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DISCLAIMER

• This is NOT a Caltrans-endorsed webinar
• Caltrans will be holding their own workshops on ATP after the call for application is released
• Our organizations have been active participants in the ATP development process and serve on ATP Technical Advisory Committee and are sharing what we know with you.
• While we strive to provide the most accurate information, the call for applications is not yet available and some information may change.
Open or hide your control panel

Join audio:
- Choose “Telephone” and dial-in using numbers on screen
- Choose “Mic & Speakers” to use your computer’s sound
If you have questions, you can enter them in the Question box and we will answer them throughout the webinar and at the end during the Q&A session.
http://saferoutescalifornia.org/funding-workshops-and-webinars/
NEW FACT SHEET ALSO AVAILABLE

http://saferoutescalifornia.org/funding-workshops-and-webinars/
AGENDA

• ATP Basics & Timeline
• The ATP Application Questions & Scoring Criteria
  • Question 1: Disadvantaged Communities
  • Questions 2-7
• Non-Infrastructure/SRTS projects
• Planning projects
• Tips for a Successful Application
• Project Examples from Previous Cycles
• Q&A
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- Safe Routes to School National Partnership
  - Bill Sadler, California Senior Policy Manager
  - Marty Martinez, Bay Area Policy Manager
  - Demi Espinoza, Southern CA Policy Manager

- California Bicycle Coalition
  - Jeanie Ward-Waller, Policy Director

- California Walks
  - Tony Dang, Deputy Director

- Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
  - Eric Bruins, Planning & Policy Director

- PolicyLink
  - Erika Rincon Whitcomb, Senior Program Associate
WHAT IS THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM?

• Grant program that encourages bicycling and walking, especially for children traveling to school and for residents of disadvantaged communities.

• Established in 2013 by SB 99, which consolidated other federal & state active transportation funding programs into one program.
ATP GOALS

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking,
- Increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users,
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals, pursuant to SB 375 (2008) and SB 341 (2009),
- Enhance public health,
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program, and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.
WHAT DOES ATP FUND?

- Infrastructure (pedestrian and bicycle projects)
- Non-infrastructure (education and encouragement programs, including Safe Routes to School)
- Plans (for disadvantaged communities)
- Combined infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects
SAMPLE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- New or improved walkways – sidewalks, paths, crossings, bulb outs, signals/signage, etc
- New or improved bikeways – paths, bike lanes, protected bike lanes, secure bike parking, etc
- Safe Routes to School projects that improve safety and encourage walking and bicycling for children on the trip to school
- Safe routes to transit projects that improve walk and bike access to bus or train stations and school bus stops
- Traffic calming
- Minimum funding request per project of $250,000
SAMPLE NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- Education, encouragement & enforcement activities
- Planning in disadvantaged communities (priority for communities without an existing plan)
- Conducting pedestrian or bicycle counts, walk or bike audits
- Safety education programs
- Community walk and bike maps, school travel plans
- Walking school bus or bike train programs
- Bike- or walk-to-school or work programs
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

- Project must increase safety and access for public school students to walk and/or bike to school.

- For infrastructure projects, **must be located within two miles** of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop.

- Non-infrastructure projects have no location restriction, unless they are traffic education & enforcement activities (then 2-mile radius applies)
• 2% of ATP is set-aside for planning
• Must be for disadvantaged communities
• Types of plans:
  • Community-wide active transportation plans within DACs
  • Area-wide plans encompassing DACs, including:
    • Bicycle plans
    • Pedestrian plans
    • Safe Routes to School Plans
    • Comprehensive active transportation plans
• Funding priority
  • 1) Places with no active transportation plans
  • 2) Places with a bicycle or pedestrian plan but not both
  • 3) Updates to active transportation plans older than 5 plans
• Cannot combine plans with infrastructure or NI projects
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

- Local, regional, or state agencies
- Transit agencies
- Tribal governments
- Natural resources or public land agencies
- Nonprofit organizations in limited cases
  - Currently, only for Rec Trails and must benefit the public
  - New federal transportation bill allows nonprofits to apply for active transportation funding but guidance from FHWA will not be out in time for Cycle 3
- Public health departments
- Public schools or school districts

*Others can partner with an eligible applicant and must follow Caltrans procedures for interagency agreements and sub-awards*
PREVIOUS CYCLES

- **Cycle 1:** 265 projects, ~$367M
  - 75% in disadvantaged communities
  - Around half included SRTS components
- **Cycle 2:** 207 projects, ~$358M
  - 88% in disadvantaged communities
  - Around half again included SRTS components

