contact SCCP@catc.ca.gov with any questions about this form.

1	CMCP Title	
2	CMCP Lead Agency	
3	CMCP Completion Date	
5	Key Routes and Facilities	
6	Partner Agencies (if applicable)	
7	CMCP Reference to Proposed SCCP Project(s) (Identify page number)	
8	CMCP Webpage Link (Link must be active and publicly accessible)	
9	Additional Comments (Optional)	



CMCP CHECKLIST

#	CMCP Key Elements	Yes or No	Page #	Notes
1	Demonstrates state, regional, and local collaboration.			
2	Identifies and evaluates performance impacts of recommended projects and strategies.			
3	Discusses induced demand analysis for highway and local road projects, as applicable.			
4	Discusses travel options for all modes of travel within the corridor, including streets and highways, transit and intercity rail, and bicycle and pedestrian modes.			
5	Recommends and prioritizes multimodal improvements for funding.			
6	Identifies a timeline for implementation (e.g., short, medium, and long-term projects).			
7	Includes strategies to preserve the character of the local community and create opportunities for neighborhood enhancement projects.			
8	Describes how the plan incorporates the principles of the federal Congestion Management Process and the intent of the state Congestion Management Program for designated Congestion Management Agencies.			
9	Describes how the plan considers environmental impacts of proposed corridor solutions, including greenhouse gas emissions and criteria air pollutants.			
10	Describes how the plan incorporates the principles of state-level planning documents such as the California Transportation Plan, Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure, and California's Climate Change Scoping Plan.			
11	Describes how the plan is consistent with the goals and objectives of the regional transportation plan and the sustainable communities strategy.			
12	Describes how the plan is consistent with other applicable regional or local planning documents such as local jurisdiction land use plans and climate adaptation plans.			
13	Incorporates technological solutions such as connected and autonomous vehicles, zero emission vehicles infrastructure, broadband planning, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) strategies, as applicable.			



CMCP CHECKLIST

#	CMCP Key Elements	Yes or No	Page #	Notes
14	Explains how disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized groups and communities, and the general public were engaged throughout the development of the plan (refer to the <i>SB 1 Programs Transportation Equity Supplement</i> included in Part VIII, Appendix E to respond).			
15	Describes how received feedback influenced the final plan.			

Approval by CMCP Agency Director

FIRST AND LAST NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)



APPENDIX C – ELECTRONIC PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

Each application must include an electronic Project Programming Request (ePPR) form. The electronic Project Programming Request must list federal, state, local, and private funding sources and amounts by project component, phase, and fiscal year.

If the proposed project includes multiple project modes to be delivered under separate contracts, each project mode must have its own electronic Project Programming Request form.

The scope, benefits, schedule, and funding plan on the electronic Project Programming Request form must be consistent with the information provided in the nomination.

Visit the [Caltrans Office of Capital Improvement Programming \(OCIP\)](#) for more information about electronic Project Programming Requests, including a User's Guide.



APPENDIX D – PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND MEASURES

- Complete the table included in this appendix with the requested information for the nominated project. This information must be consistent with the information in the electronic Project Programming Request form under [Part VIII, Appendix C](#).
- Commission staff may contact applicants for additional information.
- Refer to the [SB 1 Technical Performance Measurement Methodology Guidebook](#) which includes additional information and resources to complete this table.



Existing Average Annual Vehicle Volume on Project Segment						
Estimated Year 20 Average Annual Vehicle Volume on Project Segment with Project						
Measure	Metric	Project Type	Build	Future No Build	Change	Increase/Decrease
Congestion Reduction	Change in Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	All				
	Person Hours of Travel Time Saved					
	(Optional) Change in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay	Highway				
	(Optional) Percent Change in Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle Travel	Local Road, Highway				
	(Optional) Per Capita and Total Person Hours of Delay per Year					
	(Optional) Other Information	All				
Throughput	(Optional) Peak Period Person Throughput – by applicable mode	All				
	(Optional) Passengers Per Vehicle Service Hour	Transit Rail and Transit Bus				
	(Optional) Other Information	All				
System Reliability	Peak Period Travel Time Reliability Index (“No Build” Number Only)	National and State Highway System Only				
	Level of Transit Delay	Transit Rail and Transit Bus				
	(Optional) Other Information	All				



Measure	Metric	Project Type	Build	Future No Build	Change	Increase/Decrease
Safety	Number of Fatalities	All				
	Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT					
	Number of Serious Injuries					
	Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT					
	(Optional) Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries					
	(Optional) Other Information					
	(Optional) Number or Rate of Property Damage Only Collisions	Local Road, Highway				
	(Optional) Number or Rate of Non-Serious Injury Collisions					
	(Optional) Accident Cost Savings					
Economic Development	Jobs Created	All				
	(Optional) Other Information					
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	Particulate Matter (PM 10)	All				
	Particulate Matter (PM 2.5)					
	Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂)					
	Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)					
	Sulphur Oxides (SO _x)					
	Carbon Monoxide (CO)					
	Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)					



Measure	Metric	Project Type	Build	Future No Build	Change	Increase/Decrease
Accessibility	(Optional) Number of Jobs Accessible by Mode	All				
	(Optional) Access to Key Destinations by Mode	All				
	(Optional) Percentage of Population Defined as Low Income or Disadvantaged within ½ mile of a rail station, ferry terminal, or high-frequency bus stop	Transit Rail and Transit Bus				
	(Optional) Other Information	All				
Cost Effectiveness	Cost-Benefit Ratio	All				
	(Optional) Other Information					



APPENDIX E – SB 1 PROGRAMS TRANSPORTATION EQUITY SUPPLEMENT

On January 27, 2021, the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopted its [Racial Equity Statement](#), which states:

The California Transportation Commission recognizes that throughout California's history, improvements to the State's transportation system have disproportionately benefitted some population groups and burdened others. The Commission condemns all forms of racism and is actively working to promote equitable outcomes through our programs, policies, and practices.

In the mid-Twentieth Century, California undertook a major expansion of transportation infrastructure aided by an influx of federal funding. While infrastructure improvements were being planned, designed, and constructed, Black, Indigenous, and other people of color were disenfranchised, lacked voting protections, and were underrepresented in government decision-making. New highways were frequently constructed through predominately Black, Latino, Asian, and low-income neighborhoods to meet the needs of primarily white suburban commuters, and through tribal lands. Racist policies and decisions also influenced the siting of other types of transportation infrastructure, such as commuter railways, and the delivery of transit services. The results of racial segregation and disinvestment of transportation funds in communities of color are still visible in cities today.

Californians who live in historically underserved communities are more likely to be negatively impacted by increased exposure to air pollution and noise from cars, trucks, ships, trains, and aircraft, and struck or killed by drivers when walking and biking. These vulnerable communities may have limited access to safe and affordable transportation options to connect residents to jobs, education, healthcare, and recreation. In addition, people of color may experience diminished safety and comfort while walking, biking, driving, or using public transportation as a result of racial discrimination in enforcement.

