

# ATP Central Workshop – Notes

Visalia, March 3, 2020

## Welcome / Introduction

---

- Commission Staff: Intros and basic overview on funding years, amounts, components and processes.

## Workshop Schedule

- Workshops scheduled are available on the [ATP webpage](#) under the 2021 ATP Cycle 5 tab.
- Review of workshops we have done so far
  - Only 2 more workshops scheduled:
    - [March 10, 2020 in San Diego](#) (Central)
    - [March 11, 2020 in Orange County](#) (Branch)

## Program Schedule

- Commission staff reviewed the program schedule
  - MPOs working through their schedule and guidelines now
  - Staff recommendations for Statewide and SUR will be posted by November 16, 2020
  - Deadline for **MPO Final** project programming recommendations to the Commission changed from March 30, 2021 to April 2, 2021 \*

## Decision(s) Made:

- Deadline for **MPO Final** project programming recommendations to the Commission changed to April 2, 2021 \*

## Commission Staff Proposed Revisions

---

### Active Transportation Plans

- Final language for projects being in an AT Plan: “Beginning with the 2023 Active Transportation Program, nominated projects that are included in an adopted active transportation plan or similar plan will be awarded points. Commission staff intend to develop the criteria for these points in consultation with the ATP workgroup during the guideline development process for the 2023 Active Transportation Program.” \*
  - Changed slightly from last Central Workshop
  - Will this be for all project categories?
    - Yes, all application types except Plans
  - Will this be a requirement for the MPO component as well?
    - This will need to be discussed
    - StanCOG, FCOG, MTC, and SCAG all report not wanting this to be a requirement for the MPO component

- So this will not be a requirement/screening criteria?
  - No, it will just be for points and will not be implemented until the 2023 ATP Cycle
- Question on what other types of plans can be used for these points. CTC reported that that will need to be figured out for the next cycle

## Quick Builds

- Question on updates to the Quick Build section
- CTC removed agencies past experience with Quick Builds from the Evaluation Process
- Also made it very clear where the applicants will send their Quick Build application to

## Decision(s) Made:

- “Beginning with the 2023 Active Transportation Program, nominated projects that are included in an adopted active transportation plan or similar plan will be awarded points. Commission staff intend to develop the criteria for these points in consultation with the ATP workgroup during the guideline development process for the 2023 Active Transportation Program.” \*

## Application Changes

---

### Plans – Part A

- Plans that Agencies currently have – adding an “Other” check box where you can write in other types of Plans your agency has \*
  - This is just information gathering and will not be used in grading, just want to inform for next cycle
  - Should the application be edited to say, “Is the project in a Plan”? An agency may have a plan but their project may not be *in* a Plan. This would better show the impact of requiring a Plan next cycle
    - Santa Cruz thinks it is good as is, because it will look into if there are Plans in general. Think what is already being asked is better information.
    - Caltrans will look into adding a second part that says “Is your project in a Plan” underneath the original question \*

### Safe Routes to School Check Box – Part A

- SRTS radio button – discussion on when an applicant should click the box, SRTS projects that are State Only Funded and are within 2 miles of a school or bus stop. If they are federally funded projects then the Caltrans check is enough
- Imperial County is reporting that they are not going to submit ATP applications because it is so onerous to go through the State Architect’s office
- StanCOG also reported that they had to get a Time Extension because the State Architect did not get back to them soon enough
- Does the State Architect have enough ability to keep up with the number of projects that this Program is funding?

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.