- Over $1 billion requested in both Cycles. Very competitive program!
- Around 50 non-infrastructure projects in both cycles and 50 combined NI/infrastructure projects
$240 MILLION AVAILABLE FOR CYCLE 3

Two years of funding (FY2019/20, 2020/21)

- Statewide Competition: 50%
- Large Urban MPO Competitions: 40%
- Small Urban & Rural Competition: 10%
STATEWIDE COMPETITION

All communities are eligible to apply to the Statewide Competition

- 25% min for disadvantaged communities
- 2% max for planning in disadvantaged communities

$120M
Communities in urban regions with populations **greater than 200,000** are eligible for the Large Urban MPO Competitions.

- 25% min for disadvantaged communities
- 2% max for planning in disadvantaged communities

$96M
LARGE MPO COMPETITION

MPOs receive a proportional share of funding based on population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBAN REGIONS</th>
<th>FEDERAL TAP</th>
<th>FEDERAL OTHER</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL SHARES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTC Region</td>
<td>$5,252</td>
<td>$1,915</td>
<td>$2,908</td>
<td>$10,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Region</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>3,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG Region</td>
<td>14,493</td>
<td>4,833</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>25,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno COG (Fresno UZA)</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern COG (Bakersfield)</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG (San Diego UZA)</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>4,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin COG (Stockton)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus COG (Modesto)</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare CAG (Visalia)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,559</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,221</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,880</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Individual numbers may not add to total due to independent rounding.

Final dollar amounts may vary based on actual apportionment and obligational authority by FHWA or any changes in Federal

* Per Senate Bill 99, guidelines shall include a process to ensure no less than 25 percent of overall program funds benefit disadvantaged communities.
Communities in rural regions or in urban regions with populations **under 200,000** are eligible for the Small Urban & Rural Competition.

- **Small urban**: greater than 5,000 people
- **Rural**: less than 5,000 people (excluding those communities that fall within an MPO receiving a regional allocation)

- 25% min for disadvantaged communities

$24M
1) Highest scoring projects selected by CTC

2) Remaining projects selected by CTC

3) Remaining projects scored and selected by each MPO

Statewide Competition 50%

Large Urban MPO Competitions 40%

Small Urban & Rural Competition 10%
EVALUATION PROCESS

• CTC will form a multidisciplinary Project Evaluation Committee to assist in evaluating applications.

• Participants will have experience in active transportation infrastructure, non-infrastructure, Safe Routes to School and planning projects.

• Geographic balance throughout the state.

• Last cycle has 2-person teams and consensus scoring, may change for this cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Call for applications released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April to May</td>
<td>Caltrans will be holding workshops during the application process. Dates, times &amp; locations are TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Application deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June to August</td>
<td>MPOs may hold separate call for applications (i.e. MTC, SACOG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>Awards announced for state &amp; rural allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7-8</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission approves state &amp; rural awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2017</td>
<td>Awards announced for MPO allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>CTC approves MPO awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT’S NEW WITH CYCLE 3

• Electronic Application!

• Disadvantaged Communities: Still 10 points on application and 25% set-aside, but revised criteria and application question.

• Revised non-infrastructure eligibility: Program expansions and new elements of existing programs now allowed (previously only startup programs)

• Revisions to other application questions

• Revisions to evaluation process

• Delay in funding availability: July 2019 is when money will be available even though awards given out this year
SCREENING CRITERIA

• Consistency with an adopted regional transportation plan.

• Supplanting Funds: A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. ATP funds cannot be used to supplant other committed funds.

• Eligibility of project: Project must be one of the four types of projects listed in Section 11 of these guidelines.
### SCORING CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10 points</td>
<td>Benefits to disadvantaged communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 35 points</td>
<td>Potential for increased walking &amp; bicycling, especially students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 25 points</td>
<td>Potential for improving safety (reducing injuries &amp; fatalities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10 points</td>
<td>Public participation &amp; planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10 points</td>
<td>Improved public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5 points</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5 points</td>
<td>Leveraging of non-ATP funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5 to 0 points</td>
<td>Partnering with Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5 to 0 points</td>
<td>Past performance on ATP funded projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 total points possible
IN DEPTH:
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES
WHY INVEST IN DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES?

• Senate Bill 99: Ensure DAC’s fully share in the benefits of the program. A minimum of 25 percent of ATP funding must flow to projects benefiting disadvantaged communities.

• Level the playing field for California’s most vulnerable communities and address historic patterns of disinvestment in low-income communities and communities of color.

