



# MEETING AGENDA

## Technical Advisory Committee

**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Date:** May 16, 2022

This meeting is being conducted in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jonathan Hoy, **Chair** / Eric Cowle, CVAG  
Savat Khamphou, **Vice Chair** / Rosalva Ureno, City of Corona  
Art Vela / Nate Smith, City of Banning  
Jeff Hart / Robert Vestal, City of Beaumont  
VACANT, City of Blythe  
Michael Thornton / VACANT, City of Calimesa  
Albert Vergel De Dios / Sean Young, Caltrans District 8  
VACANT / Mike Borja, City of Canyon Lake  
John A. Corella / Crystal Sandoval, Cathedral City  
Andrew Simmons / Maritza Martinez, City of Coachella  
Daniel Porras / Nick Haecker, City of Desert Hot Springs  
Jimmy Chung / Dahi Kim, City of Eastvale  
Noah Rau / Nancy Beltran, City of Hemet  
Ken Seumalo / Dina Purvis, City of Indian Wells  
Timothy T. Wassil / Eric Weck, City of Indio  
Paul Toor / Rod Butler, City of Jurupa Valley  
Bryan McKinney / Julie Mignogna, City of La Quinta  
Remon Habib / Bradley Brophy, City of Lake Elsinore

Nick Fidler / Daniel Padilla, City of Menifee  
Michael Lloyd / Melissa Walker, City of Moreno Valley  
Bob Moehling / Jeff Hitch, City of Murrieta  
Chad Blais / Sam Nelson, City of Norco  
Andy Firestine / Randy Bowman, City of Palm Desert  
Joel Montalvo / Marcus Fuller, City of Palm Springs  
K. George Colangeli / Dale Reynolds, PVVTA  
Stuart McKibbin / VACANT, City of Perris  
Ryan Stendell / VACANT, City of Rancho Mirage  
Farshid Mohammadi / Gilbert Hernandez, City of Riverside  
Mark Lancaster / Mojahed Salama, County of Riverside  
Kristin Warsinski / Jennifer Nguyen, RTA  
Travis Randel / Stuart McKibbin, City of San Jacinto  
Brittney B. Sowell / Rohan Kuruppu, SunLine  
Patrick Thomas / Amer Attar, City of Temecula  
Christopher Tzeng / Cameron Brown, WRCOG  
Jason Farag / Cameron Luna, City of Wildomar

## STAFF

Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director  
Jenny Chan, Planning and Programming Manager  
Martha Masters, Planning and Programming Senior Management Analyst  
James Simpson, Planning and Programming Management Analyst

## AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Subject to the supervision of the Commission, the Committee shall provide technical assistance to the Commission by reviewing and evaluating the various transportation proposals and alternatives within Riverside County. The Committee shall review, comment upon, and make recommendations on such matters as are referred to it by the Commission, including all matters relating to the programming of federal funds apportioned to the Riverside County and allocated by the Commission.

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA\***

\*Actions may be taken on any item listed on the agenda.

**TIME:** 10:00 a.m.

**DATE:** May 16, 2022

**LOCATION:** This meeting is being conducted in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing.

Join Zoom Meeting - from PC, Laptop or Phone  
<https://rctc.zoom.us/j/82888102583>

One tap mobile:  
+16699006833,,82888102583# US (San Jose)

Dial by your location  
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID:  
828 8810 2583

Find your local number: <https://rctc.zoom.us/j/82888102583>

**The following commands can be used on your phone's dial pad while in Zoom meeting:**

- \*6 - Toggle mute/unmute
- \*9 - Raise hand

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Government Code Section 54954.2, and the Federal Transit Administration Title VI, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (951) 787-7141 if special assistance is needed to participate in a public meeting, including accessibility and translation services. Assistance is provided free of charge. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to the meeting time will assist staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide assistance at the meeting.*

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. HOUSEKEEPING REMARKS**

**3. ROLL CALL**

**4. APPROVAL OF MARCH 21, 2022, MINUTES**

***Page 1***

**5. PUBLIC COMMENTS** – This is for comments on items not listed on agenda. Comments relating to an item on the agenda will be taken when the item is before the Committee.

**6. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY UPDATE**

***Page 13***

***Overview***

This item is to receive and file an update from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study (Study).

**7. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS 2023 REGIONAL PROGRAM GUIDELINES - SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY APPLICATIONS**

***Page 16***

***Overview***

This item is for the Technical Advisory Committee to:

- 1) Approve the project selection criteria for inclusion in the Metropolitan Planning Organizations' (MPO) Regional Program Guidelines for Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 6;
- 2) Authorize staff to award projects based on the approved selection criteria for the MPO funding; and
- 3) Forward to the Commission for final action.

**8. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM AUGMENTATION**

***Page 20***

***Overview***

This item is to discuss and provide input on the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Active Transportation Program (ATP) Augmentation Proposal.

**9. FUTURE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING LOCATIONS**

***Page 37***

***Overview***

This item is for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to concur on the two concurrent meeting locations for future in-person TAC meetings.

**10. CALTRANS DISTRICT 8 LOCAL ASSISTANCE UPDATE**

***Page 40***

***Overview***

This item is to receive and file an update from Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance.

**11. COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT**

***Overview***

This item provides the opportunity for the committee members and staff to report on attended and upcoming meetings/conferences and issues related to committee activities.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled to be held July 18, 2022, 10:00 a.m.

***MINUTES***

# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Monday, March 21, 2022

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order by Vice Chair Savat Khamphou at 10:03 a.m., in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing

## 2. VICE CHAIR SAVAT KHAMPHOU READ THE HOUSEKEEPING NOTES.

## 3. ROLL CALL

### Members Present by Teleconference:

Nate Smith, City of Banning  
Robert Vestal, City of Beaumont  
Michael Thornton, City of Calimesa  
Albert Vergel De Dios, Caltrans  
Andrew Simmons, City of Coachella  
Savat Khamphou, City of Corona  
Ken Seumalo, City of Indian Wells  
Paul Toor, City of Jurupa Valley  
Bryan McKinney, City of La Quinta  
Remon Habib, City of Lake Elsinore  
Michael Lloyd, City of Moreno Valley  
Bob Moehling, City of Murrieta  
Randy Bowman, City of Palm Desert  
Joel Montalvo, City of Palm Springs  
Stuart McKibbin, City of Perris  
Ryan Stendell, City of Rancho Mirage  
Farshid Mohammadi, City of Riverside  
Mojahed Salama, Riverside County  
Jennifer Nguyen, Riverside Transit Agency  
Travis Randel, City of San Jacinto  
Rohan Kuruppu, Sunline Transit Agency  
Patrick Thomas, City of Temecula  
Jason Farag, City of Wildomar

## 4. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 15, 2021, MINUTES

**B/C/A (Mohammadi/Habib) to approve the Minutes as submitted. There were no objections to this motion.**

**Abstain: 1 (Montalvo)**

## **5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

## **6. RIVERSIDE COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GRANT PURSUITS**

Jenny Chan, RCTC, announced that the call for projects for the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 6 opened last week. To kick off the ATP discussion, Riverside County Health was invited to share their past success with the program and talk about potential partnerships for Cycle 6.

Miguel Vasquez, Health Equity Urban and Regional Planner, Riverside University Health System (RUHS) Public Health, clarified that RUHS was the Public Health Department for the County of Riverside serving all jurisdictions and 2.5 million people for anything relating to improving the health of communities. This is accomplished in several ways, in terms of transportation, the Injury Prevention Services has managed a transportation program, formerly the Safe Routes to School. This program is mostly related to known infrastructure interventions, working with families, schools, and community groups to educate about pedestrian and bike safety. Goals of the program include increased biking and walking, increased active transportation safety, development of new or improved bike and walkways, and improved public health.

The goals are accomplished by many strategies and are referred to in several schools as the 5 Es - Education, Encouragement, Engagement, to some extent Engineering, Evaluation and Equity. Activities provided include theme-based walk to school days, bike training, walk-ability workshops, on campus safety campaigns, health and safety fairs, and bike rodeos. Presently, Public Health is working with the Cities of Desert Hot Springs and Corona. Beginning in July, the Cities of Hemet, San Jacinto, and Coachella will also start working with Public Health.

The ATP grants have allowed Public Health to expand their services. In 2020, Public Health was part of two teams that had contracts that provided community engagement services for the City of Menifee as they were working on their active transportation plan. Public Health also worked with the City of Moreno Valley as they were engaged in developing their Dracaea Avenue Greenway Corridor. Public Health is currently planning to apply for Cycle 6, but the location and community is yet to be determined.

Of note, Public Health was recently awarded \$2 million from the Clean California Local Grant Program to conduct known infrastructure and interventions in the unincorporated community of Oasis. Public Health is available to provide services to any Riverside County city through either joint ATP grant applications or via contracts for ATP projects that involve community engagement.

## **7. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS 2023 REGIONAL PROGRAM GUIDELINES – SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY APPLICATIONS**

Ms. Chan provided a presentation on the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) ATP Cycle 6 Regional Program Guidelines. The goals of the ATP are to increase biking and walking, increase safety, advance active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reductions, enhance public health, and ensure that at least 25% of funds benefit disadvantaged communities. Pursuant to legislation, the CTC is responsible for developing the guidelines and administering the program.

The CTC distributes 50% of the funds at the statewide competitive level, 10% to small urban and rural regions, and 40% at the large MPO level. The ATP process allows applicants in Riverside County two opportunities for award at the statewide level and large MPO level. Projects are first evaluated statewide and those not ranked high enough for funding are automatically provided a second opportunity for funding through the large MPO share. SCAG works with the county transportation commissions to develop the regional program guidelines.

This year, Cycle 6 has a total of \$650 million available for award, which is \$200 million more than the last cycle thanks to an infusion of federal funding. SCAG is expected to receive \$137.68 million. In past cycles, the SCAG share was split 95% to implementation projects and 5% to non-infrastructure and planning projects. However, for this cycle, SCAG will not be utilizing the 5% share to supplement the sustainable communities program but it will instead be distributed to county transportation commissions based on population. In total, RCTC will have approximately \$17.69 million to award for Cycle 6, \$16.89 million for implementation projects, and \$884,000 for non-infrastructure planning projects.

Like past cycles, SCAG allows each county transportation commission to establish a 20-point methodology as part of the project selection criteria. The methodology used in Cycle 5 allowed RCTC to meet its goal of awarding projects that were construction ready and rewarding agencies that invested in pre-construction activities. For Cycle 6, RCTC staff is suggesting minor revisions to the point distribution methodology. With additional federal funds in the program, it may lead to more projects being federalized, prolonging the delivery timeline. To manage this program change, RCTC staff is proposing to award 4 points for projects with construction funding in the first three years of the program cycle, 7 points for projects with CEQA or NEPA approval (PA/ED completion), and 3 points for projects identified in WRCOG's Sub-Regional Active Transportation Plan, CVAG's Non-Motorized Plan, or an adopted local active transportation plan. This revised point methodology continues to reflect RCTC's goal of funding projects that are construction ready and reward agencies that invested or will invest in pre-construction activities.

During the last cycle, a copy of the CEQA or NEPA signature page had to be included for RCTC to award points for PA/ED completion. RCTC staff provided applicants an additional six months from the application deadline to submit the CEQA and/or NEPA clearance. This was beneficial

in the last cycle as it was a main criterion for award and lead to Riverside County receiving state funding because projects had cleared CEQA.

For this cycle, there are two potential deadlines to receive the CEQA and/or NEPA clearance. With project recommendations being due to SCAG on January 30, 2023, staff would bring an agenda item to the January 2023 Commission Meeting for approval, requiring all CEQA/NEPA clearances to be due by November 1, 2022. An alternative approach is to request that RCTC staff be given authority to award projects first, presenting the award list as an informational item at the next available Commission Meeting. This alternative approach would give agencies an extra two months to provide the CEQA/NEPA documentation with the final deadline being January 3, 2023.

The 5% share of the SCAG portion that will not be going to supplement the Sustainable Communities Program will be distributed to RCTC based on population. RCTC will have \$884,000 to award to non-infrastructure and planning projects. Staff is suggesting to award projects with a minimum score of 80 points for the statewide score, with a maximum award amount of \$442,000. Any remaining funds would be programmed for infrastructure projects.

Vice Chair Savat Khamphou, Corona, wanted clarification on when the application would be due for the ATP grant. Ms. Chan noted that the application would be due in June.

Patrick Thomas, Temecula, asked if a project was not currently federalized and it was awarded funds in this cycle, would the project then need to become federalized. Ms. Chan respond that the project would not need to be federalized. If the project had already completed CEQA, then that would be used as a justification for receiving state-only funding and the project would not be federalized. Even though the program has received \$200 million in federal funding, more state funds are still expected.

