# 2025 Active Transportation Program (Cycle 7)



Central Coast Region Branch Workshop

December 12, 2023

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

# Program Goals



- Increase walking and biking
- Increase safety of non-motorized users
- Help regional agencies meet their SB 375 goals
- Enhance public health
- Ensure disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users

# Program Structure



- Competitive funding program
- Funds distributed into the 3 ATP components
  - 50% for the Statewide Component
  - 10% for Small Urban & Rural Component
  - 40% for Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Component
- \* SBCAG now falls in the MPO Component
- A minimum of 25% of funds in each of the 3 components must benefit disadvantaged communities

# **Application Types**



## Large Infrastructure or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure

- Total Project Cost of greater than \$10 million\*
- Large applications may apply for Pre-Construction phases only

#### Medium Infrastructure or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure

Total Project Cost of greater than \$3.5 million and up to \$10 million\*

#### Small Infrastructure or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure

Total Project Cost of \$3.5 million or less\*

### Non-Infrastructure Only

Education and Encouragement Activities

#### **Plans**

Community-wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan that encompasses disadvantaged community

<sup>\*</sup>Pending 2025 ATP Guidelines adoption in March 2024

# Eligible Applicants



- Local, Regional, or State agencies
- Caltrans
  - Caltrans can also partner with other eligible agencies
- Transit Agencies
- Natural Resources or Public Land Agencies
- Public Schools or School Districts
- Tribal Governments
- Private Nonprofit (recreational trail funding)

# Program Status



- Anticipate Approximately \$555,500 in Funding
  - \$100,000 fiscal years 2025-26 and 2026-27
  - \$177,750 fiscal years 2027-28 and 2028-29
- Six Cycles of Projects Selected for Funding
- Over 1,000 Projects Funded
- Most Provide Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities
- Almost 100% Delivery Rate
- All the Cycle 1 Projects are Completed or Under Construction

# Program Challenges



- Very Over Subscribed
  - Massive Community Need
  - Not Enough Funding
- Funding Requests are Getting Larger
- Ensure Program is Open to All Geographic Areas Across the State
- Program Funds all Project Phases
- Measuring Performance

## Highlights from the 2025 Guidelines



- Program Schedule
- Application Update Submittable
- Justice40 Initiative
- New Federal Tools
  - Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool
  - US DOT Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Explorer
- Quick-Build Program
- Policy Clarifications

# Santa Barbara County in the ATP



- Submitted 78 projects over six Cycles
- 31 projects have been funded overall (40% success rate):
  - 13 project funded through the Statewide component
  - 18 projects funded through the SUR component
- Average scores have gradually increased each cycle starting at a 63 in Cycle 1 and 87 in Cycle 6.
- Highest scoring application is a 98 from Cycle 6.

# Santa Barbara County in Cycle 6



- 9 applications submitted
  - 7 application was funded 78% success rate
    - 5 funded in the Statewide Component
    - 2 funded in the Small Urban & Rural Component
- General Feedback:
  - Did not address any concerns of displacement that may occur as a result of this project.
  - Great discussion of how the project will benefit disadvantaged communities throughout the entire application.
  - Non-Infrastructure element was thoroughly addressed in narrative responses and tied to need and safety.
  - More discussion of local health concerns is needed.

# San Luis Obispo County in the ATP



- Submitted 60 projects over six Cycles
- 10 projects have been funded overall (17% success rate):
  - 5 projects funded through the Statewide component
  - 5 projects funded through the SUR component
- Average scores have varied between cycles, but generally have stayed in the 60's, excluding Cycle 6 which was an 87.
- Highest scoring application is a 96 in Cycle 2.

# San Luis Obispo County in Cycle 6



- 5 applications submitted
  - 4 application was funded 80% success rate
    - 2 funded in the Statewide Component
    - 2 funded in the Small Urban & Rural Component
- General Feedback:
  - Application doesn't discuss disadvantaged community throughout.
  - More discussion of local health concerns is needed.
  - Safety/collision data was lacking. More details and context needed. How are collisions relevant to project? How are proposed improvements addressing safety concern?
  - Generally, applications make assumption that evaluators are familiar with the project areas and understand community context.

# Ventura County in the ATP



- Submitted 60 projects over six Cycles
- 25 projects have been funded overall (42% success rate):
  - 2 projects funded through the Statewide component
  - 23 projects funded through the MPO component
- Average scores have gradually increased, with the exception of Cycle 6.
- Highest scoring application is a 92 in Cycle 5.

# Ventura County in Cycle 6



- 10 applications submitted
  - 8 applications were funded 80% success rate
    - 1 funded in the Statewide Component
    - 7 funded in the MPO Component
  - 2 applications were deemed ineligible
- General Feedback:
  - Overall, Plans submitted did not score high. Narrative responses focused on the value of having a Plan and didn't explain concerns taking place in communities.
  - Active transportation needs of students was not discussed, even in cases where school is nearby project area.
  - Collision data needs more context. How are collisions relevant to the project? One application didn't attach correct collision map and did not respond to Part A.
  - Extensive public participation process.

# Remaining Central Workshops



• January 10, 2024 1:00pm – 4:00pm Applications Virtual • February 6, 2024 9:00am – 12:00pm Scoring Rubrics Virtual

## Thank You



## Contact Information

**Laurie Waters** 

Laurie.Waters@catc.ca.gov

Beverley Newman-Burckhard

Beverley.Newman-Burckhard@catc.ca.gov

Elika Changizi

Elika.Changizi@catc.ca.gov

**Active Transportation Program Website**