

## Summary of Major Changes to Cycle 3 of the 2017 Fresno COG Active Transportation Program Regional Guidelines

*\*Changes are reflected with red bolded text and strikethrough*

SECTION OF THE GUIDELINES	2015 CYCLE 2	2017 CYCLE 3
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	Call for Projects: June 26 <sup>th</sup> -August 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2015	<b>ADJUSTED:</b> Call for Projects: July 1 <sup>st</sup> -September 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2016 <i>(Page 4 of Guidelines)</i>
<b>Matching Requirements</b>	Eliminated match requirement to be consistent with the statewide guidelines and added (in the scoring criteria) that points will be awarded based on the amount of the <u>non-ATP</u> funding pledged/leveraged to the project.	<b>NO CHANGE:</b> No matching requirements, but points will be awarded based on non-ATP funds pledged. <i>(Page 5 of Guidelines)</i>
<b>Minimum Request</b>	No minimum fund award request required.	<b>NO CHANGE:</b> No minimum fund award request required. <i>(Page 5 of Guidelines)</i>
<b>Maximum Request</b>	“Encourage” ATP fund awards of \$1 million or less per project.	<b>NO CHANGE:</b> “Encourage” ATP fund awards of \$1 million or less per project. <i>(Page 5 of Guidelines)</i>
<b>Funding Set-Asides</b>	No set-aside or minimum requirement for SRTS, Recreational Trails, or Active Transportation Plans.	<b>NO CHANGE:</b> No set-aside or minimum requirement for SRTS, Recreational Trails, or Active Transportation Plans. <i>(Page 5 &amp; 6 of Guidelines)</i>
<b>Eligible Applicants</b>		<b>UPDATED (NEW LANGUAGE CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES; HOWEVER, NO CHANGES MADE TO ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS LIST):</b> <b><u>A project applicant found to have purposefully misrepresented information that could affect a project’s score may result in the applicant being excluded from the program for the current cycle and the next cycle.</u></b> <i>(Page 7 of Guidelines)</i>
<b>Eligible Projects</b>	<u>Non-infrastructure projects</u> : Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of this program. The CTC intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure projects on pilot and on start-up projects that can demonstrate funding for	<b>UPDATED (NEW LANGUAGE CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b> <u>Non-infrastructure Projects</u> : Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of this program.

	<p>ongoing efforts. The Active Transportation Program funds are not intended to fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students.</p>	<p>The CTC intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure <del>projects on pilot and</del> <u>on</u> start-up projects that can demonstrate funding for ongoing efforts. <u>A project is considered to be a start-up when no program currently exists. Start-up projects must demonstrate how the program is sustainable after ATP funding is exhausted.</u> The Active Transportation Program ATP funds <u>cannot</u> are not intended to fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students. <u>Program expansions or new components of existing programs are eligible for ATP funds as long as the applicant can demonstrate that the existing program will be continued with non-ATP funds.</u> (Page 7 and 8 of Guidelines)</p>
<p><b>Disadvantaged Communities</b></p>	<p>For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement of 25%, the project must clearly demonstrate a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at <a href="http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml">http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml</a></li> <li>• An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. This list can be found at the following link under SB 535 List of Disadvantaged Communities: <a href="http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/">http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In order for a project to qualify for “severely” disadvantaged community status, it must clearly demonstrate a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a community in an area identified as among the most disadvantaged <b>10%</b> in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the latest versions of the California Communities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE (NEW/REVISED CRITERIA; CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b></p> <p>For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement of 25%, the project must clearly demonstrate, <u>with verifiable information</u>, a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a <u>disadvantaged</u> community. <del>that meets any of the following criteria:</del> <u>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.</u></p> <p><u>For a project to qualify as directly benefiting a disadvantaged community, the project must be located within or in reasonable proximity and have a direct connection, to the disadvantaged community served by the project; or the project 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; there is no presumption of benefit, even for projects located within a disadvantaged community. To qualify as a disadvantaged community the community served by the project must meet at least one of the following</u></p>