The Commission vows to create mobility opportunities for all Californians, especially those from underserved communities, to thrive in all aspects of life. The Commission will:

- Work to build and strengthen relationships with community-based organizations, non-profits, advocacy organizations, and other equity experts and practitioners;
- Empower the Commission's Equity Advisory Roundtable and future related efforts to help inform transportation decision making;
- Strengthen understanding of community transportation needs and challenges through the forthcoming Community Listening Sessions;
- Ensure equity, public health, and robust public engagement via our planning and programming guidelines;
- Provide expanded opportunities for Commissioner and staff training related to diversity, equity, and inclusion; and
- Feature equity topics and elevate diverse perspectives in public meetings of the Commission.

We uphold our dedication to serve and improve the quality of life for all Californians by continuing to prioritize transportation equity issues and ensuring all experience safe, affordable, and efficient transportation.



The Commission developed this supplement in collaboration with members from the Interagency Equity Advisory Committee and stakeholders as a resource for applicant agencies preparing project nominations for Senate Bill (SB) 1 Programs (Local Partnership Program, Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, and Trade Corridor Enhancement Program). The Commission endeavors to ensure program policies progress by embedding equity considerations in the project development, nomination, and selection process.

This supplement provides information on key statistics, benefits, and communication strategies that may be used during project development to yield more equitable outcomes. An applicant agency may use the information and strategies presented here to explain how a project advances transportation equity from identification and inclusion to impacts and outcomes:

- How did the agency engage communities in the project study area to identify their needs? Did the agency directly engage with disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized groups, including Black, Indigenous, and other people of color, displaced or unhoused persons, individuals with disabilities, seniors and elders, and low-income individuals or communities? How was community feedback incorporated into the project? How did the agency inform communities about whether their feedback was incorporated into the project?
- How did the agency develop the project scope? Was the alternatives analysis developed to include community feedback? Can the agency demonstrate its partnership and collaboration with the disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized communities in the project study area?
- How did the agency assess if the project would cause any disparate impacts on the basis of race, color, socioeconomic status, gender, sexuality, disability status, or national origin? If disparate impacts were identified, did the agency consider and incorporate alternate options as applicable?

Equitable practices should be considered through a project's lifecycle (planning, development, and delivery). This can include structural and procedural equity strategies like the examples provided in this supplement. Structural strategies reform planning practices to create inclusive, affordable, and resource-efficient transportation infrastructure, whereas procedural strategies provide special benefits to disadvantaged groups to create fairness in process. Mindful and meaningful inclusion and engagement are critical to successfully advance equity in transportation planning as well as project development and delivery.

Agencies may use this supplement to incorporate equitable corridor improvement strategies and advance projects with more equitable outcomes in their comprehensive multimodal corridor plans, as required in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.



Agencies may also consult the [California Strategic Growth Council's Racial Equity Resource Hub](#) to learn more about racial equity best practices (key focus hubs to consider: Creating Your Roadmap, Growing Awareness, Taking Action). The California Strategic Growth Council represents seven state member agencies, including the California State Transportation Agency, and created the Racial Equity Resource Hub to consolidate, streamline, and promote racial equity resources and tools for state agencies' implementation.

A. Example Indicators Used to Identify Disadvantaged or Historically Impacted and Marginalized Groups

Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 39711, disadvantaged communities are identified based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazard criteria. Disadvantaged communities may include either of the following:

- (1) Areas disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative public health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.
- (2) Areas with concentrations of people that are of low income, high unemployment, low levels of homeownership, high rent burden, sensitive populations, or low levels of educational attainment.

Recognizing localized differences helps to identify disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized groups. Some example indicators are included for reference below.

- **Median Household Income** – Is less than 80 percent of the statewide median based on the most current Census Tract (ID 140) level data. 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 the United States Census Bureau [website](#).
- **California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen)**
 - A mapping tool developed by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of the California Environmental Protection Agency that uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic information to produce scores for every census tract in the state which can be accessed on the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's [website](#).
 - SB 535 (De León, Chapter 830, Statutes of 2012) established initial requirements for minimum funding levels to “Disadvantaged Communities” for specified programs and required the California Environmental Protection Agency to identify those communities. The [SB 535 Designation of Disadvantaged Communities](#)



identifies four types of geographic areas as disadvantaged, including census tracts that receive the highest 25 percent of overall scores in the most recent version of CalEnviroScreen.

- **Healthy Places Index** – Developed by the Public Health Alliance of Southern California, the Healthy Places Index includes a composite score for each census tract in the state. The higher the score, the healthier the community conditions based on 25 community characteristics. The scores are then converted to a percentile to compare it to other tracts in the state. Within the Healthy Places Index, a census tract must be in the 25th percentile or less to qualify as a disadvantaged community. The live map and direct data can be accessed on the California Healthy Places Index [website](#).
 - **Extreme Heat Edition** – Developed by the Public Health Alliance in partnership with the UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation, the Healthy Places Index Extreme Heat Edition provides datasets on projected heat exposure for California, place-based indicators measuring community conditions and sensitive populations. It also provides a list of resources and funding opportunities that can be used to address extreme heat. More information about the tool and a live map can both be found on the UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation [website](#). This tool complements the [California Heat Assessment Tool](#) funded by the California Natural Resources Agency as part of the state’s Fourth Climate Change Assessment.
- **Native American Tribal Governments** – Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria) or projects that provide benefits to Native American Tribal Governments and communities.
- **Regional Definition** – Such as “environmental justice communities,” “equity priority communities,” or “communities of concern.” The regional definition must be developed through a robust public outreach process that includes community stakeholders’ input and must be stratified based on severity. A regional definition of disadvantaged communities must be adopted as part of a regular four-year cycle adoption of a regional transportation plan (RTP) or sustainable communities strategy (SCS) by a metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation planning agency per obligations with Title VI of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964. A regional definition of disadvantaged communities must be used for the region’s broader planning purposes rather than only to apply for SB 1 Program funding.
- **California Department of Transportation’s Transportation Equity Index (EQI)** – A spatial screening tool designed to identify transportation-based priority populations at the census block level. The Transportation Equity Index integrates transportation and



socioeconomic indicators into three screens that all reflect low-income status and tribal land status: 1) transportation-based priority populations, 2) traffic exposure, and 3) access to destinations. The live map and detailed use instructions can be accessed on the California Department of Transportation's [website](#).

- **United States Department of Transportation's Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Explorer** – Developed under the [Justice40 Initiative](#), this interactive web application uses census tracts and data to explore the cumulative impacts of transportation underinvestment in the areas of transportation insecurity, environmental burden, social vulnerability, health vulnerability, and climate and disaster risk burden. Census tracts are considered “disadvantaged” in communities if the final index score is greater than the 65th percentile. The map can be accessed on the United States Department of Transportation's [website](#).
- **Other** – If an applicant agency cannot utilize the aforementioned indicators, it may submit other documentation to demonstrate the project benefits a disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized community. Suggested alternatives include:
 - Census data that represents an assessment of the project study area. The agency must submit a quantitative assessment (e.g.: a survey) to demonstrate that the population contained within the project study area boundary includes:
 - A median household income that is at or below 80 percent of the state median household income.
 - A significant number of households at risk of displacement due to cost-of-living burden or project siting.
 - A significant number of households receiving food stamps or public assistance.
 - A significant population of seniors and elderly residents.
 - A significant population of individuals with disabilities or mobility impaired residents.
 - A significant population of single-parent households.
 - A significant population of immigrant or foreign-born households.
 - A significant population of veterans.
 - A significant number of car-less households.
 - A significant number of public transit users (including mobility impaired users).
 - Unemployment measurements.
 - Nearby amenities including shopping centers, health centers, schools, social services, and employment sites, or lack thereof.
 - Traffic safety indicators including collisions and injuries sustained.



