

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: December 7-8, 2022

From: MITCH WEISS, Executive Director

Reference Number: 4.6, Action

Prepared By: Beverley Newman-Burckhard
Assistant Deputy Director

Published Date: November 23, 2022

Subject: Adoption of 2023 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural Components, Resolution G-22-70

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt the 2023 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components, in accordance with the attached resolution and staff recommendations. Additionally, staff recommends that the Commission direct staff to continue seeking a permanent source of augmented funding for the Active Transportation Program.

Issue:

Staff recommends the Commission adopt the proposed 2023 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components in accordance with Staff Recommendations presented under Reference No. 4.5. The staff recommendations were made available to the Commission, the California Department of Transportation, regional agencies, local agencies, and other interested stakeholders on October 20, 2022. The Commission held a hearing to receive public comment on December 7, 2022 under Reference Number 4.5.

The Statewide Component includes 67 projects for funding, totaling \$853.52 million in Active Transportation Program funding and valued at approximately \$1.149 billion, as shown in Attachment B.

The Small Urban and Rural Component includes 26 projects for funding, totaling \$170.704 million in Active Transportation Program funding and valued at approximately \$209.187 million, as shown in Attachment C.

Background:

The Active Transportation Program's main purpose is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. In addition, the program aims to increase the share of walking and biking trips, increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users, help regional agencies achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals, enhance public health, ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in program benefits, and provide a broad

spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users. The new cycle of Active Transportation Program funding occurs every two years with four years of funding per cycle.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Resolution G-22-70
- Attachment B: 2023 Active Transportation Program – Statewide Component Staff Recommendations
- Attachment C: 2023 Active Transportation Program – Small Urban and Rural Component Staff Recommendations

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Adoption of the 2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide and Small Urban and Rural Components**

RESOLUTION G-22-70

- 1.1 **WHEREAS**, Streets and Highways Code Section 2384 requires the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt a program of projects to receive allocations under the Active Transportation Program; and
- 1.2 **WHEREAS**, the Commission must adopt a program of projects for the Active Transportation Program at least every two years, with each program covering four fiscal years; and
- 1.3 **WHEREAS**, the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines were adopted on March 16, 2022; and
- 1.4 **WHEREAS**, the guidelines describe the policies, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development and management of the 2023 Active Transportation Program funding cycle; and
- 1.5 **WHEREAS**, the 2023 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate was adopted on March 16, 2022, providing over \$650 million in Active Transportation Program programming capacity for fiscal years 2023-24 through 2026-27; and
- 1.6 **WHEREAS**, the Governor signed the Budget Act of 2022 on June 27, 2022, which included a one-time, \$1.049 billion funding augmentation for the Active Transportation Program; and
- 1.7 **WHEREAS**, the Commission adopted the Addendum to the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines on August 17, 2022; and
- 1.8 **WHEREAS**, the Addendum to the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines outlines the policies and procedures for the use of the one-time \$1.049 billion augmentation as part of the 2023 Active Transportation Program; and
- 1.9 **WHEREAS**, the Commission amended the 2023 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate on August 17, 2022; and
- 1.10 **WHEREAS**, the Amended 2023 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate provides over \$1.7 billion in programming capacity to the 2023 Active Transportation Program, to be apportioned to the Statewide (50 percent), Small Urban and Rural (10 percent), and Metropolitan Planning Organization (40 percent) components in fiscal years 2023-24 through 2026-27; and
- 1.11 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to Streets and Highway Code Section 2382 subdivision (c), no less than 25 percent of overall program funds must benefit disadvantaged communities during each program cycle; and