Ms. Chan wanted to know if there were any thoughts to the due date options presented for the CEQA/NEPA clearances, being either November 2022 or January 2023.

Vice Chair Khamphou thought the later the better when it comes to environmental documentation, since there is a choice.

Ken Seumalo, Indian Wells, agreed with Vice Chair Khamphou on using the later due date.

Randy Bowman, Palm Desert, echoed the decision to use the later due date.

Amer Attar, Temecula, wanted to know if the due date is in January, how would RCTC staff handle the recommendation when the Commission meeting is the same month. Ms. Chan noted that staff would finalize the selection criteria with the TAC, which would then be adopted by the Commission. In that same agenda item, staff would request authorization to award the projects based on the selection criteria. An informational item would come back to the Commission after the fact to inform them which projects were awarded.

Mr. Attar also wanted to know if the construction funding in the first three years of programming meant funds from RCTC or the agency. Ms. Chan clarified it would be based on the application where the construction funds were being requested and what year they were requested in. Mr. Attar wanted to know what would happen if the application stated there was funding in the first three years, but then the schedule fell through. Ms. Chan noted that was currently happening on other projects, but since the project was already awarded there is no mechanism of taking the funding back. This is a current concern with how the scoring criteria is structured, so staff is interested in any comments TAC members might have.

Mr. Attar thought when the decision is being made, it should be for concrete facts at the present time.

Vice Chair Khamphou thought the program understands the reality of obtaining environmental documents, but this is a mechanism to encourage agencies to go through the process of getting environmental clearance without being penalized for not having the clearance.

Andrew Simmons, Coachella, wanted to know if for criteria 3, CEQA/NEPA clearance, applicants can only receive maximum points for having the PA/ED completed or if any consideration or partial points would be given for having PA/ED started. He advocated that criteria 3 should allow for partial points if the PA/ED is started at the time the application is due. Ms. Chan wanted to know how staff should check whether PA/ED had been started. Mr. Simmons thought the agency could submit an active contract for consultant PA/ED services.

Mr. Attar thought that was a good suggestion for partial points. Another way for RCTC staff to monitor that would be to have the CEQA schedule and determine where the agency is on the schedule.

Ms. Chan stated these comments would be brought back to staff to revise the methodology based on what was shared. At the next TAC meeting, an item will be presented with the proposed methodology.

**8. 2021 AND 2023 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND 2020 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT UPDATE**

Martha Masters, RCTC, provided an update on the 2021 and 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) amendment. The FTIP is a listing of multi-modal transportation projects proposed over a six-year period for the SCAG region. The projects include highway improvements, transit, rail and bus facilities, high occupancy vehicle lanes, active transportation facilities and activities, signal synchronization, intersection improvements, freeway ramps, and more.

Links to the 2021 FTIP were included in the agenda item, and Amendments 1 through 18 have been approved as of today's date. The 2021 FTIP Amendment 21-19 is currently undergoing public review and can be viewed on SCAG's website; the link is also provided in the agenda item. Approval of Amendment 21-19 is expected in late June.

RCTC Planning and Programming staff should be notified by local agencies of any FTIP project changes so they can be properly incorporated and avoid project delays, especially as it relates to federal funds that require programming and projects that are expecting environmental approval. Both formal and administrative amendments are due to SCAG on Tuesday, April 5. Staff requests that any revisions to the project sheets be provided by Tuesday, March 29 to meet the SCAG deadline. The 2021 FTIP schedule was provided in the agenda item as well as a link to the 2021 FTIP guidelines for reference.

In January 2022, staff submitted 310 projects to SCAG totaling approximately \$10 billion in funding in the 2023 FTIP. The 2023 FTIP is anticipated to be approved in December 2022. The 2023 FTIP schedule is provided in the agenda item for information. RCTC Planning and Programming staff are available to assist with any questions regarding projects that may require updates in the 2021 or 2023 FTIP for federal approvals or federal obligations.

On January 26, an email was sent out to all TAC members regarding the 2022 RTP amendment opportunity. This opportunity meant that SCAG was accepting model updates for capacity increasing projects such as scope changes and completion date updates, as well as new projects that would be starting environmental work within the next two years. Opportunities such as these do not occur often, as it takes at least a year to approve an RTP amendment. Staff did not hear from all agencies. If an agency determines a new project needs to be added to the model or that a current project needs modeling updates, they should contact RCTC staff as soon as possible. The next opportunity to make modeling changes will be in the fall for inclusion in the 2024 RTP, anticipated to be approved in early summer 2024.

## **9. CALTRANS DISTRICT 8 LOCAL ASSISTANCE UPDATE**

Albert Vergel De Dios, Caltrans, announced that District 8 is planning on going back to the office April 1, utilizing a new telework agreement. Additionally, Mr. Vergel De Dios indicated the Clean California debrief is being scheduled and Caltrans is thinking about participating in the debrief to help out.

Leslie Avila, Caltrans, shared that funding information and award notification updates for Clean California were sent earlier this month to projects. As a county, there were six projects awarded out of the nine awarded to District 8. The grant amount that was awarded to the agencies totaled \$19 million.

There are several funding opportunities open and available currently. There are funds from the State Transportation Innovation Councils Incentive Program. These funds can be used to implement process changes, develop guidance standards and specifications, organize peer exchanges, offset implementation costs, and other activities that move innovation forward. The deadline to submit an application for the program is April 1. For the ATP program, as mentioned before, the project applications are due June 15. The FHWA Local Aid Support Tribal Transportation Assistance Program Centers, whose purpose is to re-establish the TTAP centers across the country, has an application due date of March 25. Lastly, the Rebuilding American

Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE), a discretionary grant program, has a deadline of April 14. Information on the grant is available on the U.S. Department of Transportation website.

There are currently eight inactive projects for Riverside County that need to be addressed, totaling an unexpended balance of \$6 million. The inactive project information should be reviewed on the Caltrans website. Cooperative Work Agreements (CWA) were recently sent out for project approvals, with all information also on the website. If an agency did not receive an approved extension or did not request an extension, invoices must be submitted by April 1, or the funds left on the project will lapse by June. There are currently 11 projects in Riverside County with Project End Date (PED) issues, which can also be viewed on the website. If more information is needed, member agencies can reach out to their respective area coordinator at Caltrans.

For clarification, PED is defined as the day after which no additional costs may be incurred for an authorized phase of work. Any cost incurred after this day would not be eligible for federal reimbursement. If the PED is revised after the authorized PED has passed, any costs incurred between the authorized and revised PED are ineligible for reimbursement.

Vice Chair Khamphou reminded the TAC that the PED comes from the agreement between an agency and Caltrans. They should be updated as necessary because if they are missed or are not updated, invoices can become ineligible.

Mr. Vergel De Dios added that the Buy America waiver for vehicle purchases needs to be turned in by March 22, which is a quarterly call. The A&E unit at Caltrans Headquarters is developing a checklist for developing RFP and RFQs. Caltrans does not have the resources to review these for agencies, so the checklist should be helpful for submittals on A&E contracts.

Vice Chair Khamphou wanted to clarify if the Buy America waiver for vehicles applied to FTA grants or funds. Mr. Vergel De Dios stated that this waiver did not apply to FTA grants or funds.

## **10. FUTURE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING LOCATIONS**

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, noted that AB 361 has allowed the Commission and associated committees to hold their meetings virtually due to the state of emergency caused by the COVID-19 virus. With transmission rates declining and restrictions lifting, staff brought forward this item today in anticipation that sooner or later the TAC will be required to return to in-person meetings. For the time being, the Commission continues to pass resolutions monthly to allow for virtual committee meetings to keep being held. As long as that is the case, staff will continue to hold the TAC meetings virtually. This will require members to pay close attention to the TAC agendas for location information and calendar invitations will be updated accordingly.

Staff would like input from the TAC on what would facilitate the best participation once there is a return to in-person meetings. Prior to the pandemic, when the TAC had meetings, the location was alternated between Riverside and the Coachella Valley to open opportunities for

the TAC members to not have to drive so far, every meeting. An idea to get the conversation started would be to stick with the previous format of requiring all members to travel to downtown Riverside one meeting, and then Coachella Valley for the next meeting.

Another option that was being brainstormed prior to the pandemic was to have two meeting locations for every meeting. The two locations would likely be downtown Riverside and the Coachella Valley. In this situation, both locations would use video conferencing so that the TAC members would be able to interact. RCTC staff could trade off each meeting alternating between both locations, or split up for every meeting so staff could be at both locations.

Since the TAC meeting follows the Brown Act, it is not possible to have a high number of meeting locations because the agenda would need to be posted at each location at least 72 hours in advance and the public would have to have access to each location to attend the meeting. Proposing two locations for the time being helps to manage the workload required to host the meeting.

Vice Chair Khamphou wanted to clarify that the proposed locations would be downtown Riverside and the CVAG office, but not the City of Beaumont location as had been the case in the past. Ms. Guizado stated that quite some time ago the TAC stopped meeting in Beaumont and instead moved the meetings to the Coachella Valley.

Ms. Masters noted that the City of Beaumont meeting location was relocated in 2017.

Mr. Thomas wanted to know with the two meeting locations if the TAC would still be accessible via Zoom. Ms. Guizado noted that once the Commission is no longer able or willing to continue approving the resolution for AB 361, meetings will have to be fully in-person and not virtual or hybrid. Mr. Thomas noted with that being the case, the two locations would be preferred.

Ms. Guizado added that staff had discussed the possibility of a third location in the southwestern county, though staff has not reached out to any member agencies about hosting. Mr. Thomas stated that if staff did want to add a third location, the City of Temecula has video conferencing capabilities at City Hall and could offer to host if the group agrees.

Jason Farag, Wildomar, noted that he would be in support of a third location in Temecula.

Paul Toor, Jurupa Valley, noted that when the TAC meeting used to be in the City of Banning and then switched to Beaumont it was very helpful. Ms. Guizado clarified that there is an option to have every TAC meeting at three separate locations that any jurisdiction could attend. The locations would be in downtown Riverside, Coachella Valley, and the southwest county. This does leave jurisdictions in the pass area in between locations.

Nate Smith, Banning, noted he would be willing to see if the city had facilities and would be able to accommodate and cover the middle of the region.

Vice Chair Khamphou wanted clarification on whether the TAC was looking to have three meeting sites for each meeting, or if the TAC wanted to have one central location for each meeting. The current meeting sites for the three locations would be downtown Riverside, the CVAG office, and somewhere in the southwest region, but the TAC could decide to replace one of those locations with somewhere in the pass region.

Mr. Smith thought it best to defer to Mr. Toor on whether the city could accommodate this meeting as he is new to this community. Mr. Toor stated that if the meeting could be in the City of Banning or Beaumont, it would bring the location to the halfway point and the CVAG location wouldn't be needed.

Vice Chair Khamphou clarified that the TAC would like three locations with one of them being at the pass either in Banning or Beaumont, one being in downtown Riverside, and the third being the southwestern region, eliminating the CVAG office.

Joel Montalvo, Palm Springs, would be in favor of keeping a meeting location in the desert as there are seven or eight jurisdictions in the Coachella Valley that would then have to drive out to the pass to get to the meeting.

Michael Thornton, Calimesa, wanted to know if the current virtual option would no longer be available. Ms. Guizado noted that since the TAC is done in accordance with the Brown Act, virtual meetings will not always be an option. The TAC is currently able to hold meetings virtually because the Commission is adopting monthly resolutions declaring a state of emergency which allows the TAC, under AB 361, to conduct business virtually. This discussion is for what the TAC will do once that option goes away. The current plan is the TAC will continue to meet virtually for as long as possible, but staff would like to be well positioned for when that option is unavailable.

Mark Lancaster, Riverside County, thought providing flexibility with three locations is probably the best option, leaving one in Palm Desert, one in downtown Riverside, and a third in the southwest county region. Each jurisdiction would have no more than an hour drive to one of the three locations.

Ms. Guizado noted that based on the comments received and internal staff work that needed to be done, at the May TAC meeting, if we are still able to meet virtually, an item will be brought forward to formalize the locations. Staff will work on reaching out to some locations to determine if they would be able to host the TAC meeting, as well. If the May meeting is going to be in person, staff will move forward with formalizing locations and send communication to the TAC in advance.

**11. CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: JANUARY AND MARCH 2022**

Ms. Guizado noted since the last meeting of the TAC, the CTC has had three meetings in December, January, and March. At the January 2022 meeting, the CTC approved RCTC's request

to allocate SB 1 Local Partnership Program Formulaic Funding for the design phase of the Mid County Parkway construction.

