



2025 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

2025 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components

Investment in active transportation is critical to meet California's greenhouse gas reduction goals. The Commission's investments make the transportation system more sustainable, equitable, and safe. Active transportation projects can include comfortable bikeways, improved sidewalks, comprehensive networks, multi-use paths, safer street crossings, and streetscaping elements such as shade trees, benches, wayfinding signage, and bike racks. These projects improve quality of life, build healthier communities, connect neighborhoods, and allow Californians to access jobs, schools, community resources, and transit without using a car.

The Active Transportation Program is the state's only dedicated funding source for walking and biking projects. The program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation. The Budget Act of 2024, signed by the Governor on June 29, 2024, includes a \$400 million reduction to the \$1.049 billion one-time funding augmentation from the General Fund to the Active Transportation Program appropriated in the 2022 California State Budget. To maintain the programming commitments already made for the 2023 Active Transportation Program, the \$400 million reduction had to come from the programming capacity available for the 2025 Active Transportation Program. The \$400 million reduction leaves available funding for the 2025 program cycle at \$168.7 million.

With a reduced funding level of \$168.7 million, the Commission faced an unprecedented shortfall in funding for its most oversubscribed competitive program that is critical to meeting the state's climate, safety, and equity goals. The Commission received 277 project applications requesting \$2.5 billion in funds for the 2025 program cycle – about 15 times the \$168.7 million that is available. The budget agreement stipulates that the reduced \$400 million may be appropriated through legislative action in future years, however, the funding need for the program remains even greater. With such a large unmet need in the 2025 program cycle, the Commission will stand ready to make additional funding commitments should a future appropriation of funds occur.

The Active Transportation Program consists of three components: the Statewide component (50% of the funds), the Small Urban & Rural component (10% of the funds), and the large Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component (40% of the funds). The 2025 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components are attached as Attachments A and B, respectively. Please be advised that these are the staff recommendations only. The program of projects will not be finalized until the Commission adopts the program at its December 5-6, 2024, meeting. Projects located within the boundaries of one of the ten large MPOs (Fresno Council of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, and the Stanislaus Council of Governments) that were not selected in the Statewide component will be

considered for funding through the MPO component. Recommendations for the MPO component will be released on June 2, 2025, and considered by the Commission at its June 2025 meeting.

The 2025 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components are summarized below.

Statewide Component

- 9 projects worth \$110.534 million with \$84.35 million in Active Transportation Program funding.
- 100% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities.
- 5 projects are Safe Routes to School projects.

Small Urban and Rural Component

- 4 projects worth \$59.609 million with \$16.87 million in Active Transportation Program funding.
- 100% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities.
- 2 projects are Safe Routes to School projects.
- 1 project to fund a Native American Tribal Transportation Plan.

BACKGROUND

Applications to the 2025 Active Transportation Program were due on June 17, 2024. The California Transportation Commission (Commission) received 227 applications, which included –

- \$2.5 billion in total funding requests
- \$4.1 billion in total project costs

Additionally, 8 quick-build project applications were included in the received applications, totaling –

- \$6.7 million in funding requests
- \$7.2 million in project costs

The Commission recruited 98 volunteer evaluators, who were divided into teams of two individuals. Each team reviewed five to six applications and scored them based on the screening and evaluation criteria set forth in the Commission's adopted 2025 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. The evaluator teams consisted of active transportation stakeholders with a wide range of expertise and from a variety of organizations, including local government agencies, regional transportation planning organizations, state agencies, community-based organizations, and advocacy organizations. Evaluator teams provided scores based on consensus for each question within each application and were required to provide constructive comments on all score sheets. Concurrently, Commission staff scored each project application and compared the evaluator consensus score to the staff score, and Caltrans staff reviewed the applications for eligibility and deliverability. Once the evaluations were complete, Commission and Caltrans staff met with each evaluator team to discuss any scoring differences and significant technical issues.

Commission staff evaluated the quick-build project applications based on the project selection criteria outlined in Appendix D of the 2025 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. Caltrans staff reviewed the projects for eligibility, deliverability, and alignment with quick-build project materials and principles.

The Active Transportation Program uses a sequential project selection process based on the scores the project applications received during the evaluation process. The project recommendation scoring

threshold was 96 points for the Statewide component. There is not sufficient funding to fully fund all projects that achieved this scoring threshold. Therefore, consistent with the 2025 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, Commission staff used a secondary ranking system to choose which projects to recommend.

This secondary ranking consisted of first prioritizing project readiness and then prioritizing projects that scored the highest on Question 2 of the application – Potential for Increased Walking and Biking. The lowest secondary ranking project that scored a 96, the Stanislaus County Council of Governments', Church Street Mobility Enhancement Project, requested \$7.795 million in Active Transportation Program funds. However, only \$4.537 million in programming capacity remains in the Statewide component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available funding.