	<p>Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/files.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/files.asp</a>. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefiting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.</li> </ul> <p>If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged, or how the project connects a disadvantaged community to outside resources or amenities.</p>	<p><b>criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Median Household Income (<b>Table ID B19013</b>) is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current Census Tract (<b>ID 140</b>) level data from the <b>2010-2014</b> American Community Survey (<b>&lt;\$49,191</b>). <b>Communities with a population less than 15,000 may use data at the Census Block Group (ID 150) level. Unincorporated communities may use data at the Census Place (ID 160) level.</b> Data is available at: <a href="http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml">http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml</a></li> <li>An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool <b>2.0</b> (CalEnviroScreen <b>2.0</b>) scores (<b>scores must be greater than or equal to 36.62</b>). This list can be found at the following link under SB 535 List of Disadvantaged Communities: <a href="http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/">http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>In order for a project to qualify for “severely” disadvantaged community status, it must clearly demonstrate a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a community in an area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores.</del></li> </ul> </li> <li>At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at: <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/files.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/files.asp</a>. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area. <b>Project must be located within 2 miles of the school(s) represented by this criteria.</b> or, for projects not directly benefiting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.</li> <li><b>Other:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If a project applicant believes a project benefits a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria <u>due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area</u>, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment <u>to demonstrate that the community's median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income</u>. <del>of why the community should be considered disadvantaged, or how the project connects a disadvantaged community to outside resources or amenities.</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>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, such as "environmental justice communities" or "communities of concern," may be used in lieu of the options identified above.</u></li> <li>○ <u>Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).</u></li> </ul> <p><i>(Pages 9 and 10 of Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>Screening Criteria</b></p>	<p>Demonstrated needs of the applicant: 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.</p> <p>Projects must be consistent with FCOG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): All projects submitted should be "consistent" with the relevant adopted regional transportation plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080. Applicants must provide the supporting language cited from the adopted RTP that shows that the submitted project is consistent with the plan.</p>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE (NEW/REVISED CRITERIA CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b></p> <p>Before evaluation, project applications will be screened for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Consistency with an adopted regional transportation plan. Applicants should provide the supporting language cited from the adopted RTP, such as the specific goal, objective, or RTP project number, to show that the submitted project is consistent with the plan.</u> <del>Projects must be consistent with FCOG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): All projects submitted should be "consistent" with the relevant adopted regional transportation plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080. Applicants must provide the supporting language cited from the adopted RTP that shows that the submitted project is consistent with the plan.</del></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Supplanting Funds:</b> demonstrated needs of the applicant: 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.</li> <li>• <b>Eligibility of project: Project must be one of the four types of projects listed in Section 11 of the state CTC ATP Cycle 3 guidelines.</b> (Page 11 of Guidelines)</li> </ul> <p>The language above is consistent with updates in the statewide CTC guidelines. Fresno COG added one clarifying sentence to the CTC language as acknowledged above.</p>
<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Disadvantaged Communities)</b></p>	<p>1. Benefit to “disadvantaged communities.” (0 to 5 points) Applicants must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how the project connects the disadvantaged community(ies) to commonly identified resources or amenities such as medical facilities, employers, parks, community centers and grocery stores.</li> <li>• Provide a map that delineates the specific disadvantaged census tract(s) or school(s) that will benefit from the project in relationship to the project site.</li> </ul> <p>2. Benefit to “severely disadvantaged communities.” (5 to 10 points) Applicants must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how the project connects the disadvantaged community(ies) to commonly identified resources or amenities such as medical facilities, employers, parks, community centers and grocery stores.</li> <li>• Provide a map that delineates the specific disadvantaged census tract(s) or school(s) that will benefit from the project in relationship to the project site.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE (REVISED CRITERIA AND SCORING CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b></p> <p>1. Benefit to “disadvantaged communities.” (0 to <del>5</del> 10 points) Applicants must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Demonstrate how the project connects the disadvantaged community(ies) to commonly identified resources or amenities such as medical facilities, employers, parks, community centers and grocery stores.</del></li> <li>• Provide a map that delineates the specific disadvantaged census tract(s) or school(s) that will benefit from the project in relationship to the project site.</li> </ul> <p>2. <del>Benefit to “severely disadvantaged communities.” (5 to 10 points)</del> Applicants must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Demonstrate how the project connects the disadvantaged community(ies) to commonly identified resources or amenities such as medical facilities, employers, parks, community centers and grocery stores.</del></li> <li>• <del>Provide a map that delineates the specific disadvantaged census tract(s) or school(s) that will benefit from the project in relationship to the project site.</del></li> </ul>

