

ATP Central Workshop – Notes

San Diego, March 10, 2020

Welcome / Introduction

- Commission Staff: Intros, inspirational story, and basic overview on funding years, amounts, components and processes.

Workshop Schedule

- Workshops scheduled and Central Workshop Notes are available on the [ATP webpage](#) under the 2021 ATP Cycle 5 tab.
 - Final workshop March 11, 2020 in Santa Ana.

Program Schedule

- Review of Program Schedule
 - SANDAG – reminder for how call for projects will go under MPO component.
- Final ATP Guidelines will be adopted by California Transportation Commission on March 25, 2020.

Commission Staff Proposed Revisions

Active Transportation Plans

- Reminder of final language for projects being in an AT Plan: “Beginning with the 2023 Active Transportation Program, nominated projects that are included in an adopted active transportation plan or similar plan will be awarded points. Commission staff intend to develop the criteria for these points in consultation with the ATP workgroup during the guideline development process for the 2023 Active Transportation Program.”
 - This cycle a question was added to the application to ask *what* type of Plans they had and if their specific project was in a Plan. This will hopefully help inform for next cycle what kind of impact
 - Will this lead to more funding for Plans?
 - No, it still says that the Program will fund up to 2% to Plans

Scoring Rubric Changes

General Revisions

- Clarified Language and removed duplicative language
- Defined when extreme scoring (zeros or a perfect score) is appropriate
- Added new information on policy areas (housing, anti-displacement)
- Evaluators will score leverage for Medium and Large

Disadvantaged Communities

- CTC Staff will score Severity and Location in the Disadvantaged Communities question *
- Healthy Places added to one of the main qualifiers as DAC
 - Overview of the different ways to qualify as a DAC
- Addition of anti-displacement language into this question *
 - Key will be training evaluators to make sure they understand a lot of this is information gathering. The Program has done this with other areas to get applicants thinking about something before it becomes more prominent in the application
 - Want to encourage that evaluators are lenient and not penalize applicants for something that many have not adopted or worked with yet
 - Agreement that flexibility is appreciated with this question and scoring it
- Reminder that for next cycle displacement will most likely be a stronger aspect of the application due to the priorities of the current Administration
- Stronger language that all census tracts/schools are included in DAC data *
 - How does that work with the FRPM? Schools must be within a 2 mile radius; however applicants should be including the schools that will reasonably be using the project.
 - If there is an NI component with the Infrastructure component, all schools participating in the program should be included
 - If there is a Plan that is citywide but only has one DAC census tract, does it still qualify? Yes, but the severity score will be very low
 - If there are 2 schools, for example, and one qualifies but the other doesn't how does that work?
 - It will qualify as a DAC as long as one census tract or school qualifies as a DAC, however that will affect the severity score.
 - If a project is within multiple census tracts or HPI then do they include all of those? Yes
- Language on projects not located in the DAC it is benefitting *
- Providing documentation on how DAC was involved in the planning process *
- HPI Stratification on how points will work *
- Review of "Other" Criterion and scoring. Added language for Regional Definition and what the applicant should be including in their answer
 - If the project is touching the tribal land would it count?
 - If it is an agency that is maneuvering their project to touch a tribal land just for points, then no. The intent is that it is a Tribal project on Tribal lands, because those are some of the most disadvantaged areas in the State
 - Request for an overview of how CTC staff determined whether an application received 1 or 0 points for the Regional Definition
 - Overview of looking at the narrative, the applicants Regional Definition, and how their community being impacted qualifies under their Regional Definition
- SANDAG gave a reminder about their Regional Definition and where to find it