At the March meeting, the CTC adopted the 2023 Active Transportation Program guidelines for ATP Cycle 6 and released a call for projects last week. The CTC adopted the 2022 State Transportation Improvement Program, programming nearly \$50 million in Riverside County on four projects: I-10 Highland Springs Interchange, Temescal Canyon Road, I-10 Monroe Street Interchange, and Coachella Valley Rail. The CTC also adopted the 2022 SHOPP for Caltrans. Finally, the CTC approved an allocation request from RCTC for the SB 1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, competitive funding that was received back in December 2020, for the 71/91 Interchange, which is going to construction later this year.

The next CTC meeting will be held on May 18-19 in Fresno.

## **12. RCTC COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: DECEMBER 2021 AND JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH 2022**

Ms. Guizado noted at the December meeting of the Commission, the Board approved Temecula's request for help filling the funding gap on the I-15 Auxiliary Lane Project, which the TAC heard a presentation on at the November 2021 meeting.

At the January Commission Meeting, the Board approved the 2023 FTIP financial resolution. Finance also presented, and the Commission approved, the revised mid-year revenue projections for the current Fiscal Year 2021/22, as well as the revenue projections for Fiscal Year 2022/23. The current year revenues are exceeding original and even the previously revised projections. Next year's revenue projections are also looking strong. This action officially commences RCTC's annual budget process, which is required to be completed by June 15.

At the February Commission Meeting, the Board approved six additional SB 821 awards for the Fiscal Year 2021/22 cycle due to the revised LTF projections. The additional awards are for projects in Lake Elsinore, Menifee, Corona, Hemet, and Desert Hot Springs. Also at the February Commission meeting, the Board approved funding for the design and right of way phases of the regional I-10 Bypass Project led by the County of Riverside. This item was not able to be brought to the TAC as the request was received in December when the environmental phase was completed.

At the March Commission Meeting, the Board approved the awards of two separate construction contracts. One to Granite Construction for the construction of the Moreno Valley March Field Metrolink Station Track and Platform Expansion Project, the other to All American Asphalt for the I-15 Interim Corridor Operations Project at the southern terminus of the I-15 Express Lanes in south Corona. The Commission also approved the Policy Goals and Objectives for the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget.

The next Commission meeting will be held on April 14, most likely in person.

### **13. COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Guizado shared that staff heard this week that US DOT will be releasing federal competitive notices of funding opportunities. Last fall, the federal government passed a new transportation authorization bill called IJA but Congress did not pass the related budget to fund the five-year act. The funding bill was finally approved two weeks ago, fully authorizing the federal Fiscal Year 2021/22 amounts in the IJA. US DOT will be busy putting out the programs that are authorized under the bill.

Caltrans mentioned the RAISE opportunity closes on April 14 and there are a few others that may come out as one large notice of funding opportunity. The three programs that have been confirmed are the Mega Program, INFRA, and Rural.

The Mega Program, also known as the National Infrastructure Project Assistance Program, provides funding through single or multi-year grant agreements for eligible surface transportation projects such as highway or bridge projects, freight intermodal or freight rail projects with public benefit, railway/highway grade separations, inner city passenger rail projects, or other public transportation projects. The minimum project cost is \$100 million, with the funding being split 50% for projects that are \$100 million or more and 50% for projects that are \$500 million or more.

INFRA is a continuation of the program that was authorized under the FAST Act previously. It continues to cover the multimodal freight and highway projects of national or regional significance.

The Rural program, named Rural Surface Transportation Grants, will improve and expand the surface transportation infrastructure in rural areas to increase connectivity, improve safety and reliability of the movement of people and freight, and generate regional economic growth improving quality of life.

As soon as the information is available, staff will forward it to the TAC members.

Lastly, Caltrans headquarters has embarked on what is being called an updated approach to highway investments, whereby a list of pipeline projects that have already received environmental approval are being reviewed for alignment with the state's new goals, including SB 743 for VMT reduction and CAPTI, the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure. Headquarters has authorized the districts to discuss pipeline projects with project sponsors but to date RCTC has not been successful obtaining the list, so it is unknown which projects may be in question. TAC members should reach out to Ms. Guizado directly if they have been in communication with the District about any of the projects.

Mr. Lancaster, Riverside County, asked if anyone from Caltrans District 8 was still on the meeting and could provide the list. Ms. Avila, Caltrans, stated she was not aware of the list but could inquire with Local Assistance to get more information. Mr. Lancaster asked that the list be provided to RCTC staff so it could be forwarded to the TAC members.

Vice Chair Khamphou asked that any information about this be funneled through Ms. Guizado so it could be passed on to the TAC members.

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business for consideration by the Technical Advisory Committee, the meeting adjourned at approximately 11:17 a.m. The next meeting will be on May 16, 2022, at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jillian Guizado".

Jillian Guizado

Planning and Programming Director

# ***AGENDA ITEM 6***

<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	May 16, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Martha Masters, Senior Management Analyst
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Southern California Association of Governments Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study Update

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive and file an update from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study (Study).

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Transit expansion is a cornerstone of Connect SoCal, SCAG’s 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), contributing to the region’s mobility, sustainability, and air quality goals. The Study is one of SCAG’s efforts to advance implementation of Connect SoCal and support transit recovery as the region continues to confront the COVID-19 pandemic.

Transit agencies in the SCAG region and nationwide have been grappling with ridership decline. In 2018, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) completed a SCAG-funded study on transit ridership declines, titled, *Falling Transit Ridership in California and Southern California*, and identified two main recommendations. First, UCLA found that based on current trends, public transit’s core ridership could dramatically shrink in the future, and recommended transit agencies to encourage discretionary riders to occasionally take transit instead of driving. Second, the UCLA authors identified increasing car ownership as the leading factor in declining ridership but acknowledged this was outside transit agencies’ control. However, the authors recommended that transit agencies increase the quality of service to make transit more appealing to discretionary riders.

As the region’s transit agencies look forward to recovery and post-pandemic times, there exists an opportunity to implement changes to redefine transit quality, delivery, and the need for more frequent service.

**DISCUSSION:**

Restoring confidence in transit among previous riders and attracting new riders is largely dependent on how these transit challenges are resolved, particularly in relation to the delivery of transit services and improved frequency to meet the returning riders’ demands as the economy reopens. On-time performance is a key factor for all riders and underscores their

perception of transit. Dedicated transit lanes and priority treatments are part of the tools/strategies to help address transit speed and reliability on congested corridors.

The objective of this Study is to support the development of a regional network of dedicated bus lanes to enable enhanced transit services, improve mobility, accessibility and sustainability, and advance implementation of Connect SoCal. The Study will identify the key benefits of dedicated bus lanes and the primary factors for successful implementation, provide a preliminary assessment on where dedicated bus lanes and other transit priority treatments might be most feasible and beneficial in the SCAG region, and provide recommendations and guidance for local jurisdictions that are seeking to pilot or implement dedicated bus lanes and other transit priority treatments.

Table 1: Summary of Study Tasks and Deliverables

<b>Task</b>	<b>Key Deliverables</b>	<b>Expected Date (s)</b>
Stakeholder Engagement	- Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Aug. 2021 – Sept. 2021
Best Practices & Existing Conditions Report	- Best practices	Nov. 2021 – May 2022
	- Review of existing conditions	Jan. 2021 – June 2021
Corridor Identification	- Corridor Identification	Apr. 2022 – Aug. 2022
	- Corridor Evaluation	May 2022 – Sep. 2022
Final Report		Sept. 2022

### **Stakeholder Engagement**

The project team conducted the transportation agency stakeholder kickoff meeting in October 2021, and convened county group meetings including representatives from various Councils of Governments (COGs), transit agencies, and planning and public works staff. SCAG staff engaged with the SCAG Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) and shared the preliminary best practices findings. SCAG staff also provided an overview to the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Technical Advisory Committee, Metro Bus Operators Sub-Committee (BOS), San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Transportation Committee, and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and have several future meetings planned to share updates and key findings with various stakeholders and committees.

### **Study Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

The TAC for the Study is made up of transportation planning directors and staff from the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs), COGs, transit operators, and community-Based Organizations (CBOs), and has provided technical input on study methodology, technical analysis, and findings.

The project team has conducted three meetings with the TAC to date. At the TAC kickoff meeting, the project team shared key highlights from the transportation agency kickoff and county group meetings and provided updates on the preliminary findings from the best practices and case

studies review. During the second TAC meeting, the project team focused on the preliminary existing conditions findings and future forecasts, discussed screening goals, criteria and methodology, and the preliminary screening universe, receiving invaluable feedback. The TAC discussed the screening results and the recommended screened corridors for additional feedback.

### **Preliminary Findings**

Staff has been analyzing best practices and existing conditions and will share a summary of key findings during the presentation. Staff will also share updates on the selected screened corridors for feedback. The corridor screening is meant to assess where dedicated lanes and other transit priority treatments might be most feasible and beneficial in the SCAG region. The screening is an initial step of the overall corridor identification and evaluation process.

### **Next Steps**

The corridor screening and evaluation will occur from now through September. SCAG and the project team will continue to coordinate with key stakeholders, including the respective representatives from Riverside County.

# ***AGENDA ITEM 7***

<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	May 16, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jenny Chan, Planning and Programming Manager
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Active Transportation Program – Southern California Association of Governments 2023 Regional Program Guidelines – Selection Criteria for Riverside County Applications

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is for the Technical Advisory Committee to:

- 1) Approve the project selection criteria for inclusion in the Metropolitan Planning Organizations’ (MPO) Regional Program Guidelines for Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 6;
- 2) Authorize staff to award projects based on the approved selection criteria for the MPO funding; and
- 3) Forward to the Commission for final action.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

ATP is a highly competitive statewide program that funds bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs to enhance or encourage walking and biking. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) awards 50% of the funds at the statewide competitive level, 10% to small urban and rural regions, and 40% at the large MPO level. The ATP evaluation process allows applicants in Riverside County two opportunities for award – at the statewide level and the large MPO level. As part of the sequential project selection, projects are first evaluated statewide and those that are not ranked high enough for statewide funding are automatically provided a second opportunity for funding through the large MPO share. As the MPO, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is required to work with county transportation commissions, the CTC, and Caltrans to develop its regional program recommendations.

Based on the approved ATP Fund Estimate, SCAG is expected to receive \$137.68 million for the upcoming cycle, Cycle 6. Like past cycles, the SCAG share is split 95% to implementation projects and 5% to Non-Infrastructure (NI) projects and plans. However, for this cycle, SCAG will not be utilizing the 5% share to supplement its Sustainable Communities Program. Instead, the 5% share will be distributed to the county transportation commissions based on population. Table 1 illustrates this cycle’s programming capacity for each county. The Commission will have approximately \$17.69 million to award for Cycle 6 - \$16.8 million for implementation projects and \$884 thousand for NI and planning projects.

**Table 1: County Share for Implementation and NI and Planning Projects (\$ in 1,000s)**

County	Population %	Implementation	NI and Planning	Total Capacity
Imperial	1%	\$1,249	\$66	\$1,314
Los Angeles	53%	\$69,579	\$3,662	\$73,241
Orange	17%	\$22,144	\$1,165	\$23,309
Riverside	13%	\$16,802	\$884	\$17,686
San Bernardino	12%	\$15,159	\$798	\$15,956
Ventura	4%	\$5,863	\$309	\$6,172
	100%	\$130,795	\$6,884	\$137,679

**DISCUSSION:**

***Implementation Projects***

As part of the development of the regional program guidelines, SCAG allows each county transportation commission to assign up to 20 points to the CTC’s project scores. Each county transportation commission in the SCAG region is responsible for defining “plans” and developing its guidance and methodology for assigning the 20 points.

The points distribution approved for the last cycle, Cycle 5, is provided in Table 2. The points distribution allowed the Commission to meet its goal of awarding projects that were construction ready and rewarding agencies that invested in pre-construction activities. Additionally, as an unexpected result, the Commission was able to award projects that previously competed in prior cycles.

**Table 2: ATP Cycle 5 20-Point Distribution**

	Criteria	Points
1.	Requesting construction-only funding	6
2.	Construction funding in the first two years of programming & PA/ED completed	10
3.	Projects identified in WRCOG Sub-regional Active Transportation Plan or CVAG Non-Motorized Plan; or an adopted local active transportation plan, bike or pedestrian master plan, or Safe Routes to School Plan	4

For Cycle 6, staff is proposing minor revisions to the points distribution methodology. With the passage of the new federal transportation bill, Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), Cycle 6 has more federal dollars than were in Cycle 5. This may lead to more projects being subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and may prolong the project delivery timeline. To manage this program change, Commission staff is proposing a revision to the methodology, as seen in Table 3. The revised point distribution continues to reflect the Commission’s goal of funding projects that are construction-ready and reward agencies that invested or will invest in pre-construction activities. Lastly, at the March 2022 TAC meeting, Committee members suggested offering partial funding for applicants that have initiated the environmental process. This suggestion is also incorporated into the new recommended 20-point distribution.