		<p><b>Scores will be scaled in relation to the severity of and the benefit provided to the disadvantaged community affected by the project.</b>  <i>(Page 12 of Guidelines)</i></p> <p><i>The changes above revise the criteria and points awarded for the DAC category to be completely consistent with the recent statewide revisions in Cycle 3. CTC is in the process of finalizing a scoring rubric that will detail how to scale the points awarded for this category. The scoring committee will revert to that scoring system in reviewing applications.</i></p>
<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Increased Biking and Walking)</b></p>	<p>Potential for increased 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. <b>(0 to 30 points)</b></p>	<p><b>UPDATED (NEW LANGUAGE CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b>  Potential for increased 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. <b><u>Applicants may describe how the project would address significant gap closures.</u></b> <b>(0 to <del>30</del> 35 points)</b>  <i>(Page 12 of Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Safety Improvements)</b></p>	<p>Potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists. <b>(0 to 25 points)</b></p>	<p><b>UPDATED (NEW LANGUAGE CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b>  Potential for reducing the number and/or rate <b><u>or the risk</u></b> of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists. <b><u>Applicants may describe qualitative safety barriers that deter people from walking/biking if their community lacks quantitative safety data and how the project would address the community's safety concerns.</u></b> <b>(0 to 25 points)</b>  <i>(Page 12 of Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Public Participation and Planning)</b></p>	<p>Public participation and planning. <b>(0 to 15 points)</b></p>	<p><b>UPDATED (REVISED SCORING CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b>  Public participation and planning. <b>(0 to <u>10</u> 15 points)</b>  <i>(Page 12 of Guidelines)</i></p>

<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Cost Effectiveness)</b></p>	<p>Cost-effectiveness. <b>(0 to 10 points)</b></p> <p>a. Applicants must discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered as well as quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided.</p> <p><i>Caltrans has developed a first generation benefit/cost model for infrastructure and non-infrastructure active transportation projects in order to improve information available to decision makers at the state and MPO level. Applicants must use the benefit/cost model for active transportation projects developed by Caltrans when responding to this criterion (a link to the model is posted on the Commission’s website under Programs/ATP). Applicants are encouraged to provide feedback on instructions, ease of use, inputs, etc. This input will be useful in determining future revisions of the model.</i></p>	<p><b>UPDATED (REVISED SCORING AND CRITERIA; CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES)</b></p> <p>Cost-effectiveness. <b>(0 to <del>10</del> 5 points)</b></p> <p>a. <u>A project’s cost effectiveness will be evaluated on 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.</u></p> <p><del>b. Applicants must discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered as well as quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided.</del></p> <p><del>Caltrans has developed a first generation benefit/cost model for infrastructure and non-infrastructure active transportation projects in order to improve information available to decision makers at the state and MPO level. Applicants must use the benefit/cost model for active transportation projects developed by Caltrans when responding to this criterion (a link to the model is posted on the Commission’s website under Programs/ATP). Applicants are encouraged to provide feedback on instructions, ease of use, inputs, etc. This input will be useful in determining future revisions of the model.</del></p> <p><u>The Cal-B/C benefit-cost model is being updated to incorporate active transportation projects. When this update is complete, applicants must use this model to quantify the cost-effectiveness of their project.</u></p> <p><i>(Page 13 of Guidelines)</i></p> <p><i>The update to Caltrans cost-benefit model is still in progress so this will likely be required for use in future ATP cycles. CTC is requiring a qualitative assessment from applicants during this 3<sup>rd</sup> Cycle of the ATP</i></p>
<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Fund Leveraging)</b></p>	<p>Leveraging of non-ATP funds on the ATP project scope proposed. <b>(0 to 5 points)</b></p>	<p><b>UPDATED (CLARIFICATION CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES)</b></p> <p>Leveraging of non-ATP funds <u>(excluding in-kind contributions)</u> on the ATP project scope proposed. <b>(0 to 5 points)</b></p> <p><i>(Page 13 of Guidelines)</i></p>

