

Regional Active Transportation Program Evaluation Process

Call for Projects

The SACOG Regional Active Transportation Program (Regional ATP) concluded the call for projects on September 29, 2022. Cities and counties submitted 33 projects to compete in the six-county 2023 Regional Active Transportation Program. Twenty-two projects were carried over from the 2023 State ATP. Eleven projects were submitted to the Regional ATP only. Four projects competed with a reduced scope and funding request from their State ATP request, applying for a reduced segment in the Regional ATP. These factors seem to be in acknowledgement of the increase of state funds to the overall program, with the 2023 Regional ATP cycle award of \$45,512,000 representing the largest program call in the history of the program..

The State ATP funding recommendation was released in October; the seven SACOG region projects submitted that were recommended for State ATP funding were then removed from the Regional ATP competition. One application was withdrawn from the Regional ATP due to scope ineligibility. This left 25 projects in the Regional ATP competition.

Screening

The Regional ATP Team—staff from El Dorado County Transportation Commission, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, and SACOG—screened the 25 submitted Regional ATP projects for eligibility to compete. All submitted 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 early January for review.

Evaluation

Each project was scored by seven 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.

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 November, 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 five scores to develop each

project's average score. The average scores—rounded to whole numbers—were used to develop an initial list of Regional ATP Scores for discussion..

Ranking

The Regional ATP Team of SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA reviewed the initial list of Regional ATP Scores and noted the top 11 projects that scored the highest and proposed them for further discussion. The Working Group were asked to propose additional projects for discussion, but formed a consensus on not adding any additional projects for discussion. The Working Group discussed the eleven 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. The Working Group used the revised average scores to identify a ranked funding recommendation for the Regional ATP.

Working Group Ranked Recommendation

1. Elk Grove - Laguna Creek Inter-Regional Trail Crossing at State Route 99 (score 83)
2. Citrus Heights - Arcade Cripple Creek Extension (score 81)
3. Roseville - Dry Creek Greenway East Trail, Phase 2 (score 81)
4. El Dorado County - El Dorado Trail / Missouri Flat Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing (score 79)
5. Sacramento County Regional Parks - Dry Creek Parkway Trail (score 78)
6. Sacramento County DOT - Bell Street Safe Routes to School (score 78)
7. Sacramento - 9th Street Separated Bikeway Project (score 77)
8. West Sacramento - West Capitol Avenue Regional Connection Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Improvements (score 77)
9. Folsom - Folsom-Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project (score 76)
10. West Sacramento - North 5th Street Complete Streets & Connectivity Project (score 76)
11. Citrus Heights - Old Auburn Road Complete Streets - Phase I (score 74)

Recommendation

The ranked funding recommendation could fully fund the eight top-scoring projects with \$43,174,000, leaving \$2,338,000 to be distributed to the two projects tied at 76 points. The Working Group agreed to fully fund the top eight projects and the Folsom - Folsom-Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project and recommended a partial award of the remaining \$638,000 of funds to West Sacramento - North 5th Street Complete Streets & Connectivity Project. The Funding Recommendation followed is shown below.

Regional ATP Funding Recommendation

1. Elk Grove - Laguna Creek Inter-Regional Trail Crossing at State Route 99 (score 83)
2. Citrus Heights - Arcade Cripple Creek Extension (score 81)
3. Roseville - Dry Creek Greenway East Trail, Phase 2 (score 81)
4. El Dorado County - El Dorado Trail / Missouri Flat Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing (score 79)
5. Sacramento County Regional Parks - Dry Creek Parkway Trail (score 78)
6. Sacramento County DOT - Bell Street Safe Routes to School (score 78)

7. Sacramento - 9th Street Separated Bikeway Project (score 77)
8. West Sacramento - West Capitol Avenue Regional Connection Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Improvements (score 77)
9. Folsom - Folsom-Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project (score 76)
10. West Sacramento - North 5th Street Complete Streets & Connectivity Project– partial funding recommendation/remaining available funding (score 76)

The remaining Regional ATP projects form a ranked contingency list. Tied projects are ranked based on first their score under the metric of “improving safety”, then on the metric of “increasing biking and walking”.

Ranked Contingency List

1. West Sacramento - North 5th Street Complete Streets & Connectivity Project– remaining funding need (score 76)
2. Citrus Heights - Old Auburn Road Complete Streets - Phase I (score 74)
3. Sacramento - 24th Street Reconfiguration Project (score 73)
4. Folsom - Historic District Connectivity Project (score 73)
5. Yuba County - Hammonton-Smartsville Road Project (score 69)
6. Rancho Cordova - Active Transportation Plan (score 69)
7. Sacramento - Pedestrian Crossings Improvement Project (score 68)
8. Yuba City - Yuba City Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Improvements (score 65)
9. Yolo County - County Road 98 Bike & Safety Improvement Project Phase II (score 64)
10. Southeast Connector JPA - White Rock Class I Trail (score 61)
11. Woodland - Woodland Safe Routes to School & ATP Connectivity Project (score 59)
12. Isleton - Sidewalk Gap Project (score 57)
13. El Dorado County - Ponderosa Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (score 56)
14. Loomis - Loomis Safe Pedestrian & Bike Routes to School (score 54)
15. Yuba County - Arboga Road - Safe Routes to School Project (score 47)
16. Sacramento Regional Transit District - SacRT Light Rail Modernization Station Improvements for Active Transportation Enhancement (score 46)

Project Sponsor coordination

Following the Working Group Regional ATP recommendation, SACOG staff reached out to West Sacramento staff to determine if they were able to use the recommended partial funding award. The California Transportation Commission does not allow SACOG to recommend partial funding awards that would not yield a completed project phase.

The remaining funding was offered to and accepted by the project sponsor for environmental, design, and to partially cover the right-of-way phase. The funding recommendation and contingency list in Attachment A reflects this change. Staff will work with the City of West Sacramento to ensure this recommendation meets programming requirements from the CTC.