

### Regional Active Transportation Program Evaluation Process

#### Call for Projects

The SACOG Regional Active Transportation Program (Regional ATP) concluded the call for projects on September 30, 2024. Here are the statistics:

- 13 projects were submitted by cities and counties to compete in SACOG's six-county 2025 Regional ATP
- 1 application was withdrawn from the Regional ATP due to ineligibility. This left 12 projects in the Regional ATP competition.
- 9 applicants had an overlap between their State and Regional applications
  - 5 kept the same scope with a reduced funding request and the remaining 4 projects competed with a reduced scope and funding request from their State ATP request
- The State ATP funding recommendation was released in October; no projects in the SACOG region were awarded. Given the reduced funding amount and SACOG's revised Regional ATP Policy Framework, no projects were carried over directly into SACOG's Regional ATP from the 2025 State ATP

#### Working Group Selection

Staff conducted targeted outreach to agencies covering all six counties. Without success in recruitment, SACOG put out a call for reviewers on the website and posted it to social media channels. Seven applications were received through this portal. SACOG staff then conducted another round of targeted outreach to areas within the region lacking representation. The final selection list was formed from outreach and the application process (see Attachment D for roster).

#### Project Screening

The Regional ATP Team—staff from El Dorado County Transportation Commission, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, and SACOG—screened the 12 submitted Regional ATP projects for eligibility to compete. All 12 projects were deemed eligible to compete either as submitted or with minor clarifications from the project sponsors. Following the screening, applications were shared with the Active Transportation Working Group (Working Group) in November for review.

#### Evaluation

Each project was scored by a minimum of eight members of the Working Group; Working Group members did not score or discuss projects for which they had a conflict of interest. Scores included the performance metrics of increasing biking and walking (45 points), increasing safety (20 points), cost effectiveness (5 points), reducing greenhouse gas emissions (10 points), supporting economic prosperity (10 points), and project readiness (5 points); working group members provided a score for the potential benefit to disadvantaged community member (10 points), but this metric was not included in the total score.

## Attachment F - Regional ATP Evaluation Process

The 10 points for disadvantaged community benefit was used to determine which projects should be counted towards the region's state-mandated minimum 25% investment in disadvantaged communities, and the region's goal of 40% investment in projects with a meaningful benefit for disadvantaged community residents. Projects that clearly and significantly demonstrated a meaningful benefit to disadvantaged community residents by meeting an important community need averaged 8 or more on this question, per the scoring rubric.

The Working Group met in October, December, and January to discuss projects and submit clarifying questions to the project sponsors. Staff emailed these questions to project sponsors, project sponsors emailed answers, and staff shared the responses with the Working Group. After reviewing these responses, each member of the Working Group submitted their evaluation for competing projects. Staff removed the highest and lowest scores, then averaged the remaining scores to develop each project's score. The average scores were used to develop an initial list of Regional ATP Scores for discussion.

### Ranking

The full working group reviewed the initial list of Regional ATP Scores and noted the top five projects that scored the highest and proposed them for further discussion. The Working Group discussed the five top-scoring projects to revisit strengths, weaknesses, and how project sponsors had answered the Working Group's questions. After the discussion, Working Group members had the option to re-score any of the discussed projects. Staff inputted revised scores, removed the outlying high and low scores, then averaged the remaining scores to develop the revised averages.

#### *Working Group Ranked Recommendation*

1. City of Sacramento - Northgate Boulevard Complete Streets (85.7)
2. City of West Sacramento - Sidewalks and Transportation Equity Program Implementation Project (Phase 1) (82.4)
3. Sacramento County - Whitney Avenue Road Diet and Multimodal Improvements (81.5)
4. Yolo County - SR 128/I-505 Interchange/Russell Blvd. - Active Transportation Program (76.4)
5. City of Woodland - City of Woodland Bike and Pedestrian Connectivity Project (72.0)
6. County of Yuba - Olivehurst Elementary – McGowan Parkway SR2S Project (70.1)
7. City of Galt - Emerald Vista Trail Pedestrian Crossing (60.3)
8. El Dorado County - Ponderosa Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (58.2)
9. City of Folsom - Folsom Boulevard Bicycle & Pedestrian Overcrossing (56.7)
10. City of Yuba City - El Margarita Road Safe Routes to School Project (55.3)
11. City of Lincoln - Lincoln Boulevard Streetscape Improvement Project Phase 4 (50.7)
12. County of Placer - Pedestrian and Bicycle Gap Closure - Folsom Recreation Area Project (48.7)

### Recommendation

The Working Group agreed to fully fund the top two projects and partially fund any remaining projects. The ranked funding recommendation could fully fund the two top-scoring projects with \$3,099,000,

## Attachment F - Regional ATP Evaluation Process

leaving \$821,000 to be distributed to the next two projects on the list. The Funding Recommendation is shown below.

### *Regional ATP Funding Recommendation*

1. City of Sacramento - Northgate Boulevard Complete Streets (85.7)
2. City of West Sacramento - Sidewalks and Transportation Equity Program Implementation Project (Phase 1) (82.4)
3. Sacramento County - Whitney Avenue Road Diet and Multimodal Improvements (81.5)
4. Yolo County - SR 128/I-505 Interchange/Russell Blvd. - Active Transportation Program (76.4)

The remaining Regional ATP projects form a ranked contingency list.

### *Ranked Contingency List*

1. City of Woodland - City of Woodland Bike and Pedestrian Connectivity Project (72.0)
2. County of Yuba - Olivehurst Elementary – McGowan Parkway SR2S Project (70.1)
3. City of Galt - Emerald Vista Trail Pedestrian Crossing (60.3)
4. El Dorado County - Ponderosa Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (58.2)
5. City of Folsom - Folsom Boulevard Bicycle & Pedestrian Overcrossing (56.7)
6. City of Yuba City - El Margarita Road Safe Routes to School Project (55.3)
7. City of Lincoln - Lincoln Boulevard Streetscape Improvement Project Phase 4 (50.7)
8. County of Placer - Pedestrian and Bicycle Gap Closure - Folsom Recreation Area Project (48.7)

## Project Sponsor coordination

Following the Working Group Regional ATP recommendation, SACOG staff reached out to Sacramento County to determine if they were able to use a partial award of \$821,000. Because Sacramento County was unable to fill the funding gap left between their total ATP request of \$1,089,000 and the \$821,000 we were able to offer and because the California Transportation Commission does not allow SACOG to recommend partial funding awards that would not yield a completed project phase, Sacramento County opted to receive \$452,000 to fully fund their design and non-infrastructure phases.

The remaining \$369,000 was offered to and accepted by Yolo County to fund their environmental phase. Their total request for this phase was \$388,000 and they have agreed to backfill the remaining amount. The funding recommendation and contingency list in Attachment A reflects these changes. Staff will work with Sacramento County and Yolo County to ensure this recommendation meets programming requirements from the CTC.