The project recommendation scoring threshold was 95 points for the Small Urban & Rural component. The lowest ranking project that scored a 95, the City of Visalia's, Goshen/Visalia Corridor Connection Project, requested \$34.608 million in Active Transportation Program funds. However, only \$2.636 million in programming capacity remains in the Small Urban & Rural component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available funding.

None of the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program project applications met the scoring threshold for the Statewide component. Therefore, no quick-build projects are recommended for funding.

**California Transportation Commission
2025 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1,000s)**

CTC Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Fund Request	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	PA&ED	PS&E	RW	CON	CON-NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-Salinas, City of-1	John Street/Williams Road Safe Routes to Schools Project and Programming	Monterey	\$ 9,955	\$ 7,954	\$ 1,650	\$ 550	\$ 5,754	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 500	\$ 50	\$ 5,754	\$ 1,500	Infrastructure + Non-Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	100
6-Madera, City of-1	Madera Citywide Safe Routes to School	Madera	\$ 7,756	\$ 6,201	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,201	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,201	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	99.5
6-Visalia, City of-2	Highland Community Connectivity Project	Tulare	\$ 7,194	\$ 5,470	\$ 520	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,950	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,950	\$ 520	Infrastructure + Non-Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	98
3-Grass Valley, City of-1	Wolf Creek Community and Connectivity Project	Nevada	\$ 16,300	\$ 12,990	\$ 195	\$ 1,700	\$ -	\$ 11,095	\$ 195	\$ 1,350	\$ 350	\$ 11,095	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	98
7-San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments-1	Safe Paths Pomona: At-Grade Pedestrian and Bike Safety	Los Angeles	\$ 26,158	\$ 20,162	\$ 8	\$ 2,001	\$ 18,153	\$ -	\$ 8	\$ 1,701	\$ 300	\$ 18,153	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	97.5
7-Inglewood, City of-1	Westchester/Veterans Station Multimodal Connection Project	Los Angeles	\$ 9,013	\$ 7,656	\$ 1,539	\$ -	\$ 6,117	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,539	\$ 6,117	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	97
6-Visalia, City of-4	Beyond Bike Lanes - Elevating Santa Fe Street	Tulare	\$ 14,424	\$ 11,390	\$ 520	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,870	\$ 520	Infrastructure + Non-Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	96.5
7-Los Angeles County-1	West Rancho Dominguez Walks: Providing Safer Access to Schools/Parks	Los Angeles	\$ 9,990	\$ 7,990	\$ 1,784	\$ -	\$ 6,206	\$ -	\$ 512	\$ 792	\$ 480	\$ 6,206	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	96
10-Stanislaus Council of Governments-1 [‡]	Church Street Mobility Enhancement Project	Stanislaus	\$ 9,744	\$ 4,537	\$ 321	\$ 973	\$ -	\$ 6,501	\$ 321	\$ 733	\$ 240	\$ 6,501	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	96
			\$ 110,534	\$ 84,350													

Notes
[‡]Stanislaus Council of Governments requested \$7,795 for the Church Street Mobility Enhancement Project. However, only \$4,537 in programming capacity remains in the the Statewide component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with the available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms	
CON:	Construction phase
DAC:	Project benefits a disadvantaged community
NI:	Non-infrastructure
PA&ED:	Project Approval & Environmental Document phase
PS&E:	Plans, Specifications & Estimates phase
R/W:	Right-of-way phase
SRTS:	Safe Routes to School project

**California Transportation Commission
2025 Active Transportation Program
Small Urban and Rural Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1,000s)**

CTC Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Fund Request	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	PA&ED	PS&E	RW	CON	CON-NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
9-Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley-1	Big Pine Paiute Tribal Active Transportation Plan	Inyo	\$ 251	\$ 251	\$ 251	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 251	Plan	Yes	No	95
1-Mendocino County-1	Covelo/Round Valley Safe Routes to School	Mendocino	\$ 6,181	\$ 6,181	\$ 220	\$ 880	\$ -	\$ 5,081	\$ 220	\$ 880	\$ -	\$ 5,081	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	95
9-Inyo County-1	Connecting Tecopa: Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Corridor	Inyo	\$ 9,877	\$ 7,802	\$ 791	\$ 1,632	\$ -	\$ 5,379	\$ 791	\$ 618	\$ 1,014	\$ 5,379	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	95
6-Visalia, City of-3 [‡]	Goshen Visalia Corridor Connection Project	Tulare	\$ 43,300	\$ 2,636	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,308	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,308	\$ 300	Infrastructure + Non-Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	95
			\$ 59,609	\$ 16,870													

Notes
[‡]The City of Visalia requested \$34,608,000 for the Goshen Visalia Corridor Connection Project. However, only \$2,636 in programming capacity remains in the Small Urban and Rural component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with the available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms	
CON:	Construction phase
DAC:	Project benefits a disadvantaged community
NI:	Non-infrastructure
PA&ED:	Project Approval & Environmental Document phase
PS&E:	Plans, Specifications & Estimates phase
R/W:	Right-of-way phase
SRTS:	Safe Routes to School project