• Investing specifically in DACs ensures that all Californians have access to safe, walkable and bikeable communities regardless of race, place or income.
GUIDELINES CLARIFICATIONS RE BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

• “The project must clearly demonstrate, with verifiable information, a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a disadvantaged community.
• To count as providing a benefit, a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community.
• Direct Benefit: Project must be:
  – Located within or in reasonable proximity and have a direct connection, to the disadvantaged community served by the project; or
  – Must be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or directly adjacent to that disadvantaged community.
• It is incumbent upon the applicant to clearly articulate how the project benefits the disadvantaged community;
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES CRITERIA

Cycle 2
- Income-Based
- CalEnviroScreen
- School-Based
- Alternative Criteria
  - Quantitative Assessment

Cycle 3
- Income-Based
- CalEnviroScreen
- School-Based
- Alternative Criteria
  - Quantitative Assessment*
  - Regionally Defined
  - Tribes

*Requirements changed
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES CRITERIA

**Income-Based**
The community’s median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median (<$49,191) based on 2010-2014 American Community Survey data at the Census tract level.

[http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml](http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml)

**Cycle 3 Changes**

- 2010-2014 ACS data set specified

- Communities w/ population less than 15,000 may use Census block group level data

- Unincorporated communities may use Census Place level data
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES CRITERIA

CalEnviroScreen
An area identified in the top 25% of scores based on the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool.

http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/

Cycle 3 Changes
• No Changes
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES CRITERIA

School-Based
At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible for free or reduced price meals.

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp.asp

**Cycle 3 Changes**

- Must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.

- School-based criteria cannot be used as measure representative of the larger community’s DAC status.

- Project must be within 2 miles of school(s) represented by this criteria.
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES CRITERIA

Alternative Criteria: Quantitative Assessment
to demonstrate that the community’s median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income.

Cycle 3 Changes
- Option only available to small neighborhoods and/or unincorporated communities
- Option may only be used due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data
- Quantitative assessment must demonstrate community’s Median Household Income
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES CRITERIA

Alternative Criteria: Regionally Defined
Regional definitions of disadvantaged communities as adopted in a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by an MPO or RTPA per obligations with Title VI of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Cycle 3 Changes
• New option

• Regional definitions of DACs could include other nomenclatures such as “environmental justice communities” or “communities of concern”
Alternative Criteria: Tribes
Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

Cycle 3 Changes
• New option
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES SCORING CRITERIA

**Cycle 2**

- 0 points: Identification of DACs
- 5 points: % Project Located Within DAC
- 5 points: Direct, Meaningful, & Assured Benefit to DAC

**Cycle 3**

- 0 points: Required Project Map
- 0 points: Identification of DACs
- 5 points: Direct Benefit & Project Location
- 5 points: Degree of DAC Severity

*Based on March 30, 2016 draft application; subject to change*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points available</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 points (screening)</td>
<td>Map of project boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 points (screening)</td>
<td>Identification of DACs: select from 4 options: income; CalEnviroScreen; free &amp; reduced price meals; or alternative criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 points | Direct Benefit & Project Location:  
A) Gap closure, provides connections, addresses a deficiency or meets important community needs  
B) Explain how residents will have physical access to the project/program/plan  
C) Illustrate how project requested/supportive by residents  
D) Percentage of project located in DAC |
| 5 points | Severity (auto calculated) |

*Based on March 30, 2016 draft application; subject to change*
KEY ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY PROJECTS

• Project concept begins with the community.

• Thorough understanding of community conditions, needs, barriers, etc.

• Project is designed to address community’s unique needs.

• Great visuals and maps.

• Utilizes effective public participation strategies and incorporates input.
**QUESTION 2: POTENTIAL TO INCREASE WALKING & BICYCLING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35 Points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Potential for increase walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of non-motorized users.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 points (screening)</th>
<th>Current and projected types and numbers/rates of pedestrians &amp; bicyclists in the project area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>Describe active transportation need that project addresses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15 points             | How does project address that need?  
A) Gap closure  
B) Create new route  
C) Remove barrier  
D) Other improvement to route  
E) Plan for increasing walking & biking  
F) Encouragement & education |
| 5 points              | Why is project one of agency/community’s highest priorities?                           |
QUESTION 3:
POTENTIAL FOR IMPROVING SAFETY