- Community derived safety information and indicators such as high-risk zones for pedestrians and cyclists, illegal dumping hot-spots, or school-safety priority zones
- Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities as defined by the United States Department of Transportation and identified using the mapping tools provided [here](#).

B. Example Equity Benefits

Advancing equity in transportation results in a more diverse, affordable, accessible, and efficient transportation system for everyone. Equitable transportation projects can:

1. Increase access to social, educational, and economic opportunities and amenities, including shopping centers, health centers, schools, community organizations, museums, social services, transit centers, and employment sites.
2. Reduce travel times and congestion.
3. Reduce pollution.
4. Improve access to active transportation and provide alternatives to automotive options.
5. Improve safety of active transportation and non-motorized modes of travel in the community and the corridor.
6. Enhance opportunities to increase physical activity by encouraging use of active transportation.
7. Enhance opportunities to encourage use of zero-emission modes of travel.
8. Increase access to accessible facilities and infrastructure with first-and-last-mile connectivity to accommodate all types of travelers, especially mobility impaired users.

C. Example Inclusion and Engagement Strategies

Meaningful inclusion and engagement require sustained interactions and consistent, transparent communications to build trust through every step of the project planning process—from first thought to last action. This is especially important in disadvantaged and historically impacted and marginalized communities.

Community inclusion and engagement may be pursued during each stage in the project development and delivery process. An applicant agency should demonstrate how its inclusion and engagement strategies align with the types of strategies included as examples below, describe how recently that engagement has occurred, and how it is actively implemented.

While there are many types of engagement strategies to utilize, multifaceted approaches may yield optimal benefits for communities and applicant agencies. For example, direct engagement strategies, such as meeting with community leaders to develop relationships, can



be combined with indirect strategies, such as surveys and polls to understand community needs, in which case both the communities and the applicant agencies benefit from building trust and gaining new insights through collaboration. Potential strategies include:

1. Identify, contact, engage, and include the perspectives of disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized groups. Public outreach should include traditional forms of communication, including phone calls, mailers, flyers, and in-person events as disadvantaged and historically impacted and marginalized groups may lack access to computers and the Internet. Provide resources in multiple languages and formats based on community needs (e.g., non-native English speakers, or persons living with visual or auditory impairments, etc.).
2. Develop relationships with community-based leaders, groups, or organizations, such as environmental justice groups, religious or spiritual leaders, well-known individual advocates and community organizers, local pedestrian and bike advocacy groups, public school leadership, local transit riders, long-distance commuters (super commuters), linguistically or physically isolated groups, seniors and elders, and youth individuals and groups. This can also include community members who may face barriers including formerly incarcerated persons; undocumented persons; individuals with disabilities; displaced and unhoused persons; and lesbian, gay, transgender, and queer communities.
3. Collaborate with community-based groups and organizations to establish a local or regional project study area organization or committee (e.g., planning, oversight, advisory, steering, etc.) with decision-making authority to empower community leaders and solicit quality community input and feedback through the project planning process.
4. Develop a community benefits agreement with a project study area community to strengthen incentives for good-faith community engagement and deliver targeted, meaningful benefits to the community.
5. Demonstrate how community-identified and community-driven perspectives were solicited and included or integrated into the project purpose and need or scope.
6. Survey and collect information on non-motorized travel demands and the unmet mobility needs of disadvantaged and historically impacted and marginalized groups identified in the project study area. Use this information to develop transportation improvements to address these needs.
7. Develop relationships and conduct meaningful engagement with tribal governments and incorporate their feedback into the project planning and delivery process.
8. Collaborate, fund, or contract with local organizations to support community engagement efforts in the project planning and delivery process.
9. Prioritize community identified high-need areas, such as those identified through robust community engagement.
10. Prioritize contracting strategies that benefit disadvantaged or historically impacted and marginalized groups such as the communities identified in this supplement.



11. Ensure stability in neighborhoods and communities through the successful implementation of short-term and long-term anti-displacement strategies and policies consistent with federal and state law.

D. Example Anti-Displacement Resources

1. [California Department of Housing and Community Development Final 2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice](#) – Report detailing impediments to fair housing and recommendations for anti-displacement strategies.
2. [Urban Displacement Project](#) – Comprehensive website with reports, data mapping, and resources for California local, regional, and state entities.
3. [Framework for Evaluating Anti-Displacement Policies](#) – Criteria that can be utilized to better understand the ways that certain policy tools can be used to address the needs of vulnerable groups impacted by displacement.
4. [Greening Without Gentrification](#) – Ongoing study that identifies and classifies parks-related anti-displacement strategies.
5. [Transit-Oriented Development Without Displacement: Strategies to Help Pacoima Businesses Thrive](#) – Research study focused on commercial anti-displacement strategies that can support a predominantly immigrant-owned small business community.



APPENDIX F – LAND USE EFFICIENCY AND PROHOUSING SUPPLEMENT

This supplement was developed by the California Transportation Commission in partnership with the California Department of Housing and Community Development and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research as a resource for applicants preparing project nominations for the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. This supplement provides information about local land-use policies that can serve as indicators to support efficient land use patterns. The presence of these policies in a project area can be used to demonstrate a project's ability to support the efficient land use co-benefit as described in [Part IV, Section 17.2](#) of the program guidelines.

This supplement also identifies new grant funding opportunities and online resources that are available to assist local and regional jurisdictions to plan and implement activities that promote efficient land use, including achieving indicators provided in Section B below.

For the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, applicants can demonstrate a project will support and advance transportation efficient land use by meeting *either* of these two standards:

A. Confirming Prohousing participation. The applicant may substantiate that the proposed project serves a local jurisdiction that has applied to the California Department of Housing and Community Development's [Prohousing Designation Program](#) and received email verification from the California Department of Housing and Community Development that the application meets at least one of the Prohousing criteria included below. These criteria can include Prohousing Policies or Enhancement Factors. This supplement describes 16 Prohousing criteria that promote infill development, location efficiency, and reduction of vehicle miles traveled. Verifying the adoption of local policies meeting these criteria confers benefits to local communities under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

OR

B. Providing narrative regarding efficient land use indicators. The applicant may describe and substantiate adopted local policies within the project area that support residential, mixed-use, and infill development with multimodal choices. The applicant must include a narrative response explaining these local policies. To help guide the development of this narrative, this supplement provides detailed descriptions and best-practices resources for eight indicators of efficient land use that may be consulted voluntarily. This supplement uses the same eight indicators that were used in previous Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines.



A. Prohousing

A project nomination can demonstrate that the proposed project supports efficient land use by substantiating that the project serves a community that has both:

1. Applied for Prohousing designation under the California Department of Housing and Community Development's [Prohousing Designation Program](#), and
2. Received email verification from the California Department of Housing and Community Development that the local jurisdiction's application meets at least one of the Prohousing criteria included below. These criteria can include Prohousing Policies or Enhancement Factors.