Proposed changes are as follows:

1. Award 4 points for projects with construction funding in the first three years of the program cycle.
2. Award 7 points for projects with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or NEPA approved. Award partial funding of 3 points for projects that have initiated CEQA or NEPA.
3. Award 3 points for projects identified in Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Sub-regional Active Transportation Plan or Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) Non-Motorized Plan; or an adopted local active transportation plan, bike or pedestrian master plan, or Safe Routes to School Plan.

**Table 3: Recommended 20-Point Distribution**

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>
1.	Requesting construction-only funding	6
2.	Construction funding in the first three years of programming	4
3.	PA/ED completed – either CEQA, NEPA, or both	7 or
3a.	PA/ED started – either CEQA, NEPA, or both (partial funding)	3
4.	Projects identified in WRCOG Sub-regional Active Transportation Plan or CVAG Non-Motorized Plan; or an adopted local active transportation plan, bike or pedestrian master plan, or Safe Routes to School Plan	3

In the last cycle, to satisfy criterion 3, a copy of the CEQA and/or NEPA signature page had to be provided. Commission staff provided applicants an additional six months from application deadline to submit the CEQA and/or NEPA clearance. If a project was already federalized, the agency had to provide the NEPA signature page. This criterion was beneficial in the last cycle as it was the main criterion for award, leading to the Commission receiving all state funding because projects cleared CEQA.

At the March 2022 TAC meeting, staff received feedback from the TAC regarding the deadline for applicants to submit their completed CEQA and/or NEPA to Commission staff. TAC members expressed a strong desire to have as much time as possible to demonstrate compliance with criterion 3. As such, staff is allowing applicants to submit their CEQA and/or NEPA documentation to staff by January 3, 2023, to satisfy criterion 3 and 3a. To satisfy criterion 3a, applicants will need to provide a letter detailing the environmental work that has been performed to date.

***Non-infrastructure and Planning***

As previously stated, SCAG will not be utilizing the 5% share to supplement its Sustainable Communities Program for this cycle. Instead, the 5% share is distributed to the Commission based on population share. The Commission will have \$884 thousand dollars to award to NI and planning projects that are not awarded at the statewide level. Like the implementation projects, SCAG allows each county transportation commission to assign up to 20 points to the CTC’s project scores and allows the Commission to establish any other eligibility criteria. Staff is recommending the Commission not establish a 20-point distribution methodology for the NI and planning projects. Instead, staff is recommending to award projects with a minimum score of 80 points in the state scores with a maximum award amount of \$442 thousand dollars. This item was also

brought forward to the Technical Advisory Committee at the March 2022 meeting and the committee members agreed with this approach.

The Commission's deadline to submit the ATP award list to SCAG for the MPO share is January 30, 2023. To meet this deadline, staff will follow the approved project selection criteria to award projects for the MPO share. For implementation projects, staff will utilize the approved methodology to assign 20 points to the statewide scores and will award the highest scoring projects. For non-infrastructure and planning projects, staff will award projects with a minimum score of 80 points and limit the award amount to \$442 thousand dollars per project. Any remaining funds for non-infrastructure and planning projects will be utilized for implementation projects, and vice versa.

# ***AGENDA ITEM 8***

<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	May 16, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jenny Chan, Planning and Programming Manager
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Active Transportation Program Augmentation

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to discuss and provide input on the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Active Transportation Program (ATP) Augmentation Proposal.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

In 2021, the CTC requested a one-time augmentation of \$2 billion from the state’s General Fund surplus for the ATP, intended to augment ATP Cycle 5 the CTC adopted in March 2021. In response to the CTC’s request, the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 129 (Skinner, 2021), which amended the Budget Act of 2021 to provide a \$500 million one-time augmentation for the ATP, contingent on the enactment of additional legislation prior to October 10, 2021. The additional legislation required was not enacted prior to the deadline, so the \$500 million was returned to the General Fund instead of augmenting the ATP.

CTC is requesting a one-time \$2 billion General Fund augmentation again in the state’s Fiscal Year 2022/23 budget. Depending on the size and timing of the enactment of an augmentation during the 2022 legislative session, the CTC may fund additional projects from the 2021 ATP backlog (Cycle 5 – see Attachment) and potentially reserve a portion of funding to increase the 2023 ATP (Cycle 6) funding and create a pilot program for large, transformative projects.

**DISCUSSION:**

The CTC is hosting a virtual workshop on May 26, 2022, to discuss possible funding augmentation options. As of the writing of this staff report, the workshop agenda and materials were not available. This item is for TAC members to discuss funding options that advance the ATP goals and interests of Riverside County to enable Commission staff to advocate accordingly. Anticipated possible options are:

1. Reserve all augmentation funds for the previous cycle, ATP Cycle 5.
2. Reserve all augmentation funds for the current cycle, ATP Cycle 6.
3. Hybrid approach of augmenting both Cycles 5 and 6.

Attachment: ATP Cycle 5 List of Projects

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
Active Transportation Resource Center	Various	Active Transportation Resource Center	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000			\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000					\$ 4,000	Non-Infrastructure	N/A	N/A	N/A
3-Sacramento, City of-1	Sacramento	Franklin Boulevard Complete Street Project	\$ 16,265	\$ 9,323	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,323	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,323	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		99
4-Oakland, City of-1	Alameda	7th Street Connection Project	\$ 21,037	\$ 14,180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,180	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		98
6-Huron, City of-1	Fresno	City of Huron Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Improvement Project	\$ 1,969	\$ 1,769	\$ 125	\$ 1,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ 1,644	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	98
8-Perris, City of-1	Riverside	City of Perris Bike and Pedestrian Network Project	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,931	\$ 35	\$ 1,896	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,896	\$ 35	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x		97
8-San Bernardino County-2	San Bernardino	Muscoy Area Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Improvements Project	\$ 2,355	\$ 1,881	\$ 112	\$ 463	\$ -	\$ 1,306	\$ 112	\$ 160	\$ 303	\$ 1,271	\$ 35	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	97
3-Sacramento County-2	Sacramento	South Sacramento County Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 1,946	\$ 1,946	\$ 95	\$ 390	\$ 1,461	\$ -	\$ 95	\$ 190	\$ 200	\$ 1,381	\$ 80	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	96
5-Watsonville, City of-1	Santa Cruz	Safer Access to Pajaro Valley High School and Beyond	\$ 15,823	\$ 11,709	\$ 1,168	\$ 10,541	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 521	\$ 10,541	\$ 647	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	96
6-Fresno County-1	Fresno	Biola Community Sidewalks	\$ 1,498	\$ 1,255		\$ -	\$ 1,255	\$ -			\$ -	\$ 1,255	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	96
7-Los Angeles, City of-3	Los Angeles	SRTS Carver Middle, Ascot Avenue and Harmony Elementary Schools Project	\$ 6,700	\$ 6,030	\$ 801	\$ -	\$ 290	\$ 4,939	\$ 801	\$ 290	\$ -	\$ 4,939	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	96
7-Los Angeles, City of-5	Los Angeles	SRTS Panorama City Elementary School Project	\$ 6,832	\$ 6,149	\$ 756	\$ -	\$ 329	\$ 5,064	\$ 756	\$ 329	\$ -	\$ 5,064	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	96
8-Ontario, City of-1	San Bernardino	Vine Ave & B St Bike Boulevard Project	\$ 4,881	\$ 4,392	\$ 513	\$ -	\$ 3,879	\$ -	\$ 45	\$ 468	\$ -	\$ 3,879	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		96
2-Redding, City of-2	Shasta	Turtle Bay to Downtown Gap Completion Project	\$ 3,935	\$ 2,665	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 2,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 2,462	\$ 153	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	95
3-West Sacramento, City of-2	Yolo	Sycamore Trail (Phase 2) Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing	\$ 11,538	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		95
4-Fairfield, City of-1	Solano	West Texas Street Complete Streets Project	\$ 16,922	\$ 10,903	\$ -	\$ 955	\$ 9,948	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 838	\$ -	\$ 9,948	\$ 117	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	95
5-San Luis Obispo County-1	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo County-Bob Jones Trail Gap Closure	\$ 23,414	\$ 18,248	\$ 2,295	\$ 15,953	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 321	\$ 1,974	\$ 15,953	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		95
7-Long Beach, City of-1	Los Angeles	Downtown Long Beach Walkable Corners	\$ 8,771	\$ 7,893	\$ 768	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 6,675	\$ 225	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 6,675	\$ 543	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		95
7-Maywood, City of-1	Los Angeles	City of Maywood Active Transportation Plan	\$ 263	\$ 263	\$ 263	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 263	Plan	x	x	95
8-Riverside County-10	Riverside	Riverside County Safe Routes for All - San Jacinto	\$ 600	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	95
10-Mariposa County-1	Mariposa	Mariposa Elementary School Connectivity Project	\$ 1,900	\$ 1,900	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ 1,800	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,800	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	95
10-Mariposa County-2	Mariposa	Mariposa Creek Parkway	\$ 5,176	\$ 4,415	\$ 200	\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 3,015	\$ 200	\$ 450	\$ 750	\$ 3,015	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		95
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-1	San Diego	Orange Family Friendly Street Project	\$ 5,660	\$ 4,317	\$ -	\$ 4,317	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,317	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	95
1-Arcata, City of-1	Humboldt	Arcata Annie & Mary Trail Connectivity Project	\$ 5,286	\$ 4,220	\$ 67	\$ 495	\$ 3,658	\$ -	\$ 67	\$ 240	\$ 255	\$ 3,658	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		94
6-Fresno, City of-1	Fresno	Kids Crossing: Safe Routes to School in South Fresno	\$ 1,636	\$ 1,636	\$ 141	\$ 14	\$ 1,481	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 138	\$ 14	\$ 1,441	\$ 40	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	94
6-Porterville, City of-2	Tulare	Butterfield Stage Corridor (Henderson Avenue to Date Avenue)	\$ 4,650	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		94
6-Porterville, City of-4	Tulare	Butterfield Stage Corridor (W North Grand Ave to College Ave)	\$ 7,750	\$ 7,100	\$ -	\$ 7,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,100	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		94
7-South El Monte, City of-1	Los Angeles	South El Monte Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Safety Project	\$ 1,637	\$ 1,637	\$ 140	\$ 1,497	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 1,497	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	94
11-Oceanside, City of-1	San Diego	Laurel Elementary Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,535	\$ 1,522	\$ 447	\$ 1,075	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ 1,075	\$ 127	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	94
4-Contra Costa County-2	Contra Costa	North Bailey Road Active Transportation Corridor	\$ 6,845	\$ 6,159	\$ 499	\$ -	\$ 5,660	\$ -	\$ 499	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,660	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	93
4-Santa Clara County-1	Santa Clara	Active and Safe Routes to a Healthier City	\$ 2,510	\$ 2,510	\$ 2,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,510	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	93