25 Points available

“Potential for reducing the number and/or rate or the risk of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities & injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Describe the plan/program influence area or project location’s history of pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users that the project directly mitigates and the source(s) of data used (e.g. collision reports, community observation, surveys, audits). -Include crash data and maps of collision areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Safety countermeasures – how does project address one or more of the following: A) Reduces speed/volume of cars B) Improves sight distance &amp; visibility C) Eliminates conflict points D) Improves compliance with local traffic laws E) Addresses inadequate traffic control devices F) Addresses inadequate/unsafe facilities G) Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION 4: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project/program proposal or will be utilized as part of the development of a plan.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>What: The process for defining future policies, goals, investments &amp; designs to prepare for future needs of users of the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>Who: Was/will be engaged in the identification and development of this project/program/plan (for plans: who will be engaged). Provide documentation of type, extent &amp; duration of outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>What: Feedback received during stakeholder engagement process &amp; how the process has improved the project’s overall effectiveness at meeting the purpose &amp; goals of ATP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>How will stakeholders continue to be engaged in implementation of the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION 5: IMPROVED PUBLIC HEALTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Points available</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> Applicants applying for the disadvantaged community set aside must respond to the below questions with health data specific to the disadvantaged communities. All applicants must cite information specific to project location and targeted users. Failure to do so will result in lost points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>Describe the health status of the targeted users of the project/program/plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>Describe how you expect your project/proposal/plan to enhance public health and outreach to the targeted users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION 6: COST-EFFECTIVENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A project’s cost effectiveness is considered to be the relative costs of the project in comparison to the project’s benefits as defined by the purpose and goals of the ATP. This includes the consideration of the safety and mobility benefit in relation to both the total project cost and the funds provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 points | Explain why the project is considered to have the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose and goals of “increased use of active modes of transportation”. |
QUESTION 7: LEVERAGING/MATCHING ATP FUNDS

• 5 points available
• Match not required for statewide & rural pots
• MPOs may require a match as part of their regional ATP guidelines
• Cannot be expended prior to the Commission allocation of Active Transportation Program funds in the same project phase (permits and environmental studies; plans, specifications, and estimates; right-of-way; and construction).
IN DEPTH:
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE &
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE &
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

• ATP funded approximately 100 non-infrastructure projects in Cycles 1 and 2:
  • 51 standalone non-infrastructure projects
  • 52 combined non-infrastructure & infrastructure projects
• Around half of funding in both cycles was for Safe Routes to School projects

• Visit http://www.casaferoutestoschool.org/ to see project examples, best practices and tips for non-infrastructure projects
SAMPLE NON-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- Education, encouragement & enforcement activities
- Planning in disadvantaged communities (priority for communities without an existing plan)
- Conducting pedestrian or bicycle counts, walk or bike audits
- Safety education programs
- Community walk and bike maps, school travel plans
- Walking school bus or bike train programs
- Bike- or walk-to-school or work programs
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

- **Priority for start-up programs** – schools where no program has existed before
- **ATP will not fund ongoing operations** of existing SRTS programs
- In Cycle 3, *program expansions or adding new elements to existing programs will also be considered*, if they can show the existing program will be sustained with non-ATP funds
- **Must demonstrate other sources of funding** – how will the program be sustained after the ATP grant?
- **No minimum funding amount** as there is with infrastructure projects
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

- Project must increase safety and access for public school students to walk and/or bike to school.

- For infrastructure projects, *must be located within two miles* of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop.

- Non-infrastructure projects have no location restriction, unless they are traffic education & enforcement activities (then 2-mile radius applies)
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE & SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL: DOCUMENTS TO READ

- SRTS FAQs: http://saferoutescalifornia.org/srts-atp-funding/applying-for-atp-funds/submit-an-atp-question/
NI ALLOWABLE EXPENSES: OPERATING EXPENSES

- **Staff time & benefits:**
  - Salaries & benefits of staff needed to support project
  - Can hire a SRTS Program Manager (for multiple schools) or SRTS Coordinator (for one school)
  - Consultants supporting the project
  - Law enforcement around the school during normal school hours

- **Staff Training:**
  - Should be limited to specific area of training needed.
  - NOT for conference attendance

- **Crossing Guards:**
  - Can pay for training but not for salaries.