- 1.12 **WHEREAS**, the staff recommendations conform to the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines and other statutory requirements for the Active Transportation Program; and
- 1.13 **WHEREAS**, the Commission considered the staff recommendations and public testimony at its December 7-8, 2022 meeting.
- 2.1 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Commission adopts the 2023 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components, as indicated in Attachments B and C, respectively; and
- 2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that having a project included in the adopted 2023 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components is not an authorization to begin work on that project. Contracts may not be awarded, nor work begin until an allocation is approved by the Commission for a project in the adopted program; and
- 2.3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a project included in the adopted 2023 Active Transportation Program must comply with the Active Transportation Program Guidelines; and
- 2.4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the project amounts approved for funding shall be considered as a “not to exceed amount” and that any increases in cost estimates beyond the levels reflected in the adopted program are the responsibility of the appropriate agency; and
- 2.5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that if available funding is less than assumed in the Fund Estimate, the Commission may be forced to delay or restrict allocations using interim allocation plans, or, if available funding proves to be greater than assumed, it may be possible to allocate funding to some projects earlier than the year programmed; and
- 2.6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that staff, in consultation with the California Department of Transportation, is authorized to make further technical changes in cost, schedules, and descriptions for projects in the 2023 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban and Rural components in order to reflect the most current information, or to clarify the Commission’s programming commitments, and shall request Commission approval of any substantive changes; and
- 2.7 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission directs staff to post the 2023 Active Transportation Program of projects on the Commission’s website.
- 2.8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission directs staff to continue seeking a permanent source of augmented funding for the Active Transportation Program.

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Reference No.: 4.6
December 7-8, 2022
Attachment B