- CTC and Caltrans both unsure and can look into it more
- Could also make sure all SRTS receive federal funds to avoid this requirement, but brings up other requirements
- Difficulty is they are not under Caltrans or CTC, so agencies can send a letter but not sure what can be done by CTC or Caltrans
- Problems agencies have dealt with when working with the state Architect:
  - There were minor issues that become long and cumbersome and led to delays in funding
  - Requires agencies to submit with Blue Beam Review Extreme software that is *very expensive*
  - It requires a lot of time and there is a lot of back and forth with them
- CTC Staff will make it clearer in the application when applicants *should* be clicking this box and what makes them a SRTS project
  - However, if you are a SRTS, just because an agency doesn't check this box doesn't mean they don't have to go through the State Architect. So if the project qualifies, check it to keep numbers accurate
- Agencies would appreciate more guidance on when a project is being triggered for this project
  - Caltrans can make this clearer in the next COIN they send out

## Counts – Part A

- Counts will be removed from the application because counts will only be required for funded projects \*
  - However, if an applicant has counts and would like to include them in the narrative of the application, that is still an option

## Screening Criteria Language – Part A

- Screening Criteria Language
  - Title and language will be changed to make it clearer \*
  - This was confusing to evaluators last time as to what a yes/no meant and if they should review or screen out themselves – want this to be clearer for everyone

## Disadvantaged Communities

- Healthy Places Index will be added as one of the 4 main categories that can receive 4 severity points \*
- Median Household Income will also change to match the Guidelines and updated threshold \*
- SCAG requests increasing the Word Count for the Disadvantaged Communities narrative question
  - Request to increase all 3 to 500 words and this was agreed upon \*
- Removal of requirement for agencies to get approval from CTC to use a Regional Definition \*

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.

- Will add Anti-Displacement language to Large, Medium, and Small infrastructure applications under Direct Benefit part C → “Address any concerns of displacement that may occur as the result of this project, if applicable.” \*
- SCAG: It came up in the outreach process in Santa Ana and applicant could answer the question saying something like, “During the public engagement and outreach process the topic of displacement came up, however, the community still supports the project and thinks the improvements are needed. The community still wants the project, however when the project is implemented there needs to be careful consideration of these concerns.”
- Questions on how frequent this is and what applicants could answer about this, especially in urban areas
- Concern this will be difficult to score and explain in the scoring rubric
- Instead, ask agencies what policies are in place to address displacement
  - Worry that many don’t have policies and plans
- Caltrans suggested asking Street Story to include a bullet asking if there are housing concerns and get anecdotal information from that
- While cities may have a lot of policies, not a lot of proof of success right now. MTC considered putting it in their Guidelines last time, but thought it was too soon. Instead have this as an information item for this cycle
  - CTC agrees this is gathering information right now and will go into more detail next Cycle, but will keep in application
- Suggestion to make it a negative point if not addressed, but workgroup against this

## Need – Increase for Walking and Biking

- Need Question
  - Counts will be removed because counts are not required
- Slight word change on Part A \*
  - New language:
    - Destinations and key connectivity the project will achieve.
    - ~~Lack of connectivity~~
    - How the project will increase walking and or biking.
  - No opposition from the Work Group

## Potential to Increase Safety

- Safety Question – will add that applicants can use crowd-sourcing data such as Street Story as their data for this question \*
- Santa Cruz and LA Metro do not like lumping qualitative data with quantitative data since it is only really helps agencies and people that know how to use it
  - Issue is that not all jurisdictions have consistent and reliable data from TIMS and that collisions are not always reported. This has been one of *the biggest* things at the branch workshops and at smaller agencies so CTC Staff are trying to make it attainable for *every* applicant since this is the second highest point question

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.

- TIMS data is still the *best* option and often times using an “Other” option always puts more onus on the applicant to thoroughly explain themselves to evaluators
      - Others also agree that TIMS data is not always consistent or accurate and another option for those agencies is fair
- Do we want to include a reference to countermeasure selection?
  - It is in the Scoring Rubric that applicant should be explaining why the countermeasures chosen will remediate the safety issue and the workgroup felt that was better than changing the wording in the application
- Explanation of how the Part B is different between Small, Medium, and Large
  - What is the point in breaking it down for the Large? Wouldn't it be better to allow one big box?
    - StanCOG felt the individual boxes make it easier and clearer that you addressed all the areas in the Large
    - However, one big box allows more words because applicant doesn't have to address countermeasures the project isn't using
- Suggestion to increase Word Counts for parts B and C in Part B of the Safety question, double the words from 100 to 200 words \*
  - Support for this from work group
- Request to not require the TIMS Heat Map since it can distract the evaluator from the need of the project if there are no collisions on the map
  - Currently do require TIMS map *or similar*
  - Caltrans suggests if there is a big red dot somewhere and the project is not there, just describe *why*
  - Something to clarify in the Scoring Rubrics and Reviewer training – not having the project in the red area/heat area does not mean it is a bad project. If there is a big collision history and building a new facility there won't be collisions
    - Make sure evaluators know through training that they should look through **everything** and look at explanation/narrative