If a local jurisdiction has not yet received the Prohousing Designation but has applied for it, the applicant may still satisfy the Efficient Land Use co-benefit by providing verification from the California Department of Housing and Community Development that the jurisdiction does meet one or more of the Prohousing criteria included below. In such an instance, the application should include a commitment from the local jurisdiction to continue to work with the California Department of Housing and Community Development to receive the Prohousing Designation. For verification purposes, the applicant must provide the confirmation email from the California Department of Housing and Community Development which includes the Preliminary Checklist substantiating that a local jurisdiction meets specific Prohousing criteria. Adopting local policies to meet these criteria confers benefits to local communities under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

Local jurisdictions interested in participating in the Prohousing Designation Program can contact the California Department of Housing and Community Development at ProhousingPolicies@hcd.ca.gov. The California Department of Housing and Community Development will provide technical assistance to cities or counties to apply for Prohousing Designation and to any other public agencies working with cities or counties, including transportation authorities, transportation agencies, transit agencies, or regional agencies.

Policies

1. Density bonus programs that exceed statutory requirements.
2. Increasing allowable density in low-density, single-family residential areas beyond the requirements of state Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) law [e.g., permitting more than one ADU or Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) per single-family lot].
3. Reducing or eliminating parking requirements for residential development.
4. Zoning allows for residential or mixed uses in one or more non-residential zones.
5. Modification of development standards and other applicable zoning provisions to promote greater development intensity.



6. Establishment of geographic areas for promoting workforce housing or sustainability, such as Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones defined in Government Code Section 65620 or housing sustainability districts defined in Government Code Section 66200.
7. The documented practice of streamlining housing development at the project level, such as by enabling a by-right approval process or by utilizing statutory and categorical exemptions as authorized by applicable law (such as Public Resources Code Sections 21155.1, 21155.4, 21159.24, 21159.25; Government Code Section 65457; California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15303, 15332; Public Resources Code, Sections 21094.5, 21099, 21155.2, 21159.28).
8. Priority permit processing or reduced plan check times for Accessory Dwelling Units, multifamily housing, or homes affordable to lower- or moderate-income households.
9. Adoption of policies to reduce barriers for property owners to create Accessory Dwelling Units.
10. Measures that reduce costs for transportation-related infrastructure or programs that encourage active modes of transportation or other alternatives to automobiles. Qualifying policies include, but are not limited to, publicly funded programs to expand sidewalks or protect bike and micro-mobility lanes; creation of on-street parking for bikes; transit-related improvements; or establishment of carsharing programs.
11. Establishment of pre-approved or prototype plans for missing middle housing types (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) in low-density, single-family residential areas.

Enhancement Factors

12. Policies that represent one element of a unified, multi-faceted strategy to promote multiple planning objectives, such as efficient land use, access to public transportation, affordable housing, climate change solutions, and hazard mitigation.
13. Policies that promote development consistent with the state planning priorities pursuant to Government Code Section 65041.1.
14. Policies that go beyond state law requirements in reducing displacement of lower-income households and conserving existing housing stock that is affordable to lower-income households.
15. Rezoning and other policies that support high-density development in Location Efficient Communities.
16. Other policies that involve meaningful actions towards affirmatively furthering fair housing pursuant to Government Code Section 8899.50.



B. Land Use Efficiency Indicators

A project nomination can demonstrate that the proposed project supports efficient land use by describing local policies, in place or under development, within the project area, that support residential, mixed-use, and infill development with multimodal choices. This supplement's Land Use Efficiency Indicators (included below) guide such policies.

1. Is the project located in a jurisdiction(s) that has a by-right (non-discretionary) approval process, adopted or in development, for multifamily residential and mixed-use development?

By-right approval process means the review of a proposed development shall not require:

- A conditional-use permit,
- A planned unit development permit,
- Other discretionary, local-government review or approval would constitute a “project” as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21100).

A by-right approval process does not preclude local planning agencies from imposing design review standards. However, the review and approval process must remain ministerial, and the design review must not constitute a “project” as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21100.

For example, a by-right approval process allows a hearing officer (e.g., zoning administrator) or other hearing body (e.g., planning commission) to review a project's design merits and call for a project proponent to make design-related modifications, but this process also prohibits the hearing officer or hearing body from deliberating on the project's merits or exercising judgment to reject or deny the “residential use” itself.

To assess the “Efficient Land Use and Housing” co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers whether the project is located in a jurisdiction that has adopted a by-right approval process in all zones permitting multifamily residential and mixed-use development. This by-right approval process may be an existing policy of the jurisdiction, or the by-right approval process may be in development with specific expectations that the process is adopted by a time certain.



2. *Is the project located in, or adjacent to, an existing or proposed Specific Plan area, or a similar area, that allows streamlined plan-level environmental analysis for multifamily residential and mixed-use development?*

The California Planning and Zoning Law authorizes a city or county to adopt a Specific Plan, which is a comprehensive planning and zoning document designed to carry out the General Plan policies within a particular geographic area by providing a special set of development standards for that area (Government Code Section 65450, et seq.). Special standards may include form-based code coupled with California Environmental Quality Act streamlining to help facilitate higher-density housing production and mixed-use development within core areas.

Before adopting a Specific Plan, a city or county must prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) according to California Environmental Quality Act. To meet this requirement, the jurisdiction may adopt a “Program Environmental Impact Report” which facilitates California Environmental Quality Act streamlining by including project-level analysis and project-level mitigation measures that may account for and effectively cover future proposed projects within the Specific Plan area (California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15168, et seq.).

Accordingly, Government Code Section 65457 specifies that residential and mixed-use projects that are consistent with a Specific Plan, with a certified Program Environmental Impact Report, are exempt from California Environmental Quality Act. By adopting a Specific Plan, local jurisdictions can significantly help accelerate future approval and permitting processes for infill housing development projects and efficient land use.

For information and guidance on California Environmental Quality Act streamlining through Specific Plans, see the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s [CEQA Review of Housing Projects Technical Advisory](#).

Examples of Specific Plans that Allow Streamlined Plan-Level California Environmental Quality Act Analysis

- The City of San Diego recently adopted two Specific Plans to rezone areas along trolley stations to facilitate the development of approximately 9,000 new homes, taking advantage of the planned Mid-Coast Trolley Blue Line Extension to promote transit-oriented development. Each Specific Plan includes a Program Environmental Impact Report, facilitating California Environmental Quality Act streamlining for future development by including project-level analysis and mitigation measures. The two Specific Plans include:



1. The [Balboa Station Specific Plan](#) allows for an additional 3,508 housing units, over the 1,200 units allowed in the previous zoning designation, within a half-mile of the planned station.
2. The [Morena Corridor Community Plan](#) allows for 5,630 additional housing units, over the 1,387 allowed in the previous zoning designation.

To assess the “Efficient Land Use and Housing” co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers whether the project is located in, or adjacent to, a Specific Plan area, or similar area, that allows streamlined plan-level environmental analysis for multifamily residential and mixed-use development; or whether the project is located in, or adjacent to, an area for which the jurisdiction is developing a Specific Plan, or similar policy to allow streamlining, with specific expectations to adopt one by a time certain.