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
Active Transportation Resource Center	Active Transportation Resource Center	Statewide	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	N/A	N/A
7-Bell Gardens, City of-1	Bell Gardens Complete Streets Improvements - Phase 2	Los Angeles	\$ 2,964	\$ 2,964	\$ 355	\$ -	\$ 2,609	\$ -	\$ 70	\$ 285	\$ -	\$ 2,609	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	99.5
7-Los Angeles County-2	Metro A Line Connections for Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Los Angeles	\$ 12,331	\$ 9,864	\$ 810	\$ -	\$ 3,028	\$ 6,026	\$ 810	\$ 520	\$ 2,508	\$ 6,026	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	99
3-Sacramento County-3	Stockton Blvd Complete Streets Project	Sacramento	\$ 15,721	\$ 363	\$ 363	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 363	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	98
6-Visalia, City of-2	Houston Community Connectivity Project	Tulare	\$ 2,385	\$ 2,385	\$ 275	\$ 10	\$ 2,100	\$ -	\$ 75	\$ 200	\$ 10	\$ 2,100	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	98
6-Dinuba, City of-7 ^s	Building Dinuba's Active Transportation Future - Infrastructure & Non-Infrastructure	Tulare	\$ 17,235	\$ 13,147	\$ 2,195	\$ -	\$ 10,952	\$ -	\$ 833	\$ 1,223	\$ -	\$ 10,952	\$ 139	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	98
7-Los Angeles, City of-2 ^s	Western Our Way: Walk and Wheel Improvements	Los Angeles	\$ 47,765	\$ 37,737	\$ 4,158	\$ -	\$ 2,239	\$ 31,340	\$ 4,158	\$ 2,239	\$ -	\$ 31,340	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	98
5-Lompoc, City of-1	City of Lompoc Walkability, Community Safety and School Investments Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 3,041	\$ 2,795	\$ 830	\$ 1,965	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 123	\$ -	\$ 1,965	\$ 707	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	97.5
10-Stockton, City of-5	Downtown Stockton Weber Avenue Bike and Ped Connectivity	San Joaquin	\$ 11,842	\$ 9,427	\$ 420	\$ 1,690	\$ -	\$ 7,317	\$ 420	\$ 1,690	\$ -	\$ 7,317	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	97
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-1	Jurupa Valley Mira Loma Area SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure	Riverside	\$ 3,499	\$ 3,499	\$ 389	\$ 3,110	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 379	\$ -	\$ 3,110	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	97
7-Los Angeles, City of-1 ^s	Osborne Street: Path to Park Access Project	Los Angeles	\$ 49,832	\$ 42,295	\$ 5,287	\$ -	\$ 2,266	\$ 34,742	\$ 5,287	\$ 2,266	\$ -	\$ 34,742	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	97
4-Bay Area Toll Authority-1 ^s	West Oakland Link of the Bay Skyway	Alameda	\$ 65,035	\$ 17,600	\$ -	\$ 17,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,600	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	97
7-El Monte, City of-1	Traffic Calming for Parkway Dr/Denholm Dr	Los Angeles	\$ 5,846	\$ 4,334	\$ 4,334	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,334	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	96.5
8-Riverside County-3	Desert Edge Mobility Plan	Riverside	\$ 300	\$ 300	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300	Plan	Yes	No	96
5-Santa Barbara, City of-2 ^s	Westside and Lower West Neighborhood Active Transportation Plan Implementation	Santa Barbara	\$ 21,315	\$ 19,182	\$ 1,925	\$ 1,100	\$ -	\$ 16,157	\$ 1,925	\$ 1,000	\$ 100	\$ 16,059	\$ 98	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	96
5-Monterey County-1	San Ardo Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 3,448	\$ 3,448	\$ 792	\$ 364	\$ 2,292	\$ -	\$ 85	\$ 326	\$ 38	\$ 2,292	\$ 707	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	96
