ATP Central Workshop – Notes

Stockton, CA December 17, 2019

Welcome / Introduction

- Commission Staff: Intros and basic overview on funding years, amounts, components and processes.
    - The naughty and nice elves will be the peacekeepers
    - Commission staff engagement principals and working group process

Workshop Schedule

- Workshops scheduled are available on the ATP webpage under the 2021 ATP Cycle 5 tab.
- Central vs. Branch workshops
    - Central workshops:
        - Will be held in typical locations
        - Decision making takes place and will carry forward to the next workshop
        - Working group can expect to come
    - Branch workshops:
        - Will be held in different parts of the State we don't usually hold workshops
        - Discuss what each community/area would like to talk about; freeform discussion
        - More directed towards participants who are unable to travel to Central workshops

Program Schedule

- Commission staff reviewed the program schedule; no changes have been made since the last workshop.
- Staff is proposing the MPO optional guidelines be due to the Commission by April 17, 2020. *
    - Comments:
        - The April 17th date worked for most, however SCAG requested an additional week or two be added. April 24th was suggested, but this date conflicts with the Commission book items deadline, therefore this will be further discussed at the next Central Workshop.

Decision(s) Made:

- MPO optional guidelines submission date to the Commission has not yet been decided on.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.

Commission Staff Proposed Revisions

Leveraging Funds

- This section may change a bit more for clarification purposes, as this section can be confusing.
- Matching funds are not required in the Program; however, we do give points for leveraging funds – bringing in other funds to the project for the Medium and Large Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure applications.
- Leverage funds can be from phases that you are not applying for; meaning if local funds were used towards the Environmental and application is for Construction work, that can count that as leverage.
- Per the guidelines, STIP funds can be used for leveraging. It was suggested that LPP Formulaic funds would also be a useful source of leveraging; Staff will look into this.
- A suggestion from Johnathan Matz at Safe Routes to Schools, applications submitted by tribes should automatically get the leverage points because they don't have access to a lot of other funding sources. *
    - Commission staff is supportive of this and will include it in the guidelines for this next cycle.

Quick-Build Projects

- Currently, there is a placeholder in the guidelines for the Quick-Build projects, because staff would like to make them eligible for the Program. There is a subgroup to work through some issues and to help come up with appropriate language. The first meeting will take place Thursday, December 19th. As soon as staff has language put together, it will be presented to everyone.
- Staff may include an additional appendix for the Quick-Build projects to further explain to make sure it is clear.

Small Project Application Size

- Commission Staff is proposing to change the Small Application size; it was previously projects with a total cost of less than $1.5 million, but now we are changing it to a total project cost of $2 million or less. *
- We did this to address increasing costs over time, and also because it's a bit of a compromise with the points on the medium leveraging. Small Project Applications do not get points for leveraging, however there will be more projects that can qualify to use the Small Project Application.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.

Disadvantaged Communities Definition

- Commission staff is proposing moving the Regional Definition under the "Other" section. *
    - Any applications submitted that uses the "Other", staff will review and score the DAC question instead of the evaluators.
    - Comments:
        - Majority of participants were in favor of this decision, however there was some concern about the transparency of Regional Definitions being submitted through the "Other" criteria, and advocates being unable to view the definitions prior to submittal of applications.
        - It was suggested that applicants who intend to use a Regional Definition submit a short proposal prior to the application deadline, to allow for a review committee to review and accept it.
            - Staff has some concern with this approach as it may be difficult to come to a consensus within the review committee.
        - A concern mentioned is advocates no longer having the ability to see the Regional Definitions prior to Commission Staff awarding points to ensure an accurate definition is being used.
            - Should staff give DAC points to an application that stakeholders think should not have received them, a comment can be made at the Commission meeting.
            - Staff will have a process in place for reviewing the Regional Definitions; as long as this process has been followed, then staff will support and make recommendations to management.
        - It was suggested that applicants who use the Regional Definition provide proof that their definition is used towards other planning purposes since this is a requirement in the guidelines. This may be used to address the concern above.
            - Staff will strongly consider asking for this detail this upcoming cycle.
- Commission staff would like to expand the "Other" criteria by adding the Healthy Places Index as an additional option to qualify as DAC. *
    - Staff will put the criteria for the Healthy Places Index in the Guidelines to show where applicants have to fall in the Index to qualify as a DAC.
    - Comments:
        - There was some concern with adding the Healthy Places Index as another suggested metric if it possibly overlaps with CalEnviroScreen.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.

Performance Metrics

- Commission staff is proposing applicants do not need gather performance metric data unless the project is funded. *
    - The reason for this is because only a third of the applications submitted last cycle were funded.
    - There are two things staff will be focusing on:
        - Counts; staff posted the Interim Count Guidance which includes a good methodology for how to do counts.
            - Counts must be submitted using the Interim Count Guidance. Staff hasn't decided on a deadline of when these should be submitted; however, it should be within 2 months of programming and before coming in for an allocation.
        - Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program Benefits Calculator Tool; this gives outputs such as VMT/GHG Reduction and will only work for new facilities and bike shares.
            - Commission staff will take care of inputting the values on behalf of applicants whose projects are applicable to the Tool.
            - Staff may have to ask for more data to ensure necessary detail is available to input. (i.e. number of destinations within a quarter of a mile and half of a mile from the project location).
        - These will not be scored on at all, these are only to show the benefits we are achieving out of the Program.
    - Comments:
        - There was some concern with gathering data within the 2-month timeline mentioned in the guidelines as, it takes place during winter season, and there will be rain or snow which will not allow for much walking or biking. Similarly, with the MPO adoption in May, most kids will be out of school, therefore, they won't be walking or biking either. The best time frame would be six months after being programmed.
            - Staff hasn't worked everything out, the 2-month period is only a placeholder in the draft guidelines. Staff will discuss further with Caltrans.
            - The Active Transportation Resource Center has a Count Loan Program; should any applicant need it, equipment can be borrowed from the ATRC.
        - It was suggested to take a look at the HSIP Program which uses the California Local Roadway Owner's Manual. It includes a table of countermeasure benefits that are already quantified. If a project

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.

installs a sidewalk or lighting in an intersection, you get a x% of crash reduction modification factor.