- **Volunteers:**
  - Cannot be paid for their time but may be reimbursed for materials & expenses needed for coordination & training efforts (supplies, meals, materials, mileage reimbursements)
NI ALLOWABLE EXPENSES:
OPERATING EXPENSES

• **Communications:**
  - Phone service (but not phone equipment)
  - Postage & shipping
  - Webinar service
  - Website design & maintenance/updates

• **Office Supplies**

• **Travel:**
  - Allowed for necessary staff travel, not as an incentive
  - Auto insurance (for moving bicycle fleets)
  - NOT for conference registration & attendance
  - NOT for out-of-state travel
  - Should conform to State or responsible agency reimbursement guidelines

• **Meeting Costs:**
  - Meeting/training rental fees
  - Food for working meals (conforming to state reimbursement guidelines)
NI ALLOWABLE EXPENSES: OPERATING EXPENSEs

• **Material Production:**
  • Graphic design & printing costs associated with education & encouragement materials
  • Encouraged to utilize materials at [http://www.casaferoutestoschool.org/](http://www.casaferoutestoschool.org/)

• **Indirect Costs:**
  • Must have approved Indirect Cost Allocation Plan or Rate Proposal with Caltrans in order to be reimbursed.

• **Other:**
  • Other items not listed may be eligible but must be reviewed and approved by Caltrans in advance of purchase on a project-by-project basis
NI ALLOWABLE EXPENSES: DIRECT PROGRAM-RELATED EXPENSES

• **Equipment:**
  - Bicycles & helmets for use during training & educational events
  - CANNOT be given away as an incentive – should be kept and used by the program beyond the lift of the ATP grant as part of a sustainable NI/SRTS program in the community
  - Unit cost per item must be less than $50, with exceptions for:
    - Bicycles ($250)
    - Helmets ($20)
    - Bicycle repair stands ($150)
    - Scanner ($250)

• **Safety Gear:**
  - Allowable for staff, trainers & volunteers. Must be necessary to complete program work/duties
  - Includes helmets, rain gear, safety vests, safety cones, ID badges, water bottles, etc.
NI ALLOWABLE EXPENSES: DIRECT PROGRAM-RELATED EXPENSES

• **Incentives:**
  - Limited to pedestrian & bicycling related educational safety materials
  - Should be used as rewards for program participation, not given to entire student body whether or not they participate in a SRTS activity

• **Minor Incentives:** All material must include a safety message
  - Limited to $5 per participant
  - Includes:
    - Punch card holders
    - Scanning tags or punch cards
    - Award certifications
    - Health snacks
    - Reflective items

• **Major Incentives:** Should only be for outstanding participation or achievement in the SRTS program over the course of a school year
  - Includes:
    - Bike helmets ($20 spending limit, 2 max per grade level, per school year, per school)
NI ALLOWABLE EXPENSES:
DIRECT PROGRAM-RELATED EXPENSES

• **Event-Related Expenses:**
  • Event insurance
  • Reimbursement to volunteers for materials & expenses needed for coordination & training efforts
  • Law enforcement
  • Supplies including chalk, cones, barriers/fences for safe ped/bike flow, tables & chairs for sign-in areas, shade tents and easels

• **Educational Materials:**
  • Must be specific to walking & bicycling (cannot be transit-related)
  • Curricula
  • Activity & safety books
  • Parent tip sheets
  • Bookmarks (with safety messages)
  • Training materials, handouts & flyers
  • DVDs/movies
  • Walking School Bus guides
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE INELIGIBLE EXPENSES

- Crossing guard salaries
- Attendance at conferences
- Out-of-state travel
- Cash, gift cards and gift certificates
- Electronic equipment
- Items for raffles, incentives, prizes or giveaways
- Skateboards & scooters
- Incentives for attending events but not requiring participation in the program

For more information on Non-Infrastructure Expenses, see Caltrans Guidance:
ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL NI PROGRAMS
FROM PREVIOUS ATP CYCLES

- Interventions at Multiple Schools/Clusters.
- Partnerships/Coordination with Engineering, Enforcement, & Health Agencies.
- Community engagement in projects, prioritization, and implementation.
- Served disadvantaged communities.
- Built off prior planning and data collection.
- Sustainability strategies utilized (e.g. training-the-trainer models, ATP ‘Ambassador’ programs)
ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL NI PROGRAMS FROM PREVIOUS ATP CYCLES

• Clear pre- and post-data collection included in proposed work.
• Safe walking and bicycling are both promoted.
• Infrastructure at selected sites (with highest need) with non-infrastructure available to all or most participating sites.
• NI programs addressed long-term sustainability after grant ends.
• NI used to inform future infrastructure projects.
Active Transportation Plans

April 13, 2016
Why Do I Need a Plan?