## Public Participation

- CTC Staff proposed increasing the word count in the Large Infrastructure Application since there has been an increased emphasis on public engagement, especially for the very Large projects \*
  - Support from the Work Group, especially since Large only gets 750 compared to the Medium and Small who get 1000
- Emily from Caltrans proposing also allowing Street Story in the Public Participation question
  - StanCOG against because its not really outreach, it is on the public to give responses
    - Think this is better in the “How did the community request it?” question in the Disadvantaged Communities question
  - Workgroup suggested Street Story would be better in the Quick Build projects, especially in the evaluation process for them

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.

## Transformative

- Adding “Describe how your project will transform the non-motorized environment? Address the potential for this project to support existing and planned housing, especially affordable housing.” \*
  - No disagreements from the Work Group

## Cost Effectiveness & Scope and Plan Consistency

- Cost Effectiveness will be combined with the Scope and Plan Consistency so this question will be folded in to Question 9 \*
- Now will be 0-7 points for Large, 0-5 points for Medium, and 0-3 for Small applications
  - Reminder that there was a workshop on how an application should be a PSR equivalent and the [PowerPoint](#) and [Recording](#) are both posted on the CTC website.
  - Request to have the ATRC send out the link to their list serve – will relay this to Emily Abrahams
  - Can the PSR Workshop be added somewhere on the application? Suggestion on the Engineer’s Checklist
    - Caltrans reported that could be done and that will be added \*

## Leveraging

- Will add a box that if it is on Tribal Lands they will get the full Leveraging points \*
  - Do Tribes have to be the implementing agency to get points or can they just be a partner?
    - They have to be the implementer. If they are just partnering then realistically the other partner can bring in money
  - And this is for Large correct?
    - For the Medium and Large infrastructure applications
- Will add language from Guidelines to specify what can be leveraged to receive points to make it clearer for applicants
- There will also be an attachments section added to this question so there is some proof of commitment to leveraging the funds \*
  - Meeting minutes, board resolution, etc.
  - Rather a Letter of Commitment because it agrees that the City/County is committed to giving the money, but not as strict as a Resolution
    - These much easier to get a budget document
    - Staff comfortable with Letter of Commitment being used to show Leveraging

## California Conservation Corps

- The CCC is now requiring email 10 days before rather than 5 \*
- In addition, there is now a form that you will need to fill out \*

## Changes in Non-Infrastructure Application

- Question as to why in Part A “ROW Impact” is in the NI application

- Caltrans not sure and will look into this
- Staff asked Work Group if Non-Infrastructure should have “Attachments” added to the Public Participation Question
  - Add “Letters of Support and Supporting Documents” to “Attachments” section so that applicants don’t feel like they have to have it, but if they do they can attach it and reference it in their application \*
    - Support from Webinar – one agency had outreach attachments in a prior application and were not able to attach anything
    - Work group supports this addition

## Changes in Plan Application

- Same question as to why in Part A “ROW Impact” is in the Plan application as NI application
  - Caltrans not sure and will look into this for both
- Separating Question 4 into two questions: \*
  - Question #4: Implementation and Plan Development: Describe how the plan will lead to implementation of the identified projects. (10 points max)
  - Question #5: Plan Development: Complete the 22-PLAN (15 points)
  - Separating the two will allow us and Caltrans to see if evaluators are catching things in the 22-Plan that we want them to. NI has 22-R as its own so it is easier to analyze. This will help with future cycles knowing if more training and explanations need to be made to the application or scoring rubric
  - Workgroup had no objections
- Request to include in the Implementation that this will include “PSR Equivalent Level Work”

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.