3. *Is the project located in a jurisdiction(s) that has a density bonus ordinance, adopted or in development, whose allowable density increase exceeds the requirements of State Density Bonus Law?*

Context: State Density Bonus Law

Under Government Code Section 65915, State Density Bonus Law requires cities and counties to grant a “density bonus” to a housing development, in exchange for the housing development providing affordable units, or units for senior housing, student housing, or childcare facilities.

A “density bonus” means an increase of residential units over the otherwise maximum density allowed by the applicable zone. State Density Bonus Law requires each city and county to adopt an ordinance that specifies how its density bonus will be implemented.

- For a guide to California’s State Density Bonus Law, visit <https://www.meyersnave.com/wp-content/uploads/California-Density-Bonus-Law.pdf>.
- For information on recent updates to State Density Bonus Law, review “California’s Density Bonus Law: 2019 Update” at <https://www.meyersnave.com/californias-density-bonus-law-2019-update/>.

Exceeding Statutory Requirements

State Density Bonus Law requires cities and counties to adopt an ordinance defining the density bonuses available to housing developments. Typically, the exact amount of the bonus must be determined by a sliding scale (from five to 35 percent) outlined in Government Code Section 65915. Additionally, developments that meet special criteria for affordability, or proximity to transit, are entitled to higher density bonuses. In adopting their local ordinances, cities and counties have the *option*, but not the obligation, to also offer density increases that exceed these ranges required in state law.

Examples of Local Density Bonus Ordinances Which Exceed the Requirements of State Law

- The City of San Diego’s density bonus program allows certain housing developments to receive a density increase that is 15 percent above the range set by State Density Bonus Law, for a maximum density bonus of 50 percent. This special increase is available to housing developments for low-, very low-, and moderate-income households. For a description of San Diego’s density bonus program, see [Municipal Code Article 3: Supplemental Development Regulations Division 7: Affordable Housing Regulations](#).
- The City of Fresno’s municipal code exceeds statutory requirements by offering a density bonus for transit-oriented development projects that can be combined with the density bonus required by State Density Bonus Law. Fresno’s program provides a maximum



density bonus of 100 percent of the underlying zone's typical density. For a description of Fresno's density bonus program, see [City of Fresno Municipal Code, Article 21 \(Transit-Oriented Development Height and Density Bonus\)](#) and [Article 22 \(Affordable Housing Density Bonus\)](#).

- Sonoma County's density bonus program exceeds statutory requirements by allowing a by-right 100-percent increase in density for rental housing developments that provide 40 percent of the total units as affordable to households with incomes at 50 to 60 percent of AMI. For a description of Sonoma's density bonus ordinance, including applicability, permit requirements, and summary of provisions, visit the [Sonoma County website](#).
- The City of Santa Rosa has adopted a supplemental density bonus, used in addition to State Density Bonus Law, within certain areas of the city. Housing developments within these areas may receive, if they qualify, a supplemental density bonus of up to 100 percent above the General Plan's residential density limit depending upon several factors. Those factors are the project site's General Plan land use designation, its proximity to transit and schools, and its location within a housing opportunity site or a historic preservation district. For a description of Santa Rosa's density bonus ordinance, including the supplemental density bonus, visit the [Santa Rosa City website](#).
- The City of Ontario's municipal code allows a density bonus that exceeds statutory requirements, within a program specifically for senior housing developments. In addition to the general sliding scale of potential density bonuses jurisdictions are required to offer (from five to 35 percent), State Density Bonus Law also creates a special type of density bonus for senior housing developments, requiring local jurisdictions to offer a bonus of up to 20 percent for qualified senior housing developments. The City of Ontario meets and exceeds this requirement by offering a 30 percent density bonus for senior housing developments. For a description of Ontario's density bonus program, see [Municipal Code Section 5.03.360 Senior Citizen Housing Development](#).

To assess the "Efficient Land Use and Housing" co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers whether the project is located in a jurisdiction with an ordinance whose allowable density increase exceeds the requirements of State Density Bonus Law. This ordinance may be an existing policy of the jurisdiction, or the ordinance may still be in development with specific expectations that the ordinance is adopted by a time certain.



4. *Is the project located in a jurisdiction(s) that has an ordinance or other policy, adopted or in development, allowing reduced parking requirements for all sites zoned for multifamily residential or mixed-use development?*

The Government Code authorizes local jurisdictions to set the number of parking spaces required for each residential unit being developed. However, for projects that qualify for a density bonus, the State Density Bonus Law limits these requirements. In general, State Density Bonus Law limits parking requirements for these developments to not exceed the following (Government Code Section 65915[p][1]):

- Zero to one-bedroom: one onsite parking space.
- Two to three bedrooms: two onsite parking spaces.
- Four and more bedrooms: two and one-half parking spaces.
- If the development is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom.
- Senior housing, or special needs housing, with either paratransit service or unobstructed access, within a one-half mile to fixed bus route service that operates at least eight times per day: 0.5 parking spaces per unit.

For more information, see [Government Code Section 65915](#).

To assess the “Efficient Land Use and Housing” co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers whether the project is located in a jurisdiction that imposes parking requirements, throughout the area of the jurisdiction, that is less than, or can be reduced to below, the parking requirements specified in Government Code Section 65915(p)(1). These parking requirements may be an existing policy of the jurisdiction, or they may still be in development with specific expectations that they are adopted by a time certain.



5. *Is the project located within a half-mile of a major transit stop, as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21064.3; or a high-quality transit corridor, as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21155?*

Proximity to transit is one of the best indicators of location efficiency. Improved access to transit stops can serve as an effective solution for congested corridors by encouraging alternative modes of transportation.

Major Transit Stops

Public Resources Code Section 21064.3 defines a major transit stop as “a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.”

High-Quality Transit Corridors

Public Resources Code Section 21155 defines a high-quality transit corridor as “a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.”

To assess the “Efficient Land Use and Housing” co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers where the project is located within a half-mile of a major transit stop or a high-quality transit corridor.

In collaboration with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, the California Department of Housing and Community Development released [Site Check ✓](#), a free and public mapping tool that helps users quickly find parcels where housing projects may qualify for streamlining and exemptions under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This tool has all major transit stops, high-quality transit corridors, and average per capita vehicle miles traveled mapped. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to utilize this tool when determining whether their project areas or sites may qualify under Indicator #5 and Indicator #7. For more information about Site Check, contact brianne.masukawa@opr.ca.gov.



6. *If the project is a transit stop or station, is it substantially surrounded (75 percent or more) by parcels developed for residential, commercial, public institutional, transit or transportation passenger facility, retail use, or any combination of those uses?*

State law encourages development on infill sites (Government Code Section 65041.1). Infill sites are typically defined as areas that were previously developed or are substantially surrounded by qualified urban uses. (See Public Resources Code Sections 21061.3, 21099, 21094.5, 21159.25, and California Environmental Quality Act Guideline 15332.) “Qualified urban uses” are defined as “*any residential, commercial, public institutional, transit or transportation passenger facility, or retail use, or any combination of those uses*” (Public Resources Code Section 21072).

By placing transportation investments in these infill areas, projects can facilitate future infill development.

For more information and guidance on infill developments, see the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s [*CEQA Review of Housing Projects Technical Advisory*](#).