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

Need – Increase for Walking and Biking

- Review of how the question is broken up into Part A where the applicant explains the need for the project, and Part B where the applicant explains how the project will address the need
- Added language on applicant citing specific destinations and why those key destinations are important *
- Question on how it is appropriate to have the language “A project does not need to have, or create large numbers in order to cause great change to a community’s active transportation increases, and this can be reflected in the scores given to a project” in the Large application. Makes sense in the Small, but in the Large where it is larger requests, is this needed?
 - SRTS agrees with this in theory, however maybe change wording to talk about *percentage* of users rather than raw numbers. In a community that is small, an increase of 20 may not seem like a lot, but it is a large change percentage wise
 - SACOG okay with the current language and believes “large” numbers is relative
 - StanCOG thinks because of where this is in the application also supports leaving as is. Reminds evaluators to view it in response to the *area* rather than just the raw numbers.
 - SCAG agrees that it should be viewed as the potential for that location
 - MTC suggests to just change the language to encourage the evaluator to look at the geographic area of the project or the community need. The point is to look at this project as how it impacts the community.
 - AMBAG agreed that numbers are relative, and especially in small rural areas while there may not be a lot of numbers it is due to small communities, and they can still be impactful. In addition, rural projects are often more expensive since it is hard to get construction bids in those areas
 - SCAG and SRTS also agreed that costs can be higher in rural areas
 - LA Metro just thinks that it is in conflict with Increasing Walking and Biking
 - Agreement to combine and clarify the language to explain that evaluators should be looking at the geography and context of the project when judging increases in walking and biking *
- Added language to address the DAC if you are saying the project is benefitting the DAC *
- Review of added language on how to receive the students points of this question
 - LA Metro suggests scaling the student points of 0-1-2 rather than just 0 or 2
 - Are Students points still needed? Seems like it is not necessary anymore
 - It is in Statute that we should be looking at increasing the numbers of students so want to have this in the scoring rubric
 - In all the CTC site visits, Staff cannot think of one that couldn’t find a way to connect to or benefit students in some way
 - No strong support for changing these points – keeping student points as either 0 or 2

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

Potential to Increase Safety

- This is the question with the most changes/additions due to the fact that it is so data driven, which puts a big disadvantage to those with no safety data
- Added language to say applicant can explain why the project is being built despite the lack of collision data *
- Comment that 2 of the bullets with examples of why there are no collisions are not as clear (there is no bike/ped activity due to how unsafe it is or that communities don't report collisions)
 - StanCOG reminded that some communities don't report into SWITRS and this language covers that as well
 - LA Metro in support of the new language. Request to adding this language to the table below
- Added language saying that there are other ways to show the safety need (surveys, crowd-sourcing data, etc.) *
- SCAG suggests adding language on improving a systemic problem – “A systemic safety analysis identifying high risk features or typologies”
 - No opposition
- LA Metro suggest changing first bullet language “County/City Heat Map”. Want to see if it is the highest safety needs in the community – focus on the significance of the need. *
 - MTC supports this and no opposition so this change will be incorporated
- Language being clearer on the kind of data evaluators should be looking for
- Should applicants be allowed to include vehicle collisions since that could deter people from walking or biking?
 - It can be included in your argument, but not asking for those collisions
 - Want to ensure that the applicant is focused on the bicyclists and pedestrians
- No major changes to Part B and no opposition

Public Participation

- Insertion on difference between outreach and engagement in the Scoring Rubrics *
 - SRTS – agencies and applicants have said that a lot of agencies are cancelling public meetings due to the current coronavirus outbreak. There may be applicants that have been planning public meetings and events that may not have that ability now going forward
 - Fair point, but also don't want applicant using it as an excuse to not do public engagement
 - Can alert evaluators in training to take into consideration if the applicant notes that they wanted to do one final meeting that had to go online
 - ❖ AMBAG agrees with this sentiment since the situation is so fluid
- Looking for engagement that is recent
 - SCAG thinks “recent” should be defined since it is being called out. Things can change very quickly and “recent” doesn't necessarily encapsulate that
 - Request to remove recent since it is hard to come up with what “recent” is. In different situations recent is different

- Some noted that there should not be an expiration date on how recent the Plans should be
 - SCAG suggests changing “recent” to “continued” – stakeholders support
- Added language to consider the attachments and disadvantaged communities engagement *
- Emphasized language that outreach and engagement should be appropriate for the magnitude of the project *
- “The magnitude to which the project represents a high local-community vs. regional priority.” Make this how it is in the scoring box so the two are consistent – no opposition

Context Sensitive

- Added language to make it clearer to evaluators that they need to evaluate both part A and B *

Transformative

- Added language to address housing in the scoring rubric *

Leveraging

- Has not changed, simply added language from the Guidelines to make it clearer what Leveraging can be used for points

