ATP Central Workshop – Notes

Watsonville, CA January 6, 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

Program Schedule

- Commission staff reviewed the program schedule
  - Project Applications deadline (postmark date) updated to June 15, 2020
- Staff is proposing the MPO optional guidelines be due to the Commission by April 17, 2020. *
  - SCAG reported that it could meet the April 17 deadline

Decision(s) Made:

- ATP schedule finalized for draft guidelines

Review of Previous Decisions

Leveraging Funds

- Is there a list of different funding sources that are available and allowed for Leveraging points?
  - Generally funding that is *not* programmed from the CTC aside from STIP funding.
  - Staff will look into allowing LPP funding for leveraging
- Can SHOPP funds count for Leveraging? *
  - We haven't in the past, but will consider it and be very clear in the Guidelines
- Can a project funded previously through ATP for pre-construction get leveraging points when they apply for construction? *
  - Could be a way to prioritize and give advantage to previously programmed projects
  - Helps move forward projects that CTC has already invested in

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

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 5.

through some issues and to help come up with appropriate language. Staff is still working on language for this section.

- Is the goal of quick-build projects that an agency apply for future funding for the permanent project? Staff replied yes, that is the goal.
- Can a list of Caltrans approved equipment and materials be posted so applicants know what can receive funding?
  - o There are resources available that have supply lists. CTC can include links to resources in the guidelines.
- Staff may only have CTC staff read these and choose 1-2 as pilot programs to see if these are feasible and competitive in this program. May fund two this cycle, one from the North and one from the South
  - o Can MPOs fund Quick Build projects?
    - ▪ Will address that in the Guidelines

Small Project Application Size

- Commission Staff reviewed increase to Small Application total project cost to $2 million, which was discussed at the last Central workshop. No further comments or questions.

Disadvantaged Communities Definition

- Commission staff reviewed decision from last Central workshop to move the Regional Definition under the "Other" section.
  - o Any applications submitted that uses the "Other", staff will review and score the DAC question instead of the evaluators.
- Metro would like to only see Regional Definition stay in the 2021 Cycle and for CTC to develop one metric that can compare areas Statewide for Cycle 6.
  - o One person supported having a universal metric for Regional Definition.
- CTC allowing cost of living metric?
  - o Looked into it but did not see much difference from the metrics already there, so did not add this. Agreement from workgroup.
- Staff added the Healthy Places Index to the Guidelines as another option in the "Other" criteria.
  - o No comments or questions.

Performance Metrics

- Review of metrics that will be required of programmed projects only.
- SCAG asked that Staff remember that MPO will be adopted in May 2021, which will be in the summer, and to take that into account when writing guidelines for counts.
  - o This will be considered in the guidelines and the Interim Count Guidance.
  - o Remember SRTS in the window of allowable times for counts. School is out in the summer.
  - o Allowable times for counts are included in the Count Guidance.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 5.

Housing & Anti-Displacement
- Housing considerations will only be included in the Large application under the Transformative question. Will go over this more when talking about the application. *****
  - This will be scored and guidance will be included in the Scoring Rubric.
- Anti-Displacement policies and considerations will be a prompt in the Disadvantaged Communities question. *****

Decision(s) Made:
- Housing considerations will receive points as a part of the Transformative question in Large application only.
- Anti-Displacement will be a part of the Disadvantaged Community narrative question.

Commission Staff Proposed Revisions

Evaluation Process
- CTC Staff gave an overview of the current evaluation process.
- Proposed changes to the evaluation process:
  - Comments are required on all consensus score forms submitted from evaluator teams. *****
    - Added to the guidelines and CTC staff will stress this more in trainings, as well as go into more detail as to what are good, constructive comments for applicants.
  - **All** teams will have a phone debrief with both CTC and Caltrans staff to review scores. *****
  - Comments:
    - Thank you for going over the evaluation process so thoroughly.
    - Question as to why consensus score forms are submitted instead of individual score forms.
      - ❖ Want evaluators to come to consensus scores by question to encourage more thorough discussion. Also, all evaluators are anonymous, so applicants don't know who scored their project.
    - Request for evaluator teams to receive less applications (currently receiving between 10-11).
      - ❖ CTC Staff try to keep number low, but depends on number of evaluator volunteers and applications submitted.
    - Suggestions to have teams of 3-5 people.
- CTC taking volunteers for reviewers now. Contact CTC staff to get your name on the volunteer list.