To assess the “Efficient Land Use and Housing” co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers whether the project is substantially surrounded (75 percent or more) by parcels developed for residential, commercial, public institutional, transit or transportation passenger facility, or retail use, or any combination of those uses.



7. Is the project located in an area with per capita household vehicle travel that is 15 percent below regional or city average?

In addition to proximity to transit, the per capita vehicle miles traveled of an area, as compared to a regional or city average, is a good indicator of location efficiency.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the California Air Resources Board have determined that focusing development in areas that are 15 percent below the regional or city average will help the state meet its climate goals.

These are also the areas of the state where housing, jobs, and amenities are in proximity. With the right infrastructure investments, citizens could use alternative forms of transportation to access their daily needs, removing personal vehicles from the road and alleviating congestion.

To assess the "Efficient Land Use and Housing" co-benefit under the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, this indicator considers whether the project is in an area with per capita household vehicle travel that is 15 percent below the regional or the city average.

In collaboration with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, the California Department of Housing and Community Development released [Site Check ✓](#), a free and public mapping tool that helps users quickly find parcels where housing projects may qualify for streamlining and exemptions under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This tool has all major transit stops, high-quality transit corridors, and average per capita vehicle miles traveled mapped. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to utilize this tool when determining whether their project areas or sites may qualify under Indicator #5 and Indicator #7. For more information about Site Check, contact brianne.masukawa@opr.ca.gov.



8. Does the project further the forecasted development pattern of the applicable Regional Transportation Plan's Sustainable Communities Strategy?

Federal legislation requires each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to develop a regional transportation plan (RTP) as part of its transportation planning process (23 U.S.C. Section 134[g] and 49 U.S.C. Section 5303[f]). The regional transportation plan must cover a minimum 20-year horizon, include long- and short-range strategies and actions, and describe the ways the region intends to invest in the transportation system (23 CFR Section 450.322).

In 2008, California Senate Bill 375 required each metropolitan planning organization to develop and adopt, as part of its regional transportation plan, a sustainable communities strategy (SCS). The sustainable communities strategy must demonstrate how the regional transportation plan meets regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through the planned transportation network, a forecasted development pattern, and transportation measures and policies within the regional transportation plan. Specifically, SB 375:

- Requires the California Air Resources Board to develop regional greenhouse gas reduction targets for cars and light trucks for each of the 18 metropolitan planning organizations in California.
- Requires each metropolitan planning organization, through its respective planning processes, to prepare a sustainable communities strategy that will specify how the greenhouse gas reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 can be achieved.
- Streamlines California Environmental Quality Act requirements for specific residential and mixed-use developments that are consistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy or auxiliary power system (APS) that has been determined by the California Air Resources Board to achieve the regional emissions reduction target.
- Synchronizes the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process with the regional transportation plan process.

Under state law, the sustainable communities strategy must set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which—when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies—will reduce the region's greenhouse gas from cars and light trucks (Government Code Section 65080[b][2][B]). This forecasted development pattern must be designed to achieve (if possible) the greenhouse gas reduction targets approved by the California Air Resources Board.

Additionally, state law requires the sustainable communities strategy to:

- Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region.



California Transportation Commission
2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Guidelines

- Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, considering net migration, population growth, household formation, and employment growth.
- Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region.
- Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region.
- Consider state housing goals.
- Utilize the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors.
- Provide consistency between the forecasted development pattern and Regional Housing Needs Assessment.
- Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506)



AVAILABLE RESOURCES

Local and regional jurisdictions may access new resources to support the development or implementation of activities to help meet the indicators listed above. These resources include new one-time grant funding and technical assistance.

Grant Funding

The Regional Early Action Planning Grants of 2021 (REAP 2.0) Program provides grants to regional agencies to fund planning and implementation activities that *both* accelerate infill housing development and reduce vehicle miles traveled. REAP 2.0 provides grant funding to 1) metropolitan planning organizations, with an expectation that metropolitan planning organizations will subgrant a portion of the funds to eligible entities (cities, counties, transit, or transportation agencies) in their metropolitan region; and 2) counties and tribal entities in non-metropolitan planning organization regions.

REAP 2.0 funds transformative planning and implementation activities that may include, but are not limited to, accelerating infill and affordable housing development; supporting residents through realizing multimodal communities; shifting travel behavior through reducing driving; and increasing transit ridership, walking, and biking as primary modes of transportation.

REAP 2.0 funds can be used to develop and adopt local policies meeting the indicators described in this Land Use Efficiency and Prohousing Supplement.

For more information about REAP 2.0, visit [Regional Early Action Planning Grants of 2021 \(REAP 2.0\)](#).

- For questions about the Prohousing Designation Program, contact the California Department of Housing and Community Development at ProhousingPolicies@hcd.ca.gov. The California Department of Housing and Community Development will provide technical assistance to cities or counties to apply for Prohousing Designation and to any other public agencies working with cities or counties, including transportation authorities, transportation agencies, transit agencies, or regional agencies. More information is accessible on the Prohousing Designation Program's [website](#).
- For questions about a local jurisdiction's zoning policies, municipal codes, and zoning codes, visit [Municode](#). This resource can also assist applicants to identify information to address Indicators #1 through #4.



- To identify local jurisdictions with an adopted or proposed by-right (non-discretionary) approval process, review the California Streamline Approval Open Data Map (also known as the Interactive SB 35 Determination and Housing Element Open Data Map) which identifies local jurisdictions subject to a streamlined approval process for residential developments. Hosted by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, this resource can be used by prospective applicants to identify areas where Indicator #1 (nondiscretionary approval) would apply.
 - [Streamline Approval Open Data Map](#)
 - [Mapping Webinar](#)
 - [Mapping Webinar Presentation](#)



APPENDIX G – STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM PROJECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT ([FORM CTC-0002](#))

- Applicant must complete ALL fields in Sections I and II. Write N/A if not applicable. Applicant must also provide the Attachments requested in Section IV.
 - Assessment Form and all attachments must be submitted to Caltrans District Contacts (contact link in Section III) no later than four (4) weeks prior to Application Due Date. Late or incomplete submissions of this form and attachments may delay applications.
1. Applying Agency
 2. Name of Person submitting the application
 3. Title
 4. Phone
 5. Email
 6. Project Title - The title must be consistent with the application and all project documentation.
 7. Indicate the State Funding Program(s) associated with the project. Check all that apply.
 8. Percentage of project area within State Right of Way:
(Area within State Right of Way ÷ Total project area) x 100
And
Estimated dollar (\$) value of project area within State Right of Way
 9. Total construction cost of physical project elements within State Right of Way: Provide a separate estimate for the total construction cost (capital and support costs) of the project for only those physical elements and/or portions of elements that are on or within State Right of Way. This includes project elements within State airspace. Please refer to the completed estimates form or figures included in the project application.
 10. Indicate the anticipated environmental documentation that will be required for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [e.g., Negative Declaration, Environmental Impact Report (EIR) / Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), etc.] Indicate N/A if a NEPA document is not required.
 11. Fully describe the scope of work to be performed within State Highway Right of Way. This includes all new or modifications to any physical assets within State Right of Way.
 12. Follow the steps and linked resources to determine induced Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) on the State Highway System (SHS) and applicable calculations. Enter text inputs on 4, 5, or 6 as applicable. Note: Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects may not induce VMT per the ATP Guidelines. ATP applicants check number 1 and proceed to Section 13.
 13. Review the linked flowchart and resources for appropriate level of involvement. Check the applicable items in the checklist to determine appropriate process. Check the processes that apply.

