ATP Central Workshop – Notes

San Jose, CA, February 19, 2020

Welcome / Introduction

- Commission Staff: Intros and basic overview on funding years, amounts, components and processes.
  - 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.
- Review of Central vs. Branch workshops and what we have done so far
- Updates on Workshop changes:
  - [PSR Equivalent Workshop Recording](#) is now posted
  - [Santa Barbara Workshop](#) time change

Program Schedule

- Commission staff reviewed the program schedule
  - Staff Recommendation postings updated to November 16, 2020 *
  - Management wanted this change to ensure that CTC Staff would have enough time to review and post the recommendations
    - MPOs concerned that two weeks have been taken away from their timeline, but no time was added to the back end and request CTC allow more time for MPOs

Decision(s) Made:
- Staff Recommendations posting changed from October 30 to November 16, 2020

Commission Staff Proposed Revisions

Leveraging – Final Language
- Language clarification throughout, along with review of addition that Tribes receive all leveraging points

Consistency with an Adopted Active Transportation Plan
- This requirement was taken out of current guidelines, however after working with the TAC, a compromise was added to the guidelines *
  - In 2023 ATP applicants who apply for large category will be encouraged to be consistent with a Transportation Plan or similar Plan*

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 6.

- By 2025 applicants applying for a Large project will be required to be consistent with an adopted Active Transportation Plan or similar Plan *****
- Discussion about adding specific types of plans rather than just having "and similar plans" in the guidelines (example: Local Roadway Safety Plan, Vision Zero Plan, High Injury Networks, etc.)
  - Santa Cruz, LA Metro, and MTC supportive of this
- Others felt ambiguity was fine as long as more specifics were put in 2023 ATP Guidelines
- Questions on if it being in an RTPA or MPO Plan would be enough. Many felt that would be beneficial for smaller communities that wouldn't be able to create their own Plan as easily
- Suggestions that if there is going to be a limit that projects must be in a Plan, then 2% cap for Plan funding should be removed
- Because Caltrans is already collecting this information that will be really useful to help with this going forward. This will help us decide how to nail down language for *next* cycle
  - Caltrans can have that information by the next Central Workshop on March 3

Healthy Places Index

- This has been taken out of the "Other" category and is now one of the main categories that can be scaled and given a severity score *****
  - SFMTA and SCAG both supportive of this decision
- Need to remove last line of Regional Definition in guidelines, CTC will not be approving the definitions
- Discussion on removing the Regional Definition because it is not a Statewide comparison.
- LA Metro suggested having someone from a third party to conduct an analysis with a working group to create something more statewide
  - Support for either looking for a new tool that can catch those that are left out of current tools
  - Others noted CTC should also look at current tools being used in other Programs successfully, such as the Housing and Transportation Affordability Index
  - CTC supportive of having a workgroup that can look into something for Cycle 6
- Santa Cruz, SFMTA both supportive of Regional Definition
- Cal Walks against anything that links the cost of living to disadvantage, which is what the Housing and Transportation Affordability Index does

Combine Scope and Plan Layout Consistency and Cost Effectiveness

- CTC proposed in the Large Projects combining with the Cost Effectiveness question and taking the points out of the Need to increase the total points to 10. The Medium and Small applications would then have 5 points for the Scope and Plan Consistency and those points would also be taken from the Need

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 6.

- - Support for this, especially since to submit the application an engineer must sign off, so nice to get points for it
- Question on what will trigger a loss in points on this question
    - Caltrans is looking for consistency in the entire package, so consistency between the narrative, the cost schedule, and the mapping. Consistency between cost, scope, and schedule
    - There is a slide in the [PSR Workshop PowerPoint](#) that sums up the three components applicants need (slide 17)
- Suggestion to only increase the Score and Plan Consistency points in the Large because it should be more fleshed out
    - Caltrans noted that the bulk of the projects are Small and Medium and therefore most of the scope changes are coming from those categories
    - In addition, the level Caltrans is looking for are not as high as other programs because the ATP funds all components
- Some did not want points to be taken from Need, however, consensus was not reached on where else to take points from
- Proposal of 7 points for the Large, 5 for Medium, and 3 for Small *
    - No opposition from this proposal in the room or from Webinar attendees
- Question about having Caltrans score the question rather than the evaluators and then at the phone calls they present their points for each project
    - Caltrans will be a part of the evaluation training to show evaluators what to look for and the phone call. Caltrans will be part of the project, but it will be more robust then just Caltrans scoring it.
- Scoring rubric will be updated to give more specifics on what would this would mean and what evaluators should look for

Caltrans Implemented Project Cost Increase
- CTC will consider a project cost increase **only** for Caltrans implemented projects *
- Opposition to this proposal from the workgroup:
    - Santa Cruz, MTC, LA Metro opposed
    - Holding Caltrans to a different standard and taking funds from future cycles is not in good faith with what all jurisdictions are facing
    - If the expectation is to have an accurate PSR, then it seems inconsistent to not have Caltrans be held to that standard, especially when points are being added to Scope and Plan Consistency
    - Seems like the rational is to be consistent with other SB 1 programs. But the other rational is that Caltrans doesn't have other funding options, but neither do plenty of other, especially small and poor, agencies and yet their projects fail when there is a cost increase.
- Workgroup liked that language was added to say that all other options have to be exhausted first, but still supportive of the change

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 6.