- Engage community members
- Engage partners (agencies, nonprofits, schools)
- Understand local barriers to walking and biking
- Collect baseline data
- Establish community-wide goals
- Identify and prioritize projects and programs
- Communities with plans will be more competitive for future grants
ATP Planning Grants

• ATP funds *community-wide* plans within or encompassing *disadvantaged communities*

• 2% set-aside in statewide & rural competition + most MPO regional programs

• Funding priority:
  • 1) Active transportation plans for agencies with no plans
  • 2) Ped plans for agencies with bike plans & vice versa
  • 3) Updates to active transportation plans 5+ years old

• May *not* be combined with infrastructure or program applications
Don’t Forget About Schools

• All community-wide plans should address travel to school and include school-based education & encouragement programs

• School districts are eligible applicants to ATP

• School districts are required to be included in active transportation plans
Baseline & Projected Conditions

- How many people are walking & biking (# & %)
- How many more people would walk & bike (# & %)
- Who is getting hit and where? (# & %)
- How many of those collisions would be prevented?
- Where are people walking and biking to? (existing and proposed land use)
**Proposed Actions**

- What bike and ped facilities will you install?
- Where will people park their bikes?
- How will people access transit via bike? How will people know where they’re going?
- How will you maintain everything?
- How will you educate, encourage, and enforce?
Engagement

• How will you engage communities in these decisions, particularly disadvantaged residents?

• How did you coordinate with other agencies (schools, nearby cities, regional agencies)?
Required Elements cont’d

**Action Plan**

• How will you prioritize all these great ideas?
• How much will everything cost, and how does that compare to what you’ve already spent?
• What are your next steps and how will you report what you accomplish?

**Resolution of Adoption**
Additional Advice

• Partner with a community-based organization
  • Who has reach in communities you don’t?
  • What nontraditional partners can you engage?
  • Pay them!

• Engage your school district
  • Include them on project team

• Consider nontraditional outreach
  • Think outside the meeting
  • Language access
Questions?

Eric Bruins
Planning & Policy Director
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
eric@la-bike.org
TIPS FOR A SUCCESSFUL APPLICATION
TIPS FOR A SUCCESSFUL APPLICATION

• **Start early!** The application takes time to pull together

• **Collaborate!** Partner with local transportation agency, public health department, community-based organizations, schools, etc. to pull together the application

• **Collect & assemble data!** Need data on walking & bicycling rates for question 2, injuries & fatalities for question 3, public health for question 5

• **Provide visuals of the project location!** Utilize maps and visuals throughout the application to help the evaluator understand your project
COMMON THEMES FROM SUCCESSFUL APPLICATIONS

• Leveraged prior planning efforts to maximize engagement
• Broad stakeholder support
• Corridor of multi-site interventions
• Strong partnerships between agencies and with community groups, academic institutions, etc.
• Visuals demonstrating needs
• Data-driven analysis & estimates: manual/automated counts, student tallies, parent surveys, etc.
COMMON THEMES FROM SUCCESSFUL APPLICATIONS

- Accounted for pre & post evaluation
- Clearly explained assumptions & sources
- Leveraged publicly available data sources
- Documented community concerns (qualitative findings from workshops, surveys, photos, media stories, etc.)
COLLABORATION: KEY PARTNERS

- Community residents
- School community
- Local government/regional agency staff
- Public works/transit
- Law enforcement
- Non-profit partners
- Public health partners
IN DEPTH:
PROJECT EXAMPLES
Active Transportation Program
Successful Application Examples from Cycles 1 and 2

Jeanie Ward-Waller
Policy Director
jeanie@calbike.org
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Question 1: Disadvantaged Community Benefit
Question 2: Increasing Biking & Walking
Question 3: Safety
Question 4: Public Participation & Planning
Question 5: Public Health
Question 1: Disadvantaged Community Benefit

Answers from awardees included...

- Most clearly fall within census tracts identified by CalEnviroScreen, below 80% of Median Household Income, or access a low-income school
- Clear maps delineating the extent of the project overlaid on the census tract boundaries
- Description of the DAC residents need and expressed desire for the project
**Option 1:** Median household income, by census tract for the community(ies) benefited by the project:

*Olivehurst CDP, California is $42,915*

- Provide all census tract numbers
- Provide the median income for each census track listed
- Provide the population for each census track listed

**Option 2:** California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 2.0 (CalEnviroScreen) score for the community benefited by the project: *Census Tract 6115040500 provided a poverty percentile of 92.56% and a population of 13,656.*

- Provide all census tract numbers
- Provide the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score for each census track listed
- Provide the population for each census track listed

**Option 3:** Percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Programs:

- Provide percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Meals Program for each and all schools included in the proposal. *88.8% of students at the four affected schools (Olivehurst Elementary, Johnson Park Elementary, Yuba Gardens Intermediate, and Lindhurst High) are eligible for the Free or Reduced Meals Program.*

The Community of Olivehurst is an economically disadvantaged community. The median household income is $42,915. The proposed project is 100% within the geographic area of the disadvantaged community. All four schools benefiting from this project serve the Community of Olivehurst.