Caltrans will review and retains the right to make a final determination.

I. APPLICANT INFORMATION

1. APPLICANT

2. APPLICANT CONTACT	3. CONTACT TITLE
4. CONTACT PHONE	5. CONTACT EMAIL

II. PROJECT INFORMATION

6. PROJECT TITLE

7. PROJECT PROGRAM ☐ ATP ☐ LPP-C ☐ LPP-F ☐ LSRP ☐ SCCP ☐ SGR ☐ TCEP ☐ SHOPP ☐ STIP ☐ TIRCP ☐ LTCAP

8. PERCENT OF PROJECT AREA WITHIN STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY	9. TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST WITHIN STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY
--	--

10. ANTICIPATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION FOR:

CEQA:	NEPA:
-------	-------

11. DESCRIBE THE SCOPE OF WORK TO BE DONE WITHIN STATE HIGHWAY RIGHT OF WAY

12. SB743 VEHICLE MILES OF TRAVEL (VMT) IMPACT ASSESSMENT

☐ 1. Project is screened as unlikely to induce traffic under Section 5.1.1 in [Transportation Analysis under CEQA](#). If checked, Stop. Proceed to Section 13.

☐ 2. Project is in a [Metropolitan Statistical Area](#). If checked, proceed to step 3. If not, proceed to step 6.

☐ 3. Project adds lane-miles to the SHS. If yes, proceed to step 4. If the project adds other types of traffic-inducing capacity, e.g. an interchange, proceed to step 6.

☐ 4. Enter the project lane-miles in the [NCST Induced Travel Calculator](#) and report the result here. _____

☐ 5. If the project team believes induced VMT will be different than what is shown in step 4, provide a best estimate based on guidance in the [Transportation Analysis Framework](#) and [Transportation Analysis Under CEQA](#), and a brief justification here. Stop. Proceed to Section 13. _____

☐ 6. Provide an estimate of the project’s induced VMT based on guidance in the [Transportation Analysis Framework](#) and [Transportation Analysis Under CEQA](#), and a brief justification here. Stop. Proceed to Section 13. _____

13. EXPECTED LEVEL OF CALTRANS INVOLVEMENT (Note: Final determination will be at the discretion of Caltrans)

Follow the [Flowchart to Determine the QMAP \(ca.gov\)](#) and [Applicant's checklist to determine the appropriate Caltrans review process \(TR-0416\)](#) to identify the applicable Caltrans review process that best fits the project parameters. Encroachment requests with completed permit application, checklists and supporting project documents must be submitted to District encroachment permit offices for further processing.

For determination of the processes required, check the following if the project:

☐ a.) Will impact an Environmentally Sensitive Area, or requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),

☐ b.) Requires Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approval,

☐ c.) Requires Right-of-Way dedication from Caltrans,

☐ d.) Requires modification to a Caltrans Bridge or Structure,

☐ e.) Requires Design Standard Decision Document (Reference: Highway Design Manual, Design Information Bulletin 78),

☐ f.) Requires Encroachment Exception Approval (Reference: Encroachment Permit Manual, Chapter 300),

☐ g.) None of the Above.

If any items "a" through "f" are checked a Standard Project Delivery Process is required, see #2 below. If item "g" is selected a Short Form is permitted, see #3 below.

☐ 1. Encroachment Permit Oversight Process - [Standard Encroachment Permit Application \(TR-0100\), instructions and related forms](#)

☐ 2. Standard Project Delivery Quality Assessment Process.

☐ 3. Project Delivery Short Form Quality Assessment Process (using a DEER) - [Design Engineering Evaluation Report Guidelines](#)

III. CALTRANS PROJECT

SIGNATURE: _____	DATE: _____
PRINT NAME: _____	

District Director, District _____

The above signature indicates, based on available information:
Caltrans acknowledges the Project

APPLICANTS SUBMIT TO DISTRICT CONTACTS LIST FOUNDS HERE

<https://dot.ca.gov/contact-us>

Form submissions with attachments are due **Four Weeks PRIOR** to Application Deadline.

IV. ATTACHMENTS

The Project Programming Request (PPR) must be provided to Caltrans with this form. Additional information may be required by Caltrans, including, but, not limited to: (1) project level documents and (2) draft funding application(s).



July 22, 2024

Honorable Carl Guardino
Chair, California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Recommendations for the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Draft
Guidelines

Dear Chair Guardino and Members of the Commission,

Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback on the 2024 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program Draft Guidelines. We are impressed by many of the positive changes made by the CTC staff, such as ensuring complete street elements are considered throughout the guidelines and including robust community engagement criteria. We support the strong focus on ensuring that projects funded by this program truly listen to community feedback and showcase to the community how that feedback has been incorporated. The projects our state is funding

must keep community needs at the forefront of their development, and these new community engagement requirements will support that goal and promote equity throughout this program.

While we support these improvements to the guidelines, we have a few suggestions for ways to strengthen this program. In the Eligible Projects section, the guidelines list a few examples of projects that would be eligible under this program funding. While the provided examples highlight great suggestions such as transit and rail infrastructure improvements, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and transition to zero-emission fleets, we are concerned about the exclusion of micro-mobility in this section. Micro-mobility has an opportunity to reduce emissions and congestion by encouraging the use of e-scooters, e-bikes, and other small motorized vehicles. According to the U.S. DOT, banning micro-mobility modes can increase congestion by up to 10 percent, showing that this mode is an important component of congestion reduction and should not be forgotten.¹ We urge CTC to add some examples of micro-mobility projects to this section to encourage applicants developing these projects to apply for this funding.

Additionally, we encourage the CTC to award additional points to projects that receive support from community-based organizations. As mentioned earlier, it is important that projects applying for this funding work closely with the community and incorporate their feedback. One way of tracking this is seeing whether the project has the support of local community groups through letters of support or direct collaboration. The guidelines already give priority to projects that are jointly nominated by multiple agencies, and we ask that this section be expanded to also include projects collaborating with environmental justice groups and community-based organizations.

We also ask that the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program prioritize funding projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled. VMT is directly tied to congestion reduction as VMT reduction strategies result in fewer vehicles traveling on the freeways. An example of this can be seen in the Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission which provided incentives for Bay Area employees to commute to work using non-auto modes. This pilot program saw 4 million fewer vehicle trips over the course of the year, which reduced VMT by 85 million miles. Given that a 4 percent reduction in traffic in the Bay Area can cut congestion by half, this program illustrates the importance of reducing VMT to address congestion issues.² Models show that reducing VMT by 20% by 2050 in California can cause 800 fewer fatal car crashes, which are not only a public health hazard but also can make traffic worse.³ Additionally, research conducted by the NRDC shows that the SCCP program continues to fund capacity-increasing projects, with as much as \$151M in the last funding cycle going to projects that increase VMT. This data is further supported by the CAPTI Annual Progress Report, which shows that while CAPTI actions have

¹ U.S. Department of Transportation (2023) Benefits of Increased Electric Micromobility Options.