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-Santa Cruz, City of-2	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segment 7 Phase 2 Construction	\$ 12,030	\$ 9,184	\$ 9,184	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,634	\$ 550	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	93
6-Delano, City of-1	Kern	ATP-5 SRTS Intersection Enhancement and NI Work Plan	\$ 1,178	\$ 1,164	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,164	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ -	\$ 949	\$ 75	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	93
7-Bell Gardens, City of-1	Los Angeles	Bell Gardens Complete Streets Improvements - Phase 1	\$ 6,999	\$ 6,499	\$ 200	\$ 6,299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,299	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		93
7-Long Beach, City of-2	Los Angeles	Pacific Avenue Cycle Track	\$ 8,332	\$ 7,498	\$ 225	\$ 1,533	\$ -	\$ 5,740	\$ 225	\$ 675	\$ -	\$ 5,740	\$ 858	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		93
7-Los Angeles, City of-11	Los Angeles	Connecting Canoga Park Through Safety and Urban Cooling Improvements	\$ 38,655	\$ 30,731	\$ 3,567	\$ -	\$ 1,921	\$ 25,243	\$ 3,567	\$ 1,921	\$ -	\$ 25,243	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		93
7-Los Angeles, City of-4	Los Angeles	SRTS Berendo Middle and 3 Feeder Elementary Schools Safety Project	\$ 11,057	\$ 9,951	\$ 188	\$ -	\$ 1,588	\$ 8,175	\$ 188	\$ 1,588	\$ -	\$ 8,175	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	93
2-Redding, City of-1	Shasta	Victor Ave & Cypress Ave Active Transportation (VCAT) Project	\$ 10,409	\$ 7,822	\$ 1,352	\$ 740	\$ 5,730	\$ -	\$ 1,352	\$ 338	\$ 402	\$ 5,643	\$ 87	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	92
3-El Dorado County-3	El Dorado	Pollock Pines - Pony Express Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,440	\$ 1,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,440	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		92
4-Oakland, City of-2	Alameda	East Oakland Neighborhood Bike Routes	\$ 21,859	\$ 17,269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,269	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		92
7-Ventura County-2	Ventura	El Rio Pedestrian Improvement and Safe Route to School Project	\$ 6,960	\$ 6,195	\$ -	\$ 222	\$ 5,973	\$ -	\$ 222	\$ 884	\$ -	\$ 5,089	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	92
11-Imperial Beach, City of-1	San Diego	9th St Active Transportation Corridor	\$ 3,354	\$ 3,018	\$ 539	\$ 2,479	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 539	\$ -	\$ 2,479	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	92
11-National City, City of-3	San Diego	Highland Avenue Inter-City Bike Connection	\$ 1,897	\$ 1,895	\$ 58	\$ 260	\$ 1,577	\$ -	\$ 58	\$ 260	\$ -	\$ 1,577	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		92
7-Santa Monica, City of-2*	Los Angeles	Stewart-Pennsylvania Safety Enhancement Project	\$ 4,000	\$ 3,196	\$ 3,196	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,171	\$ 25	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		92
1-Clearlake, City of-1	Lake	Dam Road Extension & South Center Drive Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 997	\$ 997	\$ 997	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 82	\$ -	\$ 915	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	91
2-Karuk Tribe-1	Siskiyou	Happy Camp Complete Streets Project	\$ 12,221	\$ 9,971	\$ 600	\$ 1,901	\$ -	\$ 7,470	\$ 600	\$ 800	\$ 1,101	\$ 7,470	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	91
2-Siskiyou County Transportation Commission-1	Siskiyou	Siskiyou- Regional Active Transportation Plan	\$ 212	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 202	Plan	x		
4-Contra Costa County-4	Contra Costa	San Pablo Avenue Complete Street/Bay Trail Gap Closure Project	\$ 9,485	\$ 8,535	\$ 850	\$ -	\$ 7,685	\$ -	\$ 850	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,685	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		
5-Seaside, City of-1	Monterey	Broadway Ave Complete Street Corridor	\$ 14,001	\$ 12,041	\$ 1,576	\$ -	\$ 10,465	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,576	\$ -	\$ 9,450	\$ 1,015	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	
6-Fresno, City of-3	Fresno	Cross, Walk & Roll! SRTS in Central Fresno	\$ 4,358	\$ 3,532	\$ 370	\$ 147	\$ 3,015	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 361	\$ 147	\$ 2,968	\$ 47	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	
7-El Monte, City of-1	Los Angeles	Traffic Calming for Parkway Dr/Denholm Dr	\$ 5,350	\$ 4,167	\$ 4,167	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,167	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		
7-Huntington Park, City of-1	Los Angeles	Huntington Park's Safe Routes and Childhood Obesity Project	\$ 3,757	\$ 3,757	\$ 325	\$ 3,432	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ 3,405	\$ 27	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	91
7-Long Beach, City of-4	Los Angeles	Pine Avenue Bicycle Boulevard	\$ 4,087	\$ 3,678	\$ 90	\$ 475	\$ 514	\$ 2,599	\$ 90	\$ 475	\$ -	\$ 2,599	\$ 514	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		91
7-Los Angeles, City of-10	Los Angeles	Mission Mile: Sepulveda Visioning for a Safe and Active Community	\$ 49,900	\$ 39,670	\$ 4,958	\$ -	\$ 2,125	\$ 32,587	\$ 4,958	\$ 2,125	\$ -	\$ 32,587	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		91
8-Riverside County-1	Riverside	Riverside County Safe Routes for All - City of Hemet	\$ 636	\$ 636	\$ -	\$ 636	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 636	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	91
10-Tuolumne County-1	Tuolumne	Jamestown Community Connectivity Project	\$ 2,300	\$ 2,071	\$ 198	\$ 147	\$ 140	\$ 1,586	\$ 198	\$ 147	\$ 140	\$ 1,586	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	91
12-Orange County-1	Orange	OC Loop Coyote Creek Bikeway (Segment O)	\$ 6,605	\$ 4,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,644	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		91
2-Shasta County-3	Shasta	Cottonwood Active Transportation Trunk Line Express (CATTLE) Network	\$ 17,844	\$ 14,273	\$ 1,197	\$ 2,556	\$ 76	\$ 10,444	\$ 1,197	\$ 1,796	\$ 760	\$ 10,444	\$ 76	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	90
4-Bay Area Toll Authority-1	Alameda	West Oakland Link to Bay Trail and Bay Bridge Path	\$ 65,035	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		90
4-Berkeley, City of-1	Alameda	Addison Street Bicycle Boulevard Project	\$ 1,997	\$ 1,997	\$ 10	\$ 300	\$ 1,687	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 1,687	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		90
4-San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency-1	San Francisco	Folsom Streetscape Project	\$ 38,981	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		90

Projects scoring less than 92 were either funded through MPO or remain unfunded.

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-Santa Barbara, City of-3	Santa Barbara	Upper De La Vina Street Gap Closure and Safe Crossings	\$ 1,998	\$ 1,998	\$ 290	\$ -	\$ 37	\$ 1,671	\$ 290	\$ 29	\$ 8	\$ 1,671	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		90
5-Santa Cruz Health Services Agency-1	Santa Cruz	Safe Routes for Watsonville School Families and Community	\$ 1,666	\$ 1,666	\$ 1,666	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,666	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	90
6-Corcoran, City of-1	Kings	Corcoran Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,998	\$ 1,998	\$ 235	\$ -	\$ 1,763	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 220	\$ -	\$ 1,763	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		90
6-Visalia, City of-1	Tulare	Goshen-Visalia Corridor Improvement Project	\$ 14,270	\$ 11,273	\$ 273	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 273	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		90
7-Los Angeles, City of-1	Los Angeles	Safe Routes to School Active Transportation Education Program	\$ 2,401	\$ 2,160	\$ 2,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,160	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	90
7-Santa Monica, City of-1	Los Angeles	Wilshire Active Transportation Safety Project	\$ 5,450	\$ 4,354	\$ 480	\$ -	\$ 3,874	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 480	\$ -	\$ 3,874	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		90
7-Ventura, City of-1	Ventura	Cabrillo Segment Multi-Use Path Gap Completion	\$ 1,008	\$ 1,008	\$ 178	\$ 5	\$ 825	\$ -	\$ 68	\$ 110	\$ 5	\$ 825	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		90
8-Cathedral City, City of-1	Riverside	Downtown Cathedral City Connectors: Gap Closure & Complete Streets Improvements	\$ 5,556	\$ 4,383	\$ -	\$ 4,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,383	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		90
8-Wildomar, City of-2	Riverside	Mission Trail Active Transportation Project (MTATP)	\$ 6,548	\$ 3,638	\$ 451	\$ 3,110	\$ 77	\$ -	\$ 168	\$ 168	\$ 115	\$ 3,110	\$ 77	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		90
10-Modesto, City of-1	Stanislaus	Encina-Lincoln Bike Path	\$ 6,950	\$ 5,550	\$ -	\$ 834	\$ -	\$ 4,716	\$ -	\$ 834	\$ -	\$ 4,716	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		90
10-Stockton, City of-4	San Joaquin	MLK Crossing Improvements and Downtown Stockton RRFB Project	\$ 5,832	\$ 5,248	\$ 60	\$ 977	\$ 4,211	\$ -	\$ 60	\$ 977	\$ -	\$ 4,211	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		90
10-Stockton, City of-9	San Joaquin	Alpine Pershing Mendocino Bicycle-Pedestrian Connectivity	\$ 4,364	\$ 3,924	\$ 225	\$ 450	\$ 3,249	\$ -	\$ 225	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 3,249	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		90
12-Santa Ana, City of-3	Orange	Raitt Street Protected and Buffered Bike Lane Project	\$ 5,499	\$ 5,499	\$ 81	\$ 808	\$ 4,610	\$ -	\$ 81	\$ 808	\$ -	\$ 4,610	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		90
10-Stanislaus County-1	Stanislaus	Robertson Road Elementary Safe Crossing and Active Transportation Connectivity Project	\$ 1,997	\$ 1,609	\$ -	\$ 1,609	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,609	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	89.5
4-Alameda County-1	Alameda	Mission Boulevard Safe and Complete Street for Active Transportation	\$ 30,943	\$ 7,900	\$ -	\$ 7,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,900	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		89
4-Alameda County-3	Alameda	Anita Avenue Safe and Accessible Route to School and Transit	\$ 5,425	\$ 2,100	\$ 2,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,100	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	89
4-Berkeley, City of-2	Alameda	Washington Elementary and Berkeley High SR2S Project	\$ 1,425	\$ 1,425	\$ 5	\$ 200	\$ 1,220	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 1,220	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	89
4-Concord, City of-1	Contra Costa	Willow Pass/Parkside/Salvio Bikeways Connection Project	\$ 2,968	\$ 2,621	\$ 118	\$ 472	\$ -	\$ 2,031	\$ 118	\$ 354	\$ 118	\$ 2,031	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	89
5-California Department of Transportation-4	Santa Barbara	Los Alamos Connected Community Project	\$ 6,899	\$ 6,499	\$ 710	\$ -	\$ 1,897	\$ 3,892	\$ 710	\$ 984	\$ 913	\$ 3,842	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	89
5-Salinas, City of-1	Monterey	Alisal Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 1,338	\$ 1,338	\$ 206	\$ 1,132	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 206	\$ -	\$ 1,132	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	89
6-Porterville, City of-3	Tulare	Putnam and Elderwood Area Pedestrian Project	\$ 1,104	\$ 494	\$ -	\$ 494	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 494	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	89
7-Lancaster, City of-2	Los Angeles	Lancaster Safe Routes to School Master Plan Implementation, Phase 2	\$ 6,384	\$ 5,424	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 420	\$ 4,554	\$ 450	\$ 420	\$ -	\$ 4,554	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	89
7-Los Angeles, City of-9	Los Angeles	Normandie Beautiful: Creating Neighborhood Connections in South L.A.	\$ 21,395	\$ 17,009	\$ 2,103	\$ -	\$ 944	\$ 13,962	\$ 2,103	\$ 944	\$ -	\$ 13,962	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	89
8-Riverside County-2	Riverside	Hemet Area Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Project	\$ 1,946	\$ 1,946	\$ 25	\$ 565	\$ -	\$ 1,356	\$ 25	\$ 225	\$ 340	\$ 1,181	\$ 175	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	89
8-Riverside County-20	Riverside	Riverside County Safe Routes for All - Coachella	\$ 657	\$ 657	\$ -	\$ 657	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 657	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	89
11-National City, City of-2	San Diego	Civic Center Drive Protected Bikeway	\$ 1,890	\$ 1,888	\$ 48	\$ 280	\$ 1,560	\$ -	\$ 48	\$ 280	\$ -	\$ 1,560	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		89
5-Santa Barbara, City of-1*	Santa Barbara	Cliff Drive: Urban Highway to Complete Street Transformation Project	\$ 24,938	\$ 24,689	\$ 2,003	\$ 928	\$ -	\$ 21,758	\$ 2,003	\$ 858	\$ 70	\$ 21,693	\$ 65	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	89
11-Chula Vista, City of-2	San Diego	Bayshore Bikeway Segment 6A	\$ 2,339	\$ 1,953	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 1,703	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 1,703	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		88.5
3-West Sacramento, City of-1	Yolo	J Street Bridge Deck Conversion for Active Transportation Project	\$ 25,671	\$ 21,555	\$ 2,600	\$ 775	\$ -	\$ 18,180	\$ -	\$ 2,600	\$ 775	\$ 18,180	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		88
4-Contra Costa County-6	Contra Costa	Carquinez Middle School Trail Connection	\$ 4,700	\$ 4,550	\$ 510	\$ 340	\$ 3,700	\$ -	\$ 510	\$ 340	\$ -	\$ 3,700	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	88