7-Commerce, City of-1	Slauson Avenue Corridor & Citywide Pedestrian, Bike, Transit Improvements	Los Angeles	\$ 2,109	\$ 2,109	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 1,959	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 140	\$ -	\$ 1,959	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	96
3-Rancho Cordova, City of-1 ^s	Zinfandel Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing	Sacramento	\$ 27,320	\$ 19,956	\$ 19,956	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,956	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	95
5-Santa Cruz County-1 ^s	Coastal Rail Trail Segments 10 and 11	Santa Cruz	\$ 84,672	\$ 67,599	\$ 5,764	\$ 61,835	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,973	\$ 1,796	\$ 61,835	\$ 995	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	95
5-Watsonville, City of-1	Safe Routes to Downtown Watsonville	Santa Cruz	\$ 8,687	\$ 6,948	\$ 616	\$ 507	\$ -	\$ 5,825	\$ -	\$ 507	\$ -	\$ 5,825	\$ 616	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	95
7-Los Angeles, City of-7 ^s	LA River Greenway, East San Fernando Valley Gap Closure	Los Angeles	\$ 49,401	\$ 34,401	\$ 3,200	\$ 4,200	\$ -	\$ 27,001	\$ 3,200	\$ 3,600	\$ 600	\$ 27,001	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	95
4-Berkeley, City of-1	Addison Street Bicycle Boulevard Extension Project	Alameda	\$ 6,165	\$ 4,870	\$ 99	\$ 529	\$ -	\$ 4,242	\$ 99	\$ 529	\$ -	\$ 4,242	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	95
3-Yuba County-1 ^s	West Linda Comprehensive Safe Routes to School Project	Yuba	\$ 26,624	\$ 21,166	\$ 2,269	\$ 60	\$ 18,837	\$ -	\$ 756	\$ 1,513	\$ -	\$ 18,837	\$ 60	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	95
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-2	Central Avenue Bikeway - The Missing Link	San Diego	\$ 4,141	\$ 2,834	\$ 2,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,834	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	95
5-Santa Maria, City of-1	Active Santa Maria Safe Routes to School Corridor Improvements	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,131	\$ 7,721	\$ 150	\$ 1,040	\$ 6,531	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 440	\$ 600	\$ 6,531	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	94
6-Porterville, City of-1	HAWK Pedestrian Crossings Project	Tulare	\$ 1,859	\$ 1,519	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,519	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,519	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	94
3-Sacramento, City of-1	Franklin Boulevard Complete Street - Phase 3	Sacramento	\$ 12,493	\$ 1,577	\$ 1,157	\$ 420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,157	\$ 420	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	94
7-City of Los Angeles, City of-9 ^s	Skid Row Connectivity and Safety Project	Los Angeles	\$ 47,566	\$ 38,599	\$ 4,260	\$ -	\$ 3,246	\$ 31,093	\$ 4,260	\$ 2,434	\$ 812	\$ 31,093	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	94
4-Contra Costa County-5	Pacifica Avenue Safe Routes to School Project	Contra Costa	\$ 4,342	\$ 3,902	\$ 375	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 3,327	\$ 375	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 3,327	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	94
4-Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority-1 ^s	Bascom Avenue Complete Street Project (I-880 to Hamilton Avenue)	Santa Clara	\$ 46,685	\$ 39,103	\$ -	\$ 39,103	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,103	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	93
3-Sacramento County-1	Elkhorn Boulevard Complete Streets Project	Sacramento	\$ 9,122	\$ 8,075	\$ 44	\$ 966	\$ -	\$ 7,065	\$ 44	\$ 612	\$ 354	\$ 6,837	\$ 228	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	93