- County of Yuba, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Name</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Enrollment (K-12)</th>
<th>Unadjusted FRPM Count (K-12)</th>
<th>Adjusted FRPM Count (K-12)</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent (%) Eligible FRPM (K-12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>Ada S. Nelson Elementary</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>Aeolian Elementary</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>Los Nietos Middle</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Whittier Union High</td>
<td>Pioneer High</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment (K-12)</th>
<th>Unadjusted FRPM Count (K-12)</th>
<th>Adjusted FRPM Count (K-12)</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent (%) Eligible FRPM (K-12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- County of Los Angeles, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
Question 1 Examples

-City of Pomona, ATP Cycle 1 awardee
Question 2: Increasing Biking & Walking

Answers from awardees included...

- Data specific to the project corridor or intersection
- Ped/bike counts and surveys with clear explanation of methods
  - i.e. conducted by local walk/bike coalition, automated counters, etc.
- SRTS project data from student travel tallies and parent surveys
  - National Center for SRTS
- Description of project orientation to key destinations - housing, jobs, schools, services
- Clear map showing orientation to destinations
- Non-infrastructure encouragement components
In February 2015, the Mojave Unified School District conducted a survey of students at both schools. 241 students responded. Currently about 20% of the students walked to school (1.1 - 1.5). Taking the percentage that currently walk and projecting that to the combined student bodies of 808 students indicates approximately 160 students currently walking to school through the project area.

- Phone survey of local companies – 75 people walk to work
- Kern Regional Transit – 125 people walk to transit locally
- Census data – 263 local households do not own a car

- Kern County, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
Students living…

- ¼ mile or less 47%-60% walk on a typical day, 53% have asked permission to walk
- ¼ to ½ mile up to 22% walk on a typical day, 56% have asked permission to walk
- ½ to 1 mile: 12-15% walk on a typical day, 18 % have asked permission to walk
- more than 1 mile typically do not walk or bike to school, 18% asked permission to walk

Reasons for not walking or biking to school include:

- 75% traffic volumes
- 73% speed of traffic
- 65% safety of crossings
- 44% lack of sidewalks and pathways

- City of Redding, ATP Cycle 1 awardee
- County of Los Angeles, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
Question 3: Safety

Answers from awardees included...

• Data specific to the project corridor or intersection
• CHP SWITRS data (Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System)
  • TIMS data (Transportation Injury Mapping System):
    http://tims.berkeley.edu/
  • SRTS Collision Map Viewer
• Survey of concerns about safety in the project area
• Images of safety hazards
• Non-infrastructure safety education and enforcement for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists
“In the 2009 California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) safety rankings…

**Inglewood ranked 5th out of 56 cities for … pedestrian casualties.”**

“Inglewood ranked 6th out of 56 for … pedestrians killed.”

“From 2008 to 2010, there were 131 pedestrian and 58 bicyclist casualties in Inglewood.”

- City of Inglewood, ATP Cycle 1 awardee
Question 3 Examples

- Stanislaus County, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
Question 3 Examples

Photo 3—Intersection of Madison Street and Cecil Avenue (looking north toward Delano Skate Park and Delano High School)

Photo 4—Intersection of Clinton Street and 14th Avenue (looking south toward Fremont Elementary School)

Photo 5—Intersection of Garces Highway and Clinton Street (looking west toward Nueva Vista Language Academy)

Photo 6—Intersection of Garces Highway and Dover Place (looking west)

- City of Delano, ATP Cycle 1 awardee
Question 4: Public Participation & Planning

Answers from Awardees included...

• Earnest outreach by the applicant agency with several meaningful, accessible input opportunities
• Workshops and walk/bike audits
• Demonstrated ongoing community involvement and support
  • Existing task forces or committees, parent volunteers
  • Wellness or SRTS policy
• Many letters of support from broad partnerships
  • other agencies, community-based organizations, elected officials
2013

- **Community Pedestrian Safety Workshop:** On September 5, 2013, a Community Pedestrian Safety Workshop was held with 28 stakeholders attending to discuss safety and barriers to walking and biking in the community as well as safe routes to Paradise schools. Key stakeholders were invited to this workshop and it was also publicized on the Chamber of Commerce website, the local newspaper, and on the Town of Paradise website. The workshop was held at the Paradise Ridge Family Resource Center, a central location easily accessible via public transit. Refreshments were provided for attendees at the workshop which lasted from 8 am to noon. Childcare was available through the Family Resource Center, though no translation services were offered. Members of the Town Council, the County Supervisor, Paradise Unified School District and the Butte County Associations of Governments were in attendance representing decision making bodies.