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
4-Oakland, City of-3	Alameda	Bancroft Avenue Greenway	\$ 33,690	\$ 4,475	\$ 845	\$ 3,630	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 845	\$ 3,630	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		88
4-Santa Rosa, City of-1	Sonoma	Santa Rosa US Highway 101 Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing	\$ 27,100	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 12,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		88
5-Santa Barbara, City of-2	Santa Barbara	Westside and Lower West Neighborhood Active Transportation Plan Implementation	\$ 12,239	\$ 12,117	\$ 1,633	\$ 560	\$ -	\$ 9,924	\$ 1,633	\$ 513	\$ 47	\$ 9,830	\$ 94	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	88
6-Porterville, City of-1	Tulare	Butterfield Stage Corridor Project (Tea Pot Dome to Avenue 196)	\$ 14,150	\$ 13,500	\$ -	\$ 13,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,500	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		88
7-Los Angeles County-3	Los Angeles	Metro A Line Connections for Unincorporated Los Angeles County	\$ 12,330	\$ 12,330	\$ 1,012	\$ -	\$ 3,785	\$ 7,533	\$ 1,012	\$ 650	\$ 3,135	\$ 7,533	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		88
7-Southern California Association of Governments-1	Los Angeles	SCAG Statewide Go Human Local Demonstration & Capacity Building Program	\$ 3,644	\$ 3,644	\$ 3,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,644	Non-Infrastructure	x		88
8-Coachella Valley Association of Governments-1	Riverside	Coachella Valley Arts & Music Line	\$ 26,818	\$ 16,903	\$ -	\$ 16,903	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,903	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	88
8-Fontana, City of-4	San Bernardino	Date Elementary School Street Improvements Project	\$ 1,808	\$ 1,808	\$ 71	\$ -	\$ 128	\$ 1,609	\$ 71	\$ 128	\$ -	\$ 1,591	\$ 18	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	88
8-Riverside, City of-2	Riverside	Five Points Neighborhood Pedestrian Safety Improvements	\$ 6,953	\$ 6,113	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,070	\$ 5,043	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,070	\$ 5,043	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	88
10-Stockton, City of-10	San Joaquin	8th Street/Houston Avenue/Mantney Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity	\$ 5,114	\$ 4,602	\$ 270	\$ 563	\$ 3,769	\$ -	\$ 270	\$ 563	\$ -	\$ 3,769	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		88
11-San Diego, City of-3	San Diego	Southeastern San Diego Safe Routes to School	\$ 666	\$ 666	\$ 666	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 666	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	88
12-Santa Ana, City of-20	Orange	Fitz Int_Heritage ES_Russell ES_Newhope	\$ 5,986	\$ 5,986	\$ 91	\$ 680	\$ 5,215	\$ -	\$ 91	\$ 680	\$ -	\$ 5,215	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	88
2-Shasta County-2	Shasta	Cottonwood Lasso Loop	\$ 12,848	\$ 10,277	\$ 858	\$ 1,947	\$ 50	\$ 7,422	\$ 858	\$ 1,287	\$ 660	\$ 7,422	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	87
4-Alameda County-4	Alameda	D Street Safe Route to Fairview Elementary School	\$ 6,964	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	87
4-Emeryville, City of-2	Alameda	40th Street Protected Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 13,915	\$ 1,374	\$ 1,374	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,374	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		87
4-Sonoma County-1	Sonoma	Moorland Pedestrian and School Access	\$ 4,854	\$ 4,454	\$ 193	\$ 348	\$ 3,913	\$ -	\$ 78	\$ 69	\$ 46	\$ 3,913	\$ 348	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	87
5-Santa Cruz, City of-1	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segment 8 and 9 Construction	\$ 32,069	\$ 19,986	\$ 655	\$ 19,331	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 19,081	\$ 655	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	87
6-Dinuba, City of-2	Tulare	El Monte Way Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	\$ 3,214	\$ 2,837	\$ 423	\$ 2,414	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 76	\$ 347	\$ -	\$ 2,414	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	87
6-Selma, City of-3	Fresno	Dinuba Avenue Class II Bike Lane Improvements	\$ 343	\$ 343	\$ 343	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ 305	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	87
7-Lynwood, City of-2	Los Angeles	Lynwood Safe Routes To School (SRTS) Plan	\$ 250	\$ 238	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 238	Plan	x	x	87
8-Apple Valley, Town of-1	San Bernardino	Yucca Loma Elementary School Safe Routes to School Phase 2	\$ 986	\$ 838	\$ 191	\$ 647	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85	\$ 106	\$ 647	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	87
8-Desert Hot Springs, City of-3	Riverside	Desert Hot Springs CV Link Extension Project	\$ 32,572	\$ 29,035	\$ -	\$ 1,290	\$ 27,745	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,290	\$ 27,745	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		87
8-Eastvale, City of-1	Riverside	Southeast Eastvale Safe Routes to School Equitable Access Project	\$ 1,420	\$ 1,420	\$ 1,420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 1,270	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	87
8-San Bernardino County-1	San Bernardino	Santa Ana River Trail - Phase III	\$ 6,880	\$ 1,105	\$ 1,105	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,105	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	87
11-El Cajon, City of-1	San Diego	Johnson Avenue Neighborhood Trail & School Connections project	\$ 4,620	\$ 4,220	\$ 815	\$ 3,405	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 295	\$ -	\$ 3,405	\$ 518	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	87
11-Oceanside, City of-3	San Diego	Coastal Rail Trail from Oceanside Boulevard to Morse Street	\$ 9,075	\$ 7,659	\$ 500	\$ 7,159	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 7,159	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	87
12-Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)-1	Orange	Garden Grove - Santa Ana Rails-to-Trails Gap Closure	\$ 42,397	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		87
7-Paramount, City of-1	Los Angeles	West Santa Ana Branch Bikeway Phase 3	\$ 4,800	\$ 4,300	\$ 496	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,804	\$ -	\$ 496	\$ -	\$ 3,804	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		86.5
8-Desert Hot Springs, City of-1	Riverside	Palm Drive Improvements - Pierson Blvd. to Mission Lakes Blvd.	\$ 4,905	\$ 3,700	\$ 3,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,700	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		86.5
2-Shasta County RTPA-1	Shasta	North Redding Active Transportation Trunk Line (NRATTTL)	\$ 24,418	\$ 19,533	\$ 318	\$ -	\$ 3,714	\$ 15,501	\$ 318	\$ 2,158	\$ 1,556	\$ 15,353	\$ 148	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	86

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-1	Nevada	SR 174/49/20 Roundabout and Active Transportation Safety Project	\$ 6,526	\$ 6,526	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 646	\$ 5,380	\$ 500	\$ 600	\$ 46	\$ 5,380	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		86
3-Paradise, Town of-1	Butte	Skyway Connectivity Project	\$ 5,937	\$ 4,632	\$ 93	\$ 649	\$ -	\$ 3,890	\$ 93	\$ 331	\$ 318	\$ 3,890	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	86
4-Alameda County-6	Alameda	San Lorenzo Creekway: Building Equitable Active Transportation in Alameda County	\$ 28,300	\$ 23,385	\$ 552	\$ 2,272	\$ -	\$ 20,561	\$ 552	\$ 2,022	\$ 250	\$ 18,143	\$ 2,418	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	86
4-Oakland, City of-5	Alameda	International Boulevard Pedestrian Lighting and Sidewalk Improvements	\$ 14,824	\$ 11,651	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,651	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,651	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		86
5-San Luis Obispo County-2	San Luis Obispo	Morro Bay to Cayucos Multi-Use Trail	\$ 12,198	\$ 6,357	\$ -	\$ 6,357	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,357	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	86
6-Dinuba, City of-4	Tulare	Kamm Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	\$ 1,139	\$ 839	\$ 84	\$ 755	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ 80	\$ -	\$ 755	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	86
7-Culver City, City of-2	Los Angeles	E Line (Expo) to Downtown Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Corridor	\$ 12,233	\$ 10,393	\$ 368	\$ 10,025	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,025	\$ 368	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		86
7-Los Angeles County-5	Los Angeles	Four Pedestrian Plans for High-Collision Disadvantaged Communities in LA County	\$ 1,860	\$ 1,860	\$ -	\$ 1,860	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,860	Plan	x		86
7-Los Angeles, City of-2	Los Angeles	SRTS Cabrillo Avenue Elementary School Project	\$ 4,744	\$ 4,269	\$ 61	\$ -	\$ 701	\$ 3,507	\$ 61	\$ 701	\$ -	\$ 3,507	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	86
7-Los Angeles, City of-6	Los Angeles	Hollywood Walk of Fame Safety and Connectivity Project: Phase One	\$ 19,696	\$ 15,726	\$ 1,526	\$ -	\$ 14,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,526	\$ -	\$ 14,200	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		86
7-Oxnard, City of-1	Ventura	SRTS Safety and Enhancements Project	\$ 1,981	\$ 1,981	\$ 202	\$ 1,779	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 202	\$ -	\$ 1,480	\$ 299	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	86
8-Barstow, City of-1	San Bernardino	Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Safe Routes to Schools Corridors (SR2S), Barstow	\$ 6,902	\$ 6,902	\$ 100	\$ -	\$ 302	\$ 6,500	\$ 100	\$ 200	\$ 40	\$ 6,500	\$ 62	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	86
9-Tehachapi, City of-1	Kern	SRTS Dennison Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Corridor Improvement Project	\$ 2,437	\$ 2,432	\$ 345	\$ 2,087	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225	\$ 120	\$ 2,087	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		86
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-4	San Diego	Inland Rail Trail - Gap Connector	\$ 15,825	\$ 12,057	\$ 1,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,821	\$ -	\$ 1,236	\$ -	\$ 10,821	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	86
12-Fullerton, City of-1	Orange	Bridging the Gap: Nutwood Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Enhancements	\$ 6,523	\$ 6,252	\$ -	\$ 1,233	\$ 5,019	\$ -	\$ 48	\$ 1,114	\$ 58	\$ 5,019	\$ 13	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		86
12-Santa Ana, City of-7	Orange	Santa Ana High School, Heninger Elementary and ALA SRTS	\$ 6,855	\$ 6,855	\$ 107	\$ 643	\$ 6,105	\$ -	\$ 107	\$ 643	\$ -	\$ 6,105	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	86
11-Vista, City of-2	San Diego	Emerald Drive Complete Streets Project	\$ 3,931	\$ 3,734	\$ 755	\$ 2,979	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 450	\$ 205	\$ 2,979	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		85.5
6-Dinuba, City of-6*	Tulare	Euclid Avenue-Phase 2 Improvements	\$ 1,571	\$ 1,501	\$ 168	\$ 1,333	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 148	\$ -	\$ 1,333	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	85
1-Eureka, City of-2	Humboldt	C Street Bike Boulevard	\$ 1,995	\$ 1,869	\$ 1,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,869	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		85
2-Modoc County-1	Modoc	Surprise Valley School Safety and Community Connectivity Project	\$ 2,439	\$ 2,439	\$ 131	\$ 164	\$ 2,144	\$ -	\$ 131	\$ 159	\$ 5	\$ 2,144	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		85
2-Shasta County-1	Shasta	West Cottonwood School Connector	\$ 12,622	\$ 10,096	\$ 860	\$ 1,700	\$ 49	\$ 7,487	\$ 860	\$ 1,290	\$ 410	\$ 7,487	\$ 49	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	85
3-Yuba County-2	Yuba	Garden Avenue Safe Route to School Project	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,320	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 2,270	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 2,270	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	85
4-Alameda County Transportation Commission-1	Alameda	East Bay Greenway	\$ 224,070	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		85
4-Healdsburg, City of-1	Sonoma	Healdsburg Avenue Complete Streets Project	\$ 12,117	\$ 10,107	\$ 50	\$ 250	\$ 9,807	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 210	\$ 40	\$ 9,807	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		85
5-Santa Barbara County-2	Santa Barbara	Isla Vista Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project	\$ 4,539	\$ 3,997	\$ 143	\$ 267	\$ 3,587	\$ -	\$ 143	\$ 188	\$ 79	\$ 3,587	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	85
6-Coalinga, City of-1	Fresno	Coalinga East Polk Street Bike/Ped Safety and Connectivity Initiative	\$ 1,770	\$ 1,551	\$ 23	\$ 475	\$ 1,053	\$ -	\$ 23	\$ 144	\$ 331	\$ 1,025	\$ 28	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x		85
7-Los Angeles, City of-7	Los Angeles	LA River Greenway East San Fernando Valley Gap Closure	\$ 34,927	\$ 19,927	\$ 3,100	\$ 3,175	\$ -	\$ 13,652	\$ 3,100	\$ 3,100	\$ 75	\$ 13,652	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		85
10-Stockton, City of-1	San Joaquin	Main Street and Market Street Complete Streets	\$ 6,999	\$ 6,299	\$ -	\$ 1,150	\$ -	\$ 5,149	\$ -	\$ 1,150	\$ -	\$ 5,149	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	85
11-Oceanside, City of-2	San Diego	Palmquist Elementary and Lincoln Middle Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,424	\$ 1,411	\$ 427	\$ 984	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 984	\$ 127	Infrastructure + NI - Small		x	85
12-Brea, City of-1	Orange	Tracks at Brea Final Phase Gap Closure	\$ 14,046	\$ 5,030	\$ 5,030	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,030	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		85