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Reference No.: 4.6
December 7-8, 2022
Attachment B

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-Santa Barbara, City of-3	Milpas Street Crosswalk Safety and Sidewalk Widening Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 9,995	\$ 7,995	\$ 1,000	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ 6,720	\$ 1,000	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ 6,720	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	93
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-1	SR 174/49/20 Roundabout and Active Transportation Safety Project	Nevada	\$ 6,815	\$ 5,439	\$ 200	\$ 1,125	\$ -	\$ 4,114	\$ 200	\$ 900	\$ 225	\$ 4,114	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	93
10-Stockton, City of-1	Alpine Pershing Mendocino Bicycle-Pedestrian Connectivity	San Joaquin	\$ 8,238	\$ 7,403	\$ 389	\$ 813	\$ -	\$ 6,201	\$ 389	\$ 723	\$ 90	\$ 6,201	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	93
2-Redding, City of-1	Butte Street Boogie Network Project	Shasta	\$ 8,048	\$ 6,437	\$ 821	\$ 834	\$ -	\$ 4,782	\$ 555	\$ 834		\$ 4,782	\$ 266	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	93
7-Los Angeles, City of-5*§	Wilmington Safe Streets: A People First Approach	Los Angeles	\$ 40,784	\$ 32,331	\$ 3,823	\$ -	\$ 1,748	\$ 26,760	\$ 3,823	\$ 1,748	\$ -	\$ 26,760	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	93
3-Paradise, Town of-4§	Go Paradise: Pentz Student Pathway	Butte	\$ 23,293	\$ 22,009	\$ 2,098	\$ -	\$ 19,911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 1,948	\$ 19,911	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	93
7-Lancaster, City of-2	Lancaster SRTS Master Plan - Refresh, Rebuild, Recruit, Sustain	Los Angeles	\$ 902	\$ 796	\$ 796	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 796	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	Yes	92
10-San Joaquin County-4	Harrison Elementary Active Transportation Improvements	San Joaquin	\$ 4,889	\$ 3,886	\$ 114	\$ 556	\$ 3,216	\$ -	\$ 114	\$ 556	\$ -	\$ 3,216	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	92
8-Coachella Valley Association of Governments-1§	Coachella Valley Arts & Music Line	Riverside	\$ 46,099	\$ 36,483	\$ 36,483	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,483	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	92
11-National City, City of-3	24th Street Transit Center Connections	San Diego	\$ 3,498	\$ 3,496	\$ 148	\$ 445	\$ -	\$ 2,903	\$ 148	\$ 445	\$ -	\$ 2,903	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	92
5-San Luis Obispo, City of-1	South Higuera Complete Streets Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 8,817	\$ 6,951	\$ 6,951	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,951	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	92
6-Fresno County-1	Del Rey Sidewalk Project	Fresno	\$ 3,014	\$ 2,982	\$ 99	\$ 417	\$ 61	\$ 2,405	\$ 99	\$ 417	\$ 61	\$ 2,405	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	92
6-Kern County - D6-1	Norris Pedestrian and Railroad Safety Project	Kern	\$ 9,793	\$ 8,782	\$ 1,059	\$ 2,302	\$ 5,421	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,059	\$ 2,302	\$ 5,421	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	91
12-Orange County-1§	OC Loop Segment P and Q	Orange	\$ 60,187	\$ 45,921	\$ 5,699	\$ 40,222	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,699	\$ 40,222	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	91
10-Calaveras County-1	San Andreas Pope Street and Safe Routes to School Project	Calaveras	\$ 9,997	\$ 9,867	\$ 470	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$ 7,797	\$ 470	\$ 1,000	\$ 600	\$ 7,797	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	91
3-Sacramento, City of-2	Envision Broadway in Oak Park	Sacramento	\$ 14,320	\$ 1,101	\$ -	\$ 1,101	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,101	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	91
6-Corcoran, City of-1	City of Corcoran Equitable Health, Safety & Connectivity Project	Kings	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 50	\$ 972	\$ 2,478	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 520	\$ 452	\$ 2,478	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	91
3-West Sacramento, City of-1§	I Street Bridge Deck Conversion for Active Transportation Project	Yolo	\$ 22,561	\$ 16,029	\$ 16,029	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,029	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	91
2-Susanville, City of-1	Riverside Drive Pedestrian and Bike Trail Project	Lassen	\$ 3,111	\$ 2,861	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 2,461	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 2,461	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	91
5-Santa Barbara, City of-1§	Cliff Drive: Urban Highway to Complete Street Transformation Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 33,991	\$ 27,191	\$ 1,920	\$ 1,116	\$ -	\$ 24,155	\$ 1,920	\$ 1,086	\$ 30	\$ 24,087	\$ 68	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	91
7-Hawaiian Gardens, City of-1	Hawaiian Gardens Bicycle Master Plan	Los Angeles	\$ 370	\$ 370	\$ 370	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 370	Plan	Yes	No	91
7-Los Angeles, City of-4§	Normandie Beautiful: Creating Neighborhood Connections in South LA	Los Angeles	\$ 27,774	\$ 23,579	\$ 2,740	\$ -	\$ 1,475	\$ 19,364	\$ 2,740	\$ 1,475	\$ -	\$ 19,364	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	91
7-San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments-2	Montebello Railroad Safety Crossings Improvements	Los Angeles	\$ 7,388	\$ 5,906	\$ 5,906	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,906	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	91
4-San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency-2§	Bayview Multimodal Community Corridor	San Francisco	\$ 15,445	\$ 12,325	\$ 2,807	\$ -	\$ 9,518	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 1,650	\$ -	\$ 9,518	\$ 857	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	90.5
11-Imperial Beach, City of-1§	Palm Avenue Complete Multimodal Corridor	San Diego	\$ 26,227	\$ 23,112	\$ 150	\$ 1,220	\$ -	\$ 21,742	\$ 150	\$ 1,100	\$ 120	\$ 21,742	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	90
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-2	Jurupa Valley Granite Hill Area SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure	Riverside	\$ 4,240	\$ 3,390	\$ 490	\$ 2,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60	\$ 430	\$ -	\$ 2,900	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	90
5-El Paso De Robles, City of-1§	Niblick Road Complete and Sustainable Bike and Pedestrian Streets	San Luis Obispo	\$ 17,257	\$ 13,806	\$ 922	\$ 1,118	\$ -	\$ 11,766	\$ 922	\$ 1,118	\$ -	\$ 11,766	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	90
5-Santa Cruz, City of-1§	Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segments 8 and 9 Construction	Santa Cruz	\$ 48,719	\$ 35,766	\$ 35,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 34,274	\$ 992	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	90
7-Ventura County-1	Saticoy Pedestrian Improvement & Community Connections Project	Ventura	\$ 3,497	\$ 3,497	\$ 225	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 2,872	\$ 225	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 2,872	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	90
3-Placerville, City of-1§	Placerville Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Phase 1	El Dorado	\$ 28,929	\$ 15,417	\$ -	\$ 15,417	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,417	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	90
4-Contra Costa County-6§	San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets/Bay Trail Gap Closure Project	Contra Costa	\$ 11,717	\$ 10,517	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,517	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,517	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	90

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Reference No.: 4.6
December 7-8, 2022
Attachment B