Decision(s) Made:

- In 2023 ATP applicants who apply for the Large category will be encouraged to be consistent with an adopted Active Transportation Plan. By 2025 ATP applicants applying for a Large project will be required to be consistent with an adopted AT or similar Plan.
- Healthy Places Index moved out of the Other category and able to receive the full 4 severity points
- Scope and Plan Consistency point change to: 7 points for the Large, 5 for Medium, and 3 for Small
- CTC will consider a project cost increase **only** for Caltrans implemented projects

Quick Build Program and Evaluation

- No minimum request fund for quick builds *
- Overview of language in Guidelines on Evaluation Process for Quick Build Pilot Program and what each of the criteria means
- One Evaluation component is "How will this quick-build project provide the foundation for a potential permanent infrastructure project". However, for some projects the Quick Build is the final project and how do we deal with that
  - Some felt this should be taken out of the evaluation process because what the Quick Build builds is enough and should be left
  - However, others pointed out that if a Quick Build becomes the permanent project, then it got funded for an ATP grant without going through the whole process and that it should have applied as a Small
  - Discussion on what makes Quick Builds different from a Small Infrastructure project:
    - Quick Builds are different because you are getting feedback throughout
    - A lot of Quick Build projects are smaller than the minimum request so without the different application they wouldn't be able to apply
    - Quick Builds also are made much quicker.
  - CTC will need to see what gets submitted. If this is an issue, it will be addressed for next cycle.
- Suggestion to add something along the lines of "How would the implementer evaluate it going forward?".
  - Collisions, speed changes, etc.
  - Emily and the ATRC are going to meet with UC Berkeley and Street Story Tool so you can set it up for your Quick Build project for reporting. This could be possible but wont know till meeting next week
  - If this is possible it could be added as a required reporting for Quick Builds
- Some advocated for the removal of $5 million maximum.
  - CTC does not want to make it too high because there are areas of the State that cannot compete in these and it seems like a set aside for urban areas

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 6.

- Smaller and rural areas also nervous about it going too high, because there are plenty of areas where they can't fund a Medium and can only do Smalls so don't want to take away too much from the Statewide
- Suggestion of increasing it to $7 million (like taking away one Medium project) – support for this in the room and no opposition from Webinar attendees
  - CTC will increase this to a maximum of $7 million but will keep the language that we reserve the right to fund none or only one *****
- Proposal to remove "Applicant's previous experience with quick-build project" because it will reduce the number of eligible applicants.
  - Counter that the goal is to have the Pilot be a success, and an agency's ability to show success with Quick Builds means a greater chance the Pilot will be
  - CTC agreed to take this out of the Evaluation Process *****
- Question from MPOs on whether or not they can fund them through their Regional Programs and CTC will ensure that it is clear that MPOs can put Quick Builds in their Regional Guidelines *****

Decision(s) Made:
- Quick Builds will not have a minimum request amount
- CTC will increase Quick Build funding to a maximum of $7 million but will keep the language that CTC reserves the right to fund none or only one
- "Applicant's previous experience with quick-build projects" will be removed from Evaluation Process for Quick Build Projects
- MPOs can fund Quick Builds out of their MPO component funds if it is in their Regional Guidelines

Other Discussions

- If the application has two build alternatives, how will the applicant have to deal with scope changes once the final design is chosen?
  - If the applicant choses one of the 2 alternatives that they discussed in their application, then no scope change would be needed. However, if the applicant chooses an alternative that is *not* one of the two or changes one of the two, then they would need to come in for a scope change
- In filling out application, you can only schedule phases once you have finished a previous phase. Is that something that can be addressed in the application?
  - The application was made "Smart" so that it wouldn't allow that. PSE and ROW should allow you to schedule those in the same fiscal years. The others the tool doesn't allow because it is to help stop applicants from creating unrealistic schedules.
  - Reminder that applicants can always request an advance, so if the project is ready it can be advanced

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 6.

* Decisions Made During San Jose Workshop	Status	Page	Decision Affects App?
CTC will post Staff Recommendations November 16, 2020	Consensus Reached	1	No
In 2023 ATP applicants who apply for the Large category will be encouraged to be consistent with an adopted Active Transportation Plan. By 2025 ATP applicants applying for a Large project will be required to be consistent with an adopted AT or similar Plan.	Decision Pending	1	Yes
Healthy Places Index moved out of the Other category and able to receive the full 4 severity points	Consensus Reached	2	Yes
Scope and Plan Consistency point change to: 7 points for the Large, 5 for Medium, and 3 for Small	Consensus Reached	3	Yes
CTC will consider a cost increase *only* for Caltrans implemented projects	Decision Pending	3	No
No minimum request fund for quick builds	Consensus Reached	4	Yes
CTC will increase this to a maximum of $7 million but will keep the language that CTC reserves the right to fund none or only one	Consensus Reached	5	No
"Applicant's previous experience with quick-build projects" will be removed from Evaluation Process for Quick Build Projects	Consensus Reached	5	Yes
MPOs can fund Quick Builds out of their MPO component funds if it is in their Regional Guidelines	Consensus Reached	5	No

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 6.