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
3-Paradise, Town of-4	Butte	Oliver Curve Pathway Project	\$ 5,944	\$ 5,097	\$ 190	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,907	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 190	\$ 4,907	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		84
3-Roseville, City of-1	Placer	Dry Creek Greenway East Trail, Phase 2	\$ 6,566	\$ 5,176	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,176	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,013	\$ 163	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	84
4-Alameda County-2	Alameda	E. Lewelling Boulevard Safe and Complete Street for Active Transportation	\$ 9,233	\$ 2,996	\$ -	\$ 2,996	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,996	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	84
6-Kern Council of Governments-1	Kern	Safe Routes for Cyclists in Kern County's Disadvantaged Communities	\$ 826	\$ 792	\$ 792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 792	Non-Infrastructure	x		84
7-Lynwood, City of-1	Los Angeles	Mid City Safe Routes to School Pedestrian Safety Project	\$ 4,596	\$ 4,356	\$ 710	\$ -	\$ 3,646	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 710	\$ -	\$ 3,646	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	84
8-Riverside County-4	Riverside	Theda Street Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Project	\$ 1,881	\$ 1,881	\$ 25	\$ 575	\$ -	\$ 1,281	\$ 25	\$ 235	\$ 340	\$ 1,181	\$ 100	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	84
10-Calaveras County-1	Calaveras	San Andreas Pope Street and Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 6,710	\$ 6,596	\$ 336	\$ 1,050	\$ -	\$ 5,210	\$ 336	\$ 600	\$ 450	\$ 5,210	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	84
10-San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission-1	San Joaquin	East Channel Street Streetscape and Connectivity Project	\$ 6,992	\$ 4,516	\$ 4,516	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,516	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	84
10-Stockton, City of-5	San Joaquin	Greater Downtown Bike and Ped Connectivity (Lincoln/Rose/Aurora)	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 75	\$ 215	\$ 1,710	\$ -	\$ 75	\$ 215	\$ -	\$ 1,710	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		84
11-Chula Vista, City of-1	San Diego	F Street Promenade Phase I, from Bay Boulevard to Broadway	\$ 9,060	\$ 5,770	\$ 790	\$ 4,980	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130	\$ 660	\$ -	\$ 4,980	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	84
12-Anaheim, City of-1	Orange	Rio Vista Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 999	\$ 999	\$ 20	\$ 255	\$ 724	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 135	\$ 120	\$ 724	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	84
12-Orange County-2	Orange	OC Loop Coyote Creek Bikeway (Segments O, P, Q)	\$ 45,354	\$ 31,806	\$ 3,400	\$ -	\$ 28,406	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,400	\$ 28,406	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		84
12-Santa Ana, City of-19	Orange	Rosita ES_Hazard ES	\$ 5,652	\$ 5,652	\$ 86	\$ 642	\$ 4,924	\$ -	\$ 86	\$ 642	\$ -	\$ 4,924	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	84
8-Menifee, City of-2	Riverside	Harvest Valley Elementary Safe Routes to School	\$ 2,997	\$ 2,397	\$ 245	\$ 40	\$ 2,112	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 230	\$ 40	\$ 2,112	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		83.5
8-Ontario, City of-3	San Bernardino	Euclid West Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 1,996	\$ 1,996	\$ 5	\$ 245	\$ 1,746	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 245	\$ -	\$ 1,746	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		83.5
1-Humboldt County Association of Governments-1	Humboldt	Humboldt Regional Active Transportation Plan	\$ 200	\$ 200	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	Plan	x		83
3-Sacramento County-3	Sacramento	Watt Avenue Complete Street Improvements, Phase 1	\$ 12,798	\$ 8,767	\$ 1,100	\$ -	\$ 7,667	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 700	\$ 400	\$ 7,667	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		83
4-California Department of Transportation-3	Contra Costa	Central Avenue I-80 Undercrossing Ped/Bike Improvements	\$ 4,333	\$ 3,833	\$ 535	\$ 1,050	\$ -	\$ 2,248	\$ 535	\$ 677	\$ 373	\$ 2,248	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		83
4-Fremont, City of-1	Alameda	Walnut Avenue Corridor Protected Intersections Project	\$ 3,555	\$ 2,712	\$ -	\$ 2,712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,712	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		83
4-San Rafael, City of-1	Marin	San Rafael Canal Crossing Project	\$ 22,127	\$ 1,575	\$ 1,575	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,575	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	83
6-Dinuba, City of-1	Tulare	Connecting Dinuba N-S for Bike/Pedestrian Safety - Alta Avenue	\$ 3,081	\$ 2,631	\$ 388	\$ -	\$ 2,243	\$ -	\$ 73	\$ 315	\$ -	\$ 2,243	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	83
6-Woodlake, City of-1	Tulare	Sequoia Ave Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 1,481	\$ 1,247	\$ 1,247	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,247	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	83
7-San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments-1	Los Angeles	Metro L (Gold) Line Fairplex Safety and Connectivity Project	\$ 8,513	\$ 6,810	\$ -	\$ 6,810	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,810	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		83
7-West Covina, City of-1	Los Angeles	West Covina Safe Routes to School & Pedestrian Safety Project	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ 150	\$ 1,849	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 140	\$ -	\$ 1,849	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	83
10-Lathrop, City of-2	San Joaquin	Lathrop Active Transportation Plan	\$ 200	\$ 190	\$ 190	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 190	Plan	x		83
10-Stanislaus County-2	Stanislaus	Denair School Safe Crossing and Active Transportation Connectivity Project	\$ 3,070	\$ 2,445	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,445	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,445	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	83
10-Stockton, City of-7	San Joaquin	Stockton Citywide Active Transportation Plan	\$ 825	\$ 825	\$ 825	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 825	Plan	x		83
11-Solana Beach, City of-1	San Diego	Lomas Santa Fe Complete Streets Project, Solana Beach	\$ 12,214	\$ 10,754	\$ 370	\$ 10,270	\$ 114	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 370	\$ 10,270	\$ 114	Infrastructure + NI - Large		x	83
11-Vista, City of-1	San Diego	Rancho Minerva Safe Routes to School	\$ 3,687	\$ 3,502	\$ 427	\$ 3,075	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 142	\$ 285	\$ 50	\$ 3,025	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	83
4-Corte Madera, Town of-1	Marin	Central Marin Regional Pathways Gap Closure Project	\$ 1,996	\$ 1,326	\$ 1,326	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,326	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	82

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-El Paso De Robles, City of-1	San Luis Obispo	Creston Road Active Transportation and Bike and School Access Improvements	\$ 12,190	\$ 6,026	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 26	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000	\$ 26	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		82
5-King City, City of-1	Monterey	San Antonio Drive Bikeway & School Gap Closure	\$ 6,712	\$ 6,612	\$ 590	\$ 6,022	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 490	\$ -	\$ 6,022	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	82
5-Santa Cruz, City of-3	Santa Cruz	Swanton Delaware Multiuse Path	\$ 2,292	\$ 2,092	\$ 90	\$ 2,002	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 80	\$ 25	\$ 1,977	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		82
5-Santa Maria, City of-1	Santa Barbara	Active Santa Maria Safe Routes to School Corridor Improvements	\$ 5,256	\$ 4,948	\$ 92	\$ 920	\$ 3,936	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 320	\$ 600	\$ 3,936	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	82
7-Avalon, City of-1	Los Angeles	Tremont Five Corners School Safety Roundabouts	\$ 5,106	\$ 2,890	\$ 2,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,870	\$ 20	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	82
7-Culver City, City of-1	Los Angeles	Overland-Transit Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Connector	\$ 6,732	\$ 5,652	\$ 996	\$ 4,656	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 168	\$ 524	\$ -	\$ 4,656	\$ 304	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	82
7-Pico Rivera, City of-1	Los Angeles	City of Pico Rivera Active Transportation Master Plan	\$ 411	\$ 411	\$ 411	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 411	Plan	x		82
8-Highland, City of-1	San Bernardino	Highland/San Bernardino Bi-City Transformative Bikeway/Walkway Connector	\$ 22,222	\$ 19,241	\$ 928	\$ 1,787	\$ -	\$ 16,526	\$ 888	\$ 1,392	\$ 395	\$ 16,526	\$ 40	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	82
8-Montclair, City of-1	San Bernardino	Montclair SRTS Implementation Project	\$ 5,426	\$ 5,426	\$ 580	\$ 4,846	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 145	\$ 435	\$ -	\$ 4,764	\$ 82	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	82
8-Riverside County-6	Riverside	Mecca-North Shore Community Connector Bike Lanes	\$ 10,055	\$ 10,055	\$ 200	\$ 1,600	\$ 8,205	\$ 50	\$ 200	\$ 1,600	\$ -	\$ 8,205	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		82
8-Temecula, City of-1	Riverside	Temecula Creek Southside Trail Project	\$ 3,637	\$ 3,218	\$ 58	\$ 3,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,160	\$ 58	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	82
11-National City, City of-1	San Diego	El Toyon Multi-Use Path	\$ 1,320	\$ 1,268	\$ 63	\$ 1,205	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 48	\$ -	\$ 1,205	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	82
8-San Bernardino, City of-1	San Bernardino	Marshall Elementary Safe Route to School Improvements	\$ 3,366	\$ 3,366	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ 3,016	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 3,016	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	81.5
2-Redding, City of-3*	Shasta	California Street Bikeway	\$ 4,302	\$ 2,413	\$ -	\$ 2,413	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,413	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	81
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-2	Nevada	SR 49 Multimodal Corridor Improvements, Nevada City	\$ 10,550	\$ 10,550	\$ 645	\$ -	\$ 811	\$ 9,094	\$ 645	\$ 806	\$ 5	\$ 9,019	\$ 75	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		81
3-Paradise, Town of-3	Butte	Pentz Pathway Project Phase II	\$ 35,377	\$ 10,188	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,188	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,188	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	81
3-Placer County-1	Placer	Kings Beach Western Approach Project	\$ 8,329	\$ 6,050	\$ 6,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,260	\$ 4,790	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		81
5-Buellton, City of-1	Santa Barbara	Santa Ynez River Trail: Connecting Buellton, Solvang, and Chumash Reservation	\$ 20,403	\$ 2,490	\$ 740	\$ 1,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 740	\$ 1,400	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	81
6-Delano, City of-2	Kern	ATP-5 Bike Lane and Sidewalk Gap Improvement Project	\$ 925	\$ 911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ 716	\$ 75	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	81
6-Selma, City of-2	Fresno	Mitchell Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	\$ 611	\$ 611	\$ 147	\$ -	\$ 464	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68	\$ 79	\$ 464	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	81
8-San Jacinto, City of-1	Riverside	San Jacinto Complete Streets Plan	\$ 328	\$ 328	\$ 328	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 328	Plan	x	x	81
9-Bishop, City of-1	Inyo	Sierra Street Bicycle Path Rehabilitation	\$ 1,717	\$ 1,717	\$ 125	\$ 384	\$ -	\$ 1,208	\$ 125	\$ 84	\$ 300	\$ 1,208	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	81
10-Waterford, City of-1	Stanislaus	Waterford Safe Routes to School Project – Yosemite Boulevard	\$ 946	\$ 946	\$ 55	\$ 88	\$ 803	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 40	\$ 88	\$ 803	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	81
12-Santa Ana, City of-5	Orange	Orange Avenue Bike Lane and Bicycle Boulevard Project	\$ 4,858	\$ 4,858	\$ 71	\$ 709	\$ 4,078	\$ -	\$ 71	\$ 709	\$ -	\$ 4,078	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	81
3-Placerville, City of-1	El Dorado	Placerville Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	\$ 26,913	\$ 14,185	\$ 930	\$ -	\$ 13,255	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 845	\$ 85	\$ 13,255	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		80
4-Menlo Park, City of-1*	San Mateo	Middle Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Rail Crossing Project	\$ 20,258	\$ 10,000	\$ 6,820	\$ 3,180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 6,720	\$ 3,180	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	80
4-Napa County Office of Education-1	Napa	Napa County Safe Routes to School Program	\$ 996	\$ 869	\$ 869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 869	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	80
5-Santa Barbara, City of-4	Santa Barbara	Milpas Street Crosswalk Safety and Sidewalk Widening Project	\$ 27,642	\$ 27,366	\$ 3,635	\$ 1,712	\$ -	\$ 22,019	\$ 3,635	\$ 1,212	\$ 500	\$ 22,019	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		80
6-Bakersfield, City of-2	Kern	Chester Avenue (4th Street to Brundage Lane)	\$ 791	\$ 791	\$ 791	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91	\$ -	\$ 700	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	80
7-Glendora, City of-1	Los Angeles	Glendora L-Line (Gold) Extension First/Last Mile Projects - Glendora Avenue	\$ 4,275	\$ 3,415	\$ 140	\$ 390	\$ -	\$ 2,885	\$ 140	\$ 390	\$ -	\$ 2,885	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium			80