<p><b>Scoring Criteria (Past Grant Performance)</b></p>	<p>Applicant’s performance on past grants. This may include project delivery, project benefits (anticipated v. actual), and use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps (planned v. actual). Applications from agencies with documented poor performance records on past grants may be excluded from competing or may be penalized in scoring. <b>(0 or -10 points)</b></p>	<p><b>UPDATED (CLARIFICATION CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES)</b>  Applicant’s performance on past ATP projects grants. <b><u>Point reduction for non-use of the Corps as committed to in a past ATP award or project failure on any past ATP project.</u></b> This may include project delivery, project benefits (anticipated v. actual), and use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps (planned v. actual). Applications from agencies with documented poor performance records on past grants may be excluded from competing or may be penalized in scoring. <b>(0 or -10 points)</b>  <i>(Page 14 of Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>Project Selection between Project Applications with the Same Score</b></p>		<p><b>SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE (NEW SECTION CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES):</b>  <b><u>If two or more project applications receive the same score that is the funding cut-off score, the following criteria will be used to determine which project(s) will be funded:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Construction ready infrastructure projects</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Highest score on question 1 (DAC)</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Highest score on question 2 (increased biking/walking)</u></b></li> </ul> <p><i>(Page 14 of Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>Allocations</b></p>	<p>If an implementing agency requests an allocation of funds in an amount that is less than the amount programmed, the balance of the programmed amount may be allocated to a programmed project advanced from a future fiscal year. FCOG, in administering its Regional Active Transportation Program, must determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the CTC. Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.</p>	<p><b>UPDATED (REVISED LANGUAGE; CONSISTENT WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES)</b>  If an implementing agency requests an allocation of funds in an amount that is less than the amount programmed, the balance of the programmed amount may be allocated to a programmed project advanced from a future fiscal year. FCOG, in administering its Regional Active Transportation Program, must determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the CTC. Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.  <i>(Page 16 of Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>Funding Active Transportation Plans</b></p>	<p>The statewide guidelines state that a large MPO, in administering its portion of the program, may make up to 3% of its funding available for active transportation plans in disadvantaged</p>	<p><b>UPDATED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH STATEWIDE GUIDELINES:</b>  The statewide guidelines state that a large MPO, in administering its portion of the program, may make up to</p>



	<p>communities within the MPO boundaries. <b>Although Fresno COG does not intend to set-aside funding for active transportation plans, no more than 3% of the total ATP regional funds can be used to fund active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities.</b> Furthermore, the CTC intends to decrease this set aside to 2% in the 2017 cycle, and reassess the set aside for plans in future program cycles.</p>	<p><del>3%</del><b>2%</b> of its funding available for active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities within the MPO boundaries. <b>Although Fresno COG does not intend to set-aside funding for active transportation plans, no more than <del>3%</del><b>2%</b> of the total ATP regional funds can be used to fund active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities.</b> Furthermore, the CTC intends to <del>decrease this set aside to 2% in the 2017 cycle, and</del> reassess the set aside for plans in future program cycles. (Page 20 and 21 of Guidelines)</p>
<p><b>Supplemental Application/ Questionnaire</b></p>	<p>Fresno COG’s supplemental application included 4 questions covering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project eligibility and application completeness</li> <li>2. Recreational trails projects only</li> <li>3. Severely disadvantaged communities</li> <li>4. Project phasing and segmentation</li> </ol>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE:</b> <i>The ATP MAG decided to eliminate the supplemental application. Since Fresno COG is adopting CTC’s definition and scoring criteria for the disadvantaged communities’ category, that supplemental question would have been removed nonetheless. The remaining 3 questions were determined to not hold significance in the applicant’s overall application and do not aid the scoring committee in reviewing the application.</i></p> <p><i>Eliminating the supplemental application will also alleviate some of the confusion past applicants have had in completing the Fresno COG supplemental application and CTC statewide application. At times, applicants have addressed the items in the supplemental application and neglected similar questions in the statewide application, thus leaving information gaps in the completed application.</i></p>