- Caltrans' ATRC is working with SafeTREC on using the TIMS tool to do a before and after safety performance measure based on reported crash data.

Decision(s) Made:

- Applications submitted by tribes automatically receive the leverage points.
- Small Project Application total project cost cap changed to $2 million or less.
- Regional Definition option will be moved under the "Other" section.
- Expand the "Other" criteria by adding the Healthy Places Index.
- Only funded project to gather and provide performance metric data (Counts and AHSC Tool).

Future Workshop Discussions

Housing Considerations

- All of the SB 1 Competitive Programs are looking at ways that they can consider housing in their guidelines, and how applicants should be thinking about housing as they apply.
- Staff would like to propose adding something about housing to the Transformative question. It would only be answered by projects that use the Large Infrastructure application. *
    - Applicants will possibly address the potential for their project to support existing and planned housing, especially affordable housing, and will also discuss how housing is being thought of or looked at in terms of the project.
    - Comments:
        - There were no comments or objections to including something about housing to the Transformative question.
- Commission staff considered adding housing in Appendix A on the guidance for plans applications, so it would be consistent with local or regional transportation, air quality, housing or energy conservation plans. Staff added to the end of this section "…not limited to general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan and local or regional housing plans or process improvements that are adopted or in development". On page 37 the footer links this to SB 2 Planning Grant Program Funding or Local Early Action Planning Grant funding through the HCD; and that would only be for plan applications.
- Staff also thought about having this be a part of the Need question, however felt the Transformative question is a good place to test it out.

Evaluation Process

- We will discuss at the Watsonville (January 6th) Central Workshop.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.

- Commission staff would like to set a teleconference meeting with each evaluator team to go over their application scores. Staff would like to include a Caltrans representative, to allow Caltrans to provide insight into anything that they're seeing (i.e. major deficiencies in the project).

Quick-Build Language

- Staff is hoping to have language written out in this section by the Watsonville workshop date.
- Caltrans will discuss some of what is in the guidelines; the application needs to be a project study report equivalent. Jaime was going to talk about some of the issues that Caltrans sees, and how applicants can do better on making sure that the applications reach that level of project study report equivalent.

Point Allocation Under Scoring Criterion

- Commission Staff included a table breakdown of how the scoring will be done by question in the draft guidelines. *
    - Comments:
        - There was a concern raised with the Quick-Build projects which would fall into the Context Sensitive & Innovative but also probably in Small, and there aren't any points available there.
            - Staff will consider changing this.
- The Transformative, Sustainability and Context Sensitive & Innovation questions were test questions last cycle that did well; therefore, staff is thinking about increasing the points there.
- Staff had considered lessening the points in the Safety question, but the working group wanted to keep them points; therefore it will stay as is.
- When looking at all of the Infrastructure applications, the bulk of the points are under the Need, so that is where staff would move out some of the questions and move them under the Context Sensitive or Transformative Large and Medium.
    - Staff is unsure where to move the 53 points for the Need under the Small application; possibly add it under the Safety or somewhere else.
- The challenge is that the Program does allow funding for pre-construction, so Caltrans staff understands that the quality and level of detail in these plans is not going to reach the level of a PS&E package. What Caltrans staff wants to see is some clarity in the layout, scope and engineering estimate; that they all tie together and that they reflect what the evaluators are giving points on. The goal is to get to a point where an application's layout sheet correctly depicts what is written verbally in the application.
- Caltrans staff will not be checking for Right of Way mapping to ensure applicants have room for the project in the area. If a project has a small facility with limited constraints and the applicant knows ROW is needed, staff will look for a ROW phase in the PPR stating funds being requested or have funds to clear the ROW

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.

to build the project; Caltrans staff wants to ensure the agency is acknowledging that there is a ROW need and that it is accounted for in their schedule and cost.

Decision(s) Made:

- Housing to be included as an unscored question under the Transformative question for Large Infrastructure applications only has yet to be decided on.
- Table breakdown of scoring criteria has yet to be decided on.

* **Decisions Made During Stockton Workshop**	**Status**	**Page**	**Decision Affects App?**
Large MPO's to submit optional guidelines to Commission by April 17, 2020	Decision Pending	1	
Applications submitted by tribes automatically receive the leverage points	Consensus Reached	2	Yes
Small Project Application total project cost cap changed to $2 million or less	Consensus Reached	2	Yes
Regional Definition option will be moved under the "Other" section	Consensus Reached	3	
Expand the "Other" criteria by adding the Healthy Places Index	Consensus Reached	3	
Only funded project to gather and provide performance metric data	Consensus Reached	4	Potentially to Part A of App.
Housing to be included as an unscored question under the Transformative question	Decision Pending	5	
Table breakdown of scoring criteria	Decision Pending	6	

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 7.