<b>* Decisions Made During Visalia Workshop</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Decision Affects App?</b>
Deadline for <b>MPO Final</b> project programming recommendations to the Commission changed to April 2, 2021	Consensus Reached	1	No
Final language for projects being in an Active Transportation Plan for 2023 – Beginning with the 2023 Active Transportation Program, nominated projects that are included in an adopted active transportation plan or similar plan will be awarded points. Commission staff intend to develop the criteria for these points in consultation with the ATP workgroup during the guideline development process for the 2023 Active Transportation Program.	Consensus Reached	1	Yes – next Cycle

<b>* Changes to Application</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Page</b>
Plans that Agencies currently have – adding an “Other” check box where you can write in other types of Plans your agency has	Consensus Reached	2
Caltrans will look into adding a second part that says “Is your project in a Plan” underneath the original question	Decision Pending	2
Counts will be removed from the application because counts will only be required for funded projects	Consensus Reached	3
Screening Language Criteria language in Part A of the application	Consensus Reached	3
Healthy Places Index will be added as one of the 4 main categories that can receive 4 severity points	Consensus Reached	3
Median Household Income will also change to match the Guidelines and updated threshold	Consensus Reached	3
Increasing word count on Disadvantaged Communities narrative to 500 words each	Consensus Reached	3
Removal of requirement for agencies to get approval from CTC to use a Regional Definition	Consensus Reached	3
Will add Anti-Displacement language to Large, Medium, and Small infrastructure applications under Direct Benefit	Consensus Reached	4
Word change on Part A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destinations and key connectivity the project will achieve.</li> <li>• <del>Lack of connectivity</del></li> <li>• How the project will increase walking and or biking.</li> </ul>	Consensus Reached	4
Will add that applicants can use crowd-sourcing data such as Street Story as their data for this question	Consensus Reached	4
Increase Word Counts for parts B and C in Part B of the Safety question for the Large Infrastructure Application, double the words from 100 to 200 words	Consensus Reached	5
Increase the word count in the Large Infrastructure application on the Public Participation Question	Consensus Reached	5

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.



Adding “Describe how your project will transform the non-motorized environment? <b>Address the potential for this project to support existing and planned housing, especially affordable housing</b> ” To Transformative question in Large Infrastructure application	Consensus Reached	6
Scope and Plan Consistency points increase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large Infrastructure application 7 points (combining Scope and Plan Consistency and Cost Effectiveness)</li> <li>• Medium Infrastructure application 5 points</li> <li>• Small Infrastructure application 3 points</li> </ul>	Consensus Reached	6
PSR Workshop link will be added to the Engineer’s Checklist	Consensus Reached	6
Leveraging question will have a check box that if the project is on Tribal Lands the application will get the full Leveraging points for both Medium and Large Infrastructure applications	Consensus Reached	6
There will also be an attachments section added to the Leveraging question to show some commitment that funds will be leveraged that they say will be – Letter of Commitment is acceptable	Consensus Reached	6
The CCC is now requiring email 10 days before rather than 5	Consensus Reached	6
New form must be filled out when applicant reaches out to CCC	Consensus Reached	6
Changes “Letters of Support” in the Attachments section to “Letters of Support and Supporting Documents” for Non-Infrastructure applications. If project has outreach documents can attach them, but not required	Consensus Reached	7
Separating Question 4 into two questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Question #4: Implementation and Plan Development</u>: Describe how the plan will lead to implementation of the identified projects. (10 points max)</li> <li>• <u>Question #5: Plan Development</u>: Complete the 22-PLAN (15 points)</li> </ul>	Consensus Reached	7

\* Decision item. All items can be found on page 8-9.