Scoring Rubrics
- Request to have scoring rubrics posted before the call for projects begins, currently guidelines say they will be posted before application is due.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 5.

- o CTC Staff will work to make that happen.
- o Scoring Rubric will hopefully go through the TAC, then the work group, and then post the final.
- o Can examples of great, good, and bad answers be included?
  - ▪ CTC staff will take into consideration.
- CTC Staff would like to add points to Scope and Plan Consistency. *
  - o Comments:
    - ▪ People liked having more points for agencies putting more effort in, however multiple agencies noted that it may put smaller and DAC agencies at a bigger disadvantage since they don't have the staff or resources.
    - ▪ There is no question in the application, so locals struggle to gauge how many points they will get or how they will ensure they will receive full points. Will application include a narrative or more direction?
    - ▪ Add more points to Public Participation process instead since that should have included going out and doing a site review and planning with the community?
    - ▪ Where would the points come from? And how many would it be?
      - ❖ Probably take points from Need or Safety.
      - ❖ 10 points not going over well, what about 5 points?
      - ❖ Opposition from taking from the Safety question.
      - ❖ Opposition from taking from the Need question.
    - ▪ Suggestion to bring this up at Branch workshops and see if small agencies think this is reasonable for them.
    - ▪ What about making Scope a negative score like Past Performance?
    - ▪ Ask to not change in Cycle 5, have more educational workshops such as the PSR workshop, and then make change for Cycle 6.
    - ▪ Ask about different weighting for Small, Medium, and Large apps.
      - ❖ CTC Staff suggested increasing the points for only Large.
- Request to decrease Cost Effectiveness or take it out. *
  - o It is in statute as something that must be scored on, so cannot take out.
  - o Suggest combining Cost Effectiveness with Scope/Plan Consistency.
    - ▪ This would make that question a total of 10 points (5 for Cost Effectiveness and 5 for Scope and Plan Consistency).
- Discussion about taking points from Need and moving to Public Participation.
  - o No consensus – would really narrow Need question and Need and Safety are the main goals of the program.
- Transformative points → CTC Staff wants to increase them but would have to take from Need. *
  - o Has CTC thought about adding Transformative question to Small and Medium Infrastructure applications?
    - ▪ Support for adding to Medium application, opposition to putting in Small application.

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 5.

- - Suggestion to fold it into the Need question in the Small and Medium application that will give insight into if these will be good answers and worth adding to the application as its own question in Cycle 6.
- Concern that Need and safety questions are too duplicative.
  - CTC Staff will work on language in the application and scoring rubric to try and reduce redundancy.

Decision(s) Made:
- Comments are required on all consensus score forms submitted from evaluator teams.
- All teams will have a phone debrief with both CTC and Caltrans staff to review scores.

* Decisions Made During Watsonville Workshop	Status	Page	Decision Affects App?
Large MPO's to submit optional guidelines to Commission by April 17, 2020	Consensus Reached	1	No
Leveraging Points for SHOPP funds	Decision Pending	1	Yes
Leveraging points for projects previously funded through ATP	Decision Pending	1	Yes
Housing to be included under the Transformative question	Consensus Reached	3	Yes
Anti-Displacement to be included under the Disadvantaged Community question	Consensus Reached	3	Yes
Comments required on all consensus score forms	Consensus Reached	3	No
All evaluator teams have phone debrief with CTC and Caltrans Staff	Consensus Reached	3	No
Table breakdown of scoring criteria	Decision Pending	3	Yes
Increase Points to Plan and Scope Consistency	Decision Pending	4	Yes
Combine Cost Effectiveness and Plan and Scope Consistency questions	Decision Pending	4	Yes
Adding Transformative to Need question in Medium and Small Infrastructure applications	Decision Pending	4	Yes

* Decision item. All items can be found on page 5.