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
1-Eureka, City of-2	C Street Bike Boulevard	Humboldt	\$ 2,405	\$ 2,344	\$ 2,344	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,344	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	90
12-Santa Ana, City of-13	Orange Avenue Bike Lane and Bicycle Boulevard Project	Orange	\$ 5,827	\$ 5,827	\$ 85	\$ 851	\$ -	\$ 4,891	\$ 85	\$ 851	\$ -	\$ 4,891	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	90
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-3	Jurupa Valley Agate Street Complete Streets Project	Riverside	\$ 1,272	\$ 1,272	\$ 140	\$ 1,132	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 1,132	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	90
7-Long Beach, City of-1	Mid-City Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections	Los Angeles	\$ 9,797	\$ 8,817	\$ -	\$ 1,604	\$ -	\$ 7,213	\$ -	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ 7,213	\$ 854	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	No	89.5
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-1†	Howard Bikeway: Connecting Vibrant San Diego Neighborhoods	San Diego	\$ 9,800	\$ 1,396	\$ 1,396	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,396	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	89
			\$ 1,149,392	\$ 853,520													

Notes
§Project requires a Baseline Agreement. Please see the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines for more information.
†San Diego Association of Governments requested \$8,137,000 for the Howard Bikeway: Connecting Vibrant San Diego Neighborhoods project. However, only \$1,396,000 in programming capacity remains in the Statewide component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms			
CON:	Construction Phase	PS&E:	Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase
DAC:	Disadvantaged Community	R/W:	Right-of-Way Phase
NI:	Non-Infrastructure	SRTS:	Safe Routes to School Project
PA&ED:	Environmental Phase		

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Small Urban and Rural Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Reference No: 4.6
December 7-8, 2022
Attachment C