Cost Effectiveness & Scope and Plan Consistency

- Cost Effectiveness will be combined with the Scope and Plan Consistency so this question will be folded in to Question 8
- Now will be 0-7 points for Large, 0-5 points for Medium, and 0-3 for Small applications
 - Reminder that there was a workshop on how an application should be a PSR equivalent and the [PowerPoint](#) and [Recording](#) are both posted on the [CTC ATP website](#).
- Added language, in conjunction with Caltrans, on how applicant is being scored *
- LA Metro asked if more information from the Workshop could be added before the point boxes
 - Caltrans agreed to add more verbiage to this section
 - The PSR Presentation link was added to the Engineer’s Checklist so it can be accessed by applicants as well
- Do the Guidelines reflect the new changes to the score?
 - Yes, the newest Guidelines will be posted on Friday
- More information on what makes maps good?
 - Engineer’s Checklist does have this information, but Caltrans can also add more information
- Do we want evaluators scoring this? Or should Caltrans score this?
 - Because every point counts in the application it puts a lot of pressure on Caltrans and puts them in a difficult position.
 - However, CTC Staff and Caltrans staff will meet with every team and discuss this question for the applications. If the evaluators gave them a 7 and Caltrans can’t

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

tell what is even going on, that can be discussed with the evaluators. However, the score will come from evaluators.

- SACOG against combining Cost Effectiveness with Engineer's Estimate. Don't think Cost Effectiveness should be nested under the Engineer's Estimate.
 - Caltrans feels that these are both tied together and that they should match
 - SCAG suggesting put it in the Evaluating Layouts and Maps since that is where applicants are proposing the project and where they should be defending the components
 - This will be looked at by Caltrans and CTC
- Suggestion to add a Risk Assessment of Scope for Scope assessment
 - Do not look at all components in the "Project Schedule"
- How will Planning vs. Design element costing be compared?
 - Currently if you have a Plan or NI project, the 22-R and 22-Plan gets evaluated. When it is an Infrastructure/NI it is folded into the whole package
 - The Engineer's Estimate has not changed and the level applicants are asked to be displayed has not changed. There are descriptions on what can be lump sums and what cannot. Most applications are providing enough detail, some do use lump sum extensively, but for the most part the estimates received would be able to get the points in this breakdown

Changes in Non-Infrastructure Application

- Request to add language to make it clear that sustainability does not just mean having a stream of money *
- No opposition
- Question to work group on if there should be a change in the Public Participation breakdown
 - StanCOG likes current split because 5 points is for past and 10 is for continuing
 - No support to change, so scoring will stay as is

Changes in Plan Application

- Question to work group on if there should be a change in the 22-Plan scoring breakdown
 - Don't think that there needs to be changes since they all influence each other
 - AMBAG and StanCOG supportive of existing scoring for Plans
- In the Plan submittal can Construction documents be tied in?
 - Very preliminary work is allowed, but that is it. Not even environmental

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

* Changes/Additions to Scoring Rubrics	Page
CTC Staff will score Severity and Location in the Disadvantaged Communities question	2
Addition of anti-displacement language into Disadvantaged Communities question	2
Stronger language that all census tracts/schools are included in DAC data	2
Language on projects not located in the DAC it is benefitting	2
Language on providing documentation on how DAC was involved in the planning process	2
HPI Stratification added	2
Need Question – Added language on applicant citing specific destinations and why those key destinations are important	3
Need Question – Agreement to combine and clarify the language to explain that evaluators should be looking at the geography and context of the project when judging increases in walking and biking	3
Need Question – Added language to address the DAC if you are saying the project is benefitting the DAC	3
Safety Question – Added language to say applicant can explain why the project is being built despite the lack of collision data	4
Safety Question – Changing first bullet language “County/City Heat Map”	4
Public Participation Question – Insertion on difference between outreach and engagement in the Scoring Rubrics	4
Public Participation Question – Added language to consider the attachments and engagement with disadvantaged community being impacted	5
Public Participation Question – Emphasized language that outreach and engagement should be appropriate for the magnitude of the project	5
Context Sensitive Question – Added language to make it clearer to evaluators that they need to evaluate both part A and B	5
Transformative Question – Added language to address housing in the scoring rubric	5
Cost Effectiveness and Scope and Plan Consistency combined in Question 8. Added language, in conjunction with Caltrans, on how applicant is being scored	5
Non-Infrastructure – will add language to make it clear that sustainability does not just mean having a stream of money	6