<https://www.transportation.gov/urban-e-mobility-toolkit/e-mobility-benefits-and-challenges/increased-options>

² Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (2016) Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program Report to the California Legislature.

<https://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/commuter-benefits-program/reports/commuter-benefits-report.pdf>

³ Moravec, M. et al. (2024) Smarter MODES Calculator: Smarter Mobility Options for Decarbonization, Equity, and Safety, Rocky Mountain Institute.

<https://rmi.org/insight/smarter-modes-calculator-smarter-mobility-options-for-decarbonization-equity-and-safety/>

made significant progress in reducing VMT, the SCCP still continues to result in a net increase in VMT even after all of the actions have been adopted.⁴

While the SCCP program already acknowledges the importance of VMT reduction by funding projects investing in transit and active transportation while prohibiting the funding of general-purpose lanes, there is still more that can be done to ensure this program does not inadvertently increase VMT. For example, the SCCP guidelines still allow the funding of capacity-increasing projects provided they construct high-occupancy vehicle lanes or managed lanes. However, according to Caltrans guidance, building a new HOV lane generates as much VMT as building a general-purpose lane, rendering any potential VMT reduction benefits ineffectual.⁵ Given this, there is little reason for the SCCP program to continue to support any highway expansion projects, especially since these projects directly undermine the purpose of this program. We ask that the CTC remove this provision and discontinue funding any projects that increase lane capacity.

Similarly, we ask that SCCP guidelines adopt stronger language to highlight the importance of reducing VMT. The guidelines currently state that “Nominated projects may reduce vehicle miles traveled, improve access to zero-emission vehicle charging or hydrogen fueling infrastructure, or deploy zero-emission equipment and vehicles.” However, given the program’s goal to reduce congestion, this program should solely be funding projects that either reduce vehicle miles traveled or promote the transition to zero emission. Thus, we ask this language to be amended to state that “Nominated projects **must** reduce vehicle miles traveled, improve access to zero-emission vehicle charging or hydrogen fueling infrastructure, or deploy zero-emission equipment and vehicles.”

Finally, we are concerned about the lack of consistent methodologies when evaluating the environmental impacts of projects. Past projects presented to the CTC Commissioners and staff have shown discrepancies in VMT and traffic modeling as part of the project applications. In order to ensure that the projects CTC is funding are achieving the desired outcomes, we ask that the CTC staff thoroughly check the submitted methodology pertaining to VMT and traffic reduction estimates. CTC should also consider defining the preferred methodology in the guidelines appendix to ensure consistency between projects.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide feedback. The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program is a key program that will help California achieve its climate targets and save thousands of lives from complications caused by poor air quality coming from our transportation sector. We strongly support this program and offer a few recommendations on how to further improve it to ensure its structure fully supports our congestion reduction goals.

Sincerely,

⁴ *California State Transportation Agency* (2023) Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure 2023 Annual Progress Report. <https://calsta.ca.gov/-/media/calsta-media/documents/capti-2023-annual-report-finalreport-ally.pdf>

⁵ *California Department of Transportation* (2024) HOV Lanes and VMT. <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/esta/sb-743/resources/hov-lane>

Sofia Rafikova
Policy Advocate
Coalition for Clean Air

Zack Deutsch-Gross
Policy Director
Transform

Moiz Mir
Interim Executive Director
ClimatePlan

Rick Longinotti
Co-Chair
Campaign for Sustainable Transportation

Jonathan Matz
California Senior Policy Manager
Safe Routes Partnership

Kendra Ramsey
Executive Director
California Bicycle Coalition

Laura Cohen
Western Region Director
Rails to Trails Conservancy

David Diaz
Executive Director
Active San Gabriel Valley

Kevin C. Shin
Co-Executive Director
California Walks

Stephen Birdlebough
Chair
Sonoma County Transportation & Land-Use
Coalition



July 24, 2024

Ms. Tanisha Taylor
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for Approval of SB1 Cycle 4 Program Guidelines

Dear Ms. Taylor:

The Central Coast Coalition (Coalition) greatly appreciates the collaborative process in which California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff undertook with the development of the guidelines for Cycle 4 of the Senate Bill 1 (SB1) competitive programs. The Coalition strongly supports approval of the SB1 competitive guidelines at your August 15/16 meeting.

We would specifically like to highlight the transparent, accountable and inclusive process conducted by CTC staff ensuring that all stakeholders had the opportunity to provide input on existing guidelines topics and new topics at each individual workshop. This reflects the dedication that your team has with being collaborative with the public.

The SB1 Local Partnership, Solutions for Congested Corridors, and Trade Corridor Enhancement Programs are especially critical for small urban and rural regions like ours to help deliver critical transformative projects that are regional and state priorities, address interregional travel, improve goods movement, reduce congestion, and improve air quality. Not only do these programs meet goals included in the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI), but they are essential for regions of our size to deliver on transformative projects that would otherwise take us 25 to 50 years or longer to complete with only formula funding provided by the State and Federal government. These projects include improvements to lifeline service for those who rely on transit, safe evacuation routes, bicycle and pedestrian corridors and critical freight corridors connecting Northern and Southern California and to points beyond.

Similar to prior SB1 cycles, the Coalition has been actively engaged in the CTC's workshops for development of the Cycle 4 guidelines and we would like to offer support on the following sections of the final Solutions for Congested Corridors Program guidelines:

1. Award of At Least One Project from a County Less than 500,000 in Population

In Section 5, we support and appreciate the CTC's intent to fund at least one project in a county with a population less than 500,000. This allows larger transformative projects from smaller regions to receive funding.

2. Priority on Completion of Corridors

In Section 13, we support that proposed projects (or segments) that complete a corridor as defined in a comprehensive multimodal corridor plan will be prioritized for funding. By completing corridors, the state will realize the full benefits from previously completed segments and the full impact of completing the final segment.



Central Coast Coalition

Moving California's Economy

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Cycle 4 guidelines. The Central Coast Coalition looks forward to submitting our SB1 applications later this year!

If you have any questions, please contact Sarkes Khachek, SBCAG Director of Programming, at 209.402.4445 or skhachek@sbcag.org.

Sincerely,

Marjie Kirn, Executive Director
Santa Barbara County Association of
Governments

Pete Rodgers, Executive Director
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Todd Muck, Executive Director
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

Mitch Weiss, Interim Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation
Commission

Binu Abraham, Executive Director
San Benito Council of Governments

Maura Twomey, Executive Director
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

cc: Paul Golaszewski, Chief Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission
Matthew Yosgott, Deputy Director Programming, California Transportation Commission
Tony Tavares, Director, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
Michael Keever, Chief Deputy Director, Caltrans
Steven Keck, Deputy Director of Finance/Chief Financial Officer, Caltrans
Anne Fox, Deputy Director of Planning and Modal Programs, Caltrans
James Anderson, Division Chief of Financial Programming, Caltrans
Angel Pyle, SB1 Program Manager/PMP Program Management, Caltrans
Scott Eades, District 5 Director, Caltrans, District 5
Brandy Rider, Deputy Director of Planning, Caltrans, District 5