-City of Paradise, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
“The County has a long history of proactive involvement with stakeholders… the Florence-Firestone Community Enhancement Team (Team) … staff from different County Departments, including the Sherriff, and Departments of Parks and Recreation, Regional Planning, Public Health and Public Works… working with local schools and community stakeholders such as the Florence-Firestone Community Leaders (FFCL) to address quality of life issues such as code enforcement, economic development, and traffic safety in the community.”

- City of Los Angeles, ATP Cycle 1 awardee

We significantly expanded the scope of the project based on the input we received during our outreach efforts. The inclusion of sidewalks on P Street, Q Street, Nadeau Street, Barstow Road south of SR 58, Belshaw Street leading into the Air and Space Port, and K Street connecting to the Oak Creek Overpass were all the direct results of comments from the public and local leaders.

- Kern County, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
Answers from Awardees included...

- Data specific to the neighborhood or school
- Consulting and partnering with local public health department and other health experts
- Identification of obesity/inactivity and asthma/air quality issues
- CalEnviroScreen Population Health Data by census tract for pollution exposure and asthma rates: [http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html](http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html)
- California Health Interview Survey: [www.chis.ucla.edu](http://www.chis.ucla.edu)
- Surveys or health impact assessments of community
“The Florence-Firestone community is located in the economically disadvantaged South Los Angeles area… exposed to high concentrations of Ozone, Particulate Matter 2.5, and Diesel Particulate Matter emissions according to CalEnviroScreen (CES) data… due to the proximity of major freeways and high traffic density.

The CES data also shows a prevalence for asthma related hospital visits in the area, which can be attributed to traffic pollution.

The Florence-Firestone Community has an adult obesity rate of 38.7% and a childhood obesity rate of 31% based on 2008 data compiled by the County’s Department of Public Health (DPH).

The prevalence of childhood obesity is determined by using body mass index (BMI) measurements of 5th, 7th, and 9th grade public school children from the annual California Physical Fitness Testing Program.”

- City of Los Angeles, ATP Cycle 1 awardee
The K'ima:w Medical Center in Hoopa is dedicated to improving the health of its residents by providing health care to the Native American population in the Hoopa Valley. K'ima:w Medical Center's Diabetes Prevention & Treatment Program (DPTP) works together with the medical team and supporting ancillary staff to provide diabetes education and care to patients and community members of the Hoopa Valley and surrounding areas. There are an estimated 500 community members with diabetes in the K'ima:w database, 300 of which are estimated to be serviced by the program. K'ima:w implements a Diabetes Prevention

- Hoopa Valley Tribe, ATP Cycle 2 awardee
All funded applications posted online

Cycle 1 apps:

http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP/2014_Project_Apps.html

Cycle 2 apps:

http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP/2015_Project_Apps.html
Jeanie Ward-Waller
Policy Director
jeanie@calbike.org
916-399-3211
Q&A

• Over the years we’ve collected questions on the ATP. See our website for frequently asked questions:
  http://saferoutescalifornia.org/srts-atp-funding/applying-for-atp-funds/submit-an-atp-question/

• Please use the Question Box to ask questions during the webinar.
SAFE ROUTES CONTACTS

State: Bill Sadler
bill@saferoutespartnership.org
(847) 732-4007

Bay Area/Northern CA: Marty Martinez
marty@saferoutespartnership.org
(415) 637-6488

Southern California: Demi Espinoza
demi@saferoutespartnership.org
(503) 739-3654
AGENCY CONTACTS

Teresa McWilliam
Caltrans ATP Program Manager
(916) 653-0328
teresa.mcwilliam@dot.ca.gov

Laurie Waters
California Transportation Commission
(916) 651-6145
laurie.waters@dot.ca.gov
CALTRANS LINKS TO ATP

• Visit these links to learn more about ATP:
  – http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/
  – http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP.htm
  – http://saferoutestoschool.org/srts-atp-funding/

• For non-infrastructure and public health:
  – California Active Transportation Safety Program: www.casaferoutestoschool.org
THANK YOU!