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
10-Tuolumne County-1	Groveland Community Connectivity Project	Tuolumne	\$ 3,036	\$ 3,036	\$ 160	\$ 220	\$ 100	\$ 2,556	\$ 160	\$ 220	\$ 100	\$ 2,556	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	89
10-Sonora, City of-1	SR 49 Gold Rush Multi-Use Path Phase 1	Tuolumne	\$ 6,418	\$ 5,018	\$ 233	\$ 1,220	\$ 3,565	\$ -	\$ 233	\$ 520	\$ 700	\$ 3,565	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	89
3-Butte County-1	South Oroville Bike and Ped Connectivity Project	Butte	\$ 9,286	\$ 7,786	\$ 7,786	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,904	\$ 882	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88.5
5-Monterey County-3	Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 6,463	\$ 6,463	\$ 1,045	\$ 488	\$ 4,930	\$ -	\$ 37	\$ 450	\$ 38	\$ 4,930	\$ 1,008	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88.5
5-Arroyo Grande, City of-1	Halcyon Road Complete Streets Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 9,170	\$ 8,169	\$ 1,304	\$ 6,865	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 648	\$ 656	\$ 6,765	\$ 100	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88
10-Groveland Community Services District-1	Hetch Hetchy Railroad Trail Project	Tuolumne	\$ 5,443	\$ 4,299	\$ 146	\$ 308	\$ 118	\$ 3,727	\$ 146	\$ 308	\$ 118	\$ 3,727	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	88
5-San Luis Obispo County-1	Morro Bay to Cayucos Multi-Use Trail Gap Closure Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 13,170	\$ 7,406	\$ -	\$ 7,406	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,406	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	88
5-California Department of Transportation-1	Los Alamos Connected Community Project (SR 135)	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,525	\$ 8,075	\$ 710	\$ -	\$ 1,956	\$ 5,409	\$ 710	\$ 1,044	\$ 912	\$ 5,359	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88
1-Eureka, City of-1	Bay to Zoo Trail	Humboldt	\$ 9,999	\$ 8,999	\$ 118	\$ 525	\$ 8,356	\$ -	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ 525	\$ 8,356	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	87
3-Paradise, Town of-2§	Go Paradise: Neal Gateway Project	Butte	\$ 13,068	\$ 12,348	\$ 1,838	\$ -	\$ 10,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 352	\$ 1,486	\$ 10,510	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	86
5-Santa Barbara County-2	Isla Vista Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,998	\$ 7,107	\$ 308	\$ 517	\$ 6,272	\$ 10	\$ 308	\$ 375	\$ 142	\$ 6,272	\$ 10	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	87
5-Monterey County-2	Chualar Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 6,349	\$ 6,349	\$ 1,694	\$ 4,655	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270	\$ 513	\$ 38	\$ 4,617	\$ 911	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	86
2-Modoc County-2	Surprise Valley School Safety and Community Connectivity Project	Modoc	\$ 3,021	\$ 3,021	\$ 144	\$ 208	\$ 2,669	\$ -	\$ 144	\$ 196	\$ 12	\$ 2,669	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	86
5-Salinas, City of-2	Alisal Safe Routes to School Project	Monterey	\$ 1,084	\$ 998	\$ 998	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 913	\$ 85	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	86
5-Santa Cruz, City of-2	Swanton Delaware Multiuse Path	Santa Cruz	\$ 2,968	\$ 2,968	\$ 140	\$ 25	\$ 2,803	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ 25	\$ 2,803	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	86
1-Mendocino Council of Governments-1	Gualala Downtown Streetscape Enhancement Project	Mendocino	\$ 9,995	\$ 7,780	\$ 447	\$ -	\$ 7,333	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 265	\$ 182	\$ 7,333	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	85
6-Madera County-1	La Vina Community Mobility and Safety Enhancements Project	Madera	\$ 2,837	\$ 2,837	\$ 325	\$ 95	\$ 2,417	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 300	\$ 95	\$ 2,417	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	85
2-Redding, City of-2	Victor Improvement Project	Shasta	\$ 9,992	\$ 7,993	\$ 904	\$ 1,045	\$ -	\$ 6,044	\$ 700	\$ 1,045	\$ -	\$ 6,044	\$ 204	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	84
5-Santa Cruz Health Services Agency-2	Safe Routes for Watsonville School Families and Community	Santa Cruz	\$ 1,921	\$ 1,881	\$ 1,881	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,881	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	Yes	84
5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County-1	Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway: California Avenue Segment	Monterey	\$ 10,670	\$ 8,429	\$ 1,508	\$ 6,921	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 528	\$ -	\$ 6,921	\$ 980	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	84
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-2*§	SR 49 Multimodal Corridor Improvements, Nevada City	Nevada	\$ 17,357	\$ 13,863	\$ 1,250	\$ -	\$ 1,900	\$ 10,713	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,750	\$ 150	\$ 10,637	\$ 76	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	83.5
5-King City, City of-1§	San Antonio Drive Path & Safe Routes to Schools	Monterey	\$ 14,543	\$ 11,043	\$ 3,695	\$ 12	\$ 7,336	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 1,050	\$ 12	\$ 7,336	\$ 2,295	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	81
3-Paradise, Town of-1	Go Paradise: Skyway Link Project	Butte	\$ 6,810	\$ 6,704	\$ 424	\$ 1,073	\$ -	\$ 5,207	\$ 424	\$ 715	\$ 358	\$ 5,207	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	80
3-Williams, City of-1	E Street Complete Streets Project	Colusa	\$ 11,760	\$ 9,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,141	\$ 200	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	80
5-University of California - Santa Cruz-1	UCSC "SlugBikeLife" Bike Safety and Education Program Phase 2	Santa Cruz	\$ 742	\$ 712	\$ 712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 712	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	No	79
5-Salinas, City of-1‡	Harden Parkway Path & Safe Routes to School project	Monterey	\$ 15,562	\$ 8,079	\$ 3,528	\$ -	\$ 4,551	\$ -	\$ 405	\$ 1,575	\$ -	\$ 4,551	\$ 1,548	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	78
			\$ 209,187	\$ 170,704													

Notes
 §Project requires a Baseline Agreement. Please see the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines for more information.
 ‡The City of Salinas requested \$14,006,000 for the Harden Parkway Path & Safe Routes to School Project. However, only \$8,079,000 in programming capacity remains in the Small Urban & Rural component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms			
CON:	Construction Phase	PS&E:	Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase
DAC:	Disadvantaged Community	R/W:	Right-of-Way Phase
NI:	Non-Infrastructure	SRTS:	Safe Routes to School Project
PA&ED:	Environmental Phase		