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
7-South Gate, City of-2	Los Angeles	Hollydale Area Access Improvements Project	\$ 313	\$ 313	\$ 29	\$ 284	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 19	\$ -	\$ 284	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		80
8-Riverside, City of-1	Riverside	Mitchell Avenue Sidepath Gap Closure	\$ 6,989	\$ 6,289	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 2,373	\$ 3,716	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 2,373	\$ 3,716	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		80
12-Santa Ana, City of-1	Orange	Safe Mobility Santa Ana	\$ 5,282	\$ 5,282	\$ 77	\$ 771	\$ 4,434	\$ -	\$ 77	\$ 771	\$ -	\$ 4,434	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		80
12-Santa Ana, City of-6	Orange	St. Andrews Place Bicycle Boulevard Project	\$ 3,218	\$ 3,218	\$ 47	\$ 470	\$ 2,701	\$ -	\$ 47	\$ 470	\$ -	\$ 2,701	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	80
12-Santa Ana, City of-8	Orange	Monroe Elementary and Edison Elementary SRTS	\$ 6,705	\$ 6,705	\$ 102	\$ 762	\$ 5,841	\$ -	\$ 102	\$ 762	\$ -	\$ 5,841	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		80
4-Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)-1*	Marin	Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Shared Use Path Gap Closure	\$ 5,612	\$ 4,302	\$ 4,302	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,302	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		80
4-San Bruno, City of-1	San Mateo	Huntington Bikeway and Pedestrian Safety Project	\$ 6,750	\$ 6,572	\$ 1,003	\$ 5,569	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 805	\$ 198	\$ 5,569	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		79.5
10-Manteca, City of-1	San Joaquin	Manteca SRTS Pedestrian Safety Improvements	\$ 3,477	\$ 3,477	\$ 248	\$ 373	\$ -	\$ 2,856	\$ 248	\$ 373	\$ -	\$ 2,856	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	79.5
1-Round Valley Indians Tribe-1	Mendocino	Foothill Blvd. Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Project	\$ 1,543	\$ 1,543	\$ 170	\$ 1,373	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ 1,373	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	79
3-El Dorado County-4	El Dorado	Ponderosa Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 1,801	\$ 496	\$ 496	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 496	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	79
3-Elk Grove, City of-1	Sacramento	Laguna Creek Inter-Regional Trail Crossing at State Route 99	\$ 7,770	\$ 434	\$ 434	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 434	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		79
4-Contra Costa County-3	Contra Costa	Market Avenue Complete Street	\$ 3,209	\$ 2,884	\$ 295	\$ -	\$ 2,589	\$ -	\$ 295	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,589	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	79
4-Oakland, City of-6	Alameda	International Boulevard Pedestrian Lighting and Sidewalk Improvements (M)	\$ 6,598	\$ 5,212	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,212	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,212	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		79
5-Atascadero, City of-1	San Luis Obispo	Downtown Infrastructure Enhancement Plan	\$ 6,952	\$ 6,352	\$ 25	\$ 1,125	\$ 5,202	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 1,050	\$ 75	\$ 5,202	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium			79
6-Bakersfield, City of-4	Kern	North Bakersfield Bicycle Connectivity Project	\$ 234	\$ 234	\$ 234	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 234	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	79
6-Clovis, City of-1	Fresno	Sierra Vista Elementary Area Sidewalk Improvements	\$ 997	\$ 997	\$ 25	\$ 96	\$ 876	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 96	\$ -	\$ 876	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	79
6-Orange Cove, City of-1	Fresno	Bike Lane, Sidewalk and Crossing Improvement Project	\$ 973	\$ 973	\$ 973	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 109	\$ -	\$ 839	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	79
7-Baldwin Park, City of-1	Los Angeles	Baldwin Park Blvd Bike Lane Project	\$ 2,100	\$ 2,100	\$ 83	\$ -	\$ 2,017	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ 2,017	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		79
7-Manhattan Beach, City of-1	Los Angeles	Rowell Avenue Safe Routes to School Connectivity Improvement Project	\$ 1,531	\$ 1,531	\$ 75	\$ 235	\$ -	\$ 1,221	\$ 75	\$ 185	\$ 50	\$ 1,221	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	79
8-Menifee, City of-1	Riverside	Romoland Elementary SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 6,413	\$ 5,453	\$ 370	\$ 5,083	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60	\$ 260	\$ 50	\$ 5,083	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	79
8-Riverside County-5	Riverside	Grand Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvement Project	\$ 2,820	\$ 2,820	\$ 25	\$ 650	\$ -	\$ 2,145	\$ 25	\$ 400	\$ 250	\$ 2,045	\$ 100	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	79
8-Twenty-nine Palms, City of-1	San Bernardino	Class II Bike Paths on Amboy Road	\$ 643	\$ 643	\$ 10	\$ 90	\$ 543	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 80	\$ 10	\$ 543	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		79
8-Wildomar, City of-1	Riverside	Bundy Canyon Active Transportation Corridor (BCATC)	\$ 3,990	\$ 1,454	\$ 1,454	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,377	\$ 77	Infrastructure + NI - Medium			79
12-La Habra, City of-1	Orange	La Habra Rails to Trail OC Loop Gap Closure	\$ 43,223	\$ 36,729	\$ 3,839	\$ 247	\$ 32,643	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,839	\$ 32,643	\$ 247	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		79
7-Los Angeles County-4	Los Angeles	Los Nietos Pedestrian Access Improvements	\$ 5,574	\$ 5,574	\$ 615	\$ -	\$ 390	\$ 4,569	\$ 615	\$ 390	\$ -	\$ 4,569	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		78.5
3-El Dorado County-5	El Dorado	Golden Center Drive/Forni Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project	\$ 1,982	\$ 1,982	\$ 462	\$ -	\$ 1,520	\$ -	\$ 133	\$ 199	\$ 130	\$ 1,520	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	78
3-South Lake Tahoe, City of-1	El Dorado	Pioneer Trail Pedestrian Improvement Project Phase 2	\$ 3,400	\$ 3,400	\$ 3,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 2,900	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		78
3-Yolo County-1	Yolo	Yolo-80 Corridor Improvement Project - Bikeway Connectivity	\$ 17,700	\$ 1,900	\$ 1,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		78
3-Yuba County-1	Yuba	Ninth Avenue & Fleming Way Safe Route to School Project	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,070	\$ -	\$ 214	\$ 4,856	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 214	\$ -	\$ 4,856	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	78
4-Contra Costa County-1	Contra Costa	Appian Way Corridor - Pedestrian Crossing Enhancements	\$ 2,332	\$ 1,961	\$ 101	\$ 67	\$ -	\$ 1,793	\$ 101	\$ 67	\$ -	\$ 1,793	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		78

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
4-Napa County-1	Napa	Napa Valley Vine Trail Yountville to St Helena Gap Closure	\$ 16,200	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	78
5-Monterey, City of-1	Monterey	Del Monte/Washington Intersection, Bike, and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 2,798	\$ 2,238	\$ 24	\$ 280	\$ 1,934	\$ -	\$ 24	\$ 280	\$ -	\$ 1,934	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium			78
8-Fontana, City of-1	San Bernardino	San Sevaime Class I Multi-Use Trail:Philadelphia to North of Foothill	\$ 30,831	\$ 30,331	\$ 2,575	\$ 3,745	\$ -	\$ 24,011	\$ 2,575	\$ 2,575	\$ 1,170	\$ 23,961	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		78
8-Fontana, City of-2	San Bernardino	San Sevaime Class I Multi-Use Trail: Philadelphia to Slover	\$ 9,840	\$ 9,340	\$ 750	\$ 1,920	\$ -	\$ 6,670	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 1,170	\$ 6,645	\$ 25	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		78
10-Waterford, City of-2	Stanislaus	Waterford Safe Routes to School Project – Washington Road	\$ 504	\$ 504	\$ 35	\$ 469	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 25	\$ 32	\$ 437	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	78
12-Buena Park, City of-1	Orange	Dale Street Complete Street and Safe Route to School Project	\$ 810	\$ 611	\$ 611	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 611	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	78
12-Santa Ana, City of-10	Orange	Jackson ES_Diamond ES	\$ 7,737	\$ 7,737	\$ 120	\$ 720	\$ 6,897	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ 720	\$ -	\$ 6,897	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	78
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-1	Riverside	Pacific Avenue Safe Route to School Project Saticoy to Santa Paula: West Branch Trail Gap Closure	\$ 4,132	\$ 2,403	\$ 233	\$ 2,170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 233	\$ -	\$ 2,170	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	78
7-Ventura County-1	Ventura	Gualala Downtown Streetscape Enhancement Project	\$ 22,434	\$ 21,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,250	\$ 17,250	\$ -	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,250	\$ -	\$ 17,250	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		77.5
1-Mendocino Council of Governments-1	Mendocino	Safe Routes to School Safety Enhancement Project	\$ 9,039	\$ 7,224	\$ 260	\$ 437	\$ -	\$ 6,527	\$ 260	\$ 250	\$ 187	\$ 6,527	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		77
3-Rancho Cordova, City of-1	Sacramento	Complete Streets in Downtown Dinuba - Tulare Street	\$ 1,987	\$ 1,987	\$ 275	\$ 1,712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ 1,712	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	77
6-Dinuba, City of-3	Tulare	Avenue L Interchange Bike/Ped Safety Improvements and Gap Closure	\$ 1,946	\$ 1,946	\$ 245	\$ 1,701	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 1,701	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	77
7-Lancaster, City of-1	Los Angeles	District 10-Groveland Bike and Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 12,780	\$ 10,854	\$ 254	\$ 10,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,600	\$ 254	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x	x	77
10-California Department of Transportation-1	Tuolumne	Main Street Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 2,750	\$ 2,295	\$ 180	\$ 755	\$ -	\$ 1,360	\$ 180	\$ 220	\$ 535	\$ 1,360	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	77
10-Escalon, City of-1	San Joaquin	Ross Street Complete Streets	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ 160	\$ 345	\$ 1,494	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 165	\$ 180	\$ 1,494	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	77
12-Santa Ana, City of-2	Orange	Heroes ES_Carver ES_Willard Int_Wilson SRTS	\$ 3,305	\$ 3,305	\$ 47	\$ 523	\$ 2,735	\$ -	\$ 47	\$ 523	\$ -	\$ 2,735	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		77
12-Santa Ana, City of-9	Orange	Bay to Zoo Trail	\$ 9,752	\$ 9,752	\$ 148	\$ 1,108	\$ 8,496	\$ -	\$ 148	\$ 1,108	\$ -	\$ 8,496	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	77
1-Eureka, City of-1	Humboldt	Cycle 5 – City of Colusa Active Transportation Improvement Project	\$ 6,999	\$ 6,824	\$ 130	\$ 450	\$ 6,244	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 105	\$ 450	\$ 6,244	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	76
3-Colusa, City of-1	Colusa	El Dorado Trail / Missouri Flat Road Pedestrian Overcrossing	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 83	\$ -	\$ 1,916	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	76
3-El Dorado County-1	El Dorado	Garfield Elementary Safe Routes to School	\$ 5,722	\$ 5,129	\$ 5,129	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,129	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		76
4-Oakland, City of-4	Alameda	Our Streets: SRTS Community Bike/Walk Campaign for East Contra Costa	\$ 947	\$ 937	\$ 260	\$ -	\$ 677	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 260	\$ -	\$ 677	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	76
4-Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)-1	Contra Costa	Glendora L-Line (Gold) Extension First/Last Mile Projects - Foothill Boulevard	\$ 488	\$ 488	\$ 488	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 488	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	76
7-Glendora, City of-2	Los Angeles	Main Street/Henry Elementary School Road Diet/Buffered Bike Lanes	\$ 3,513	\$ 2,810	\$ 112	\$ 292	\$ -	\$ 2,406	\$ 112	\$ 292	\$ -	\$ 2,406	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium			76
10-San Joaquin County-1	San Joaquin	Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$ 317	\$ 254	\$ 4	\$ 40	\$ 210	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ 210	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		76
10-Stockton, City of-2	San Joaquin	Pedestrian Connectivity and Safety Improvements	\$ 6,239	\$ 3,540	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,540	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,540	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	76
10-Stockton, City of-8	San Joaquin	Riley Street Sidewalks Project	\$ 6,795	\$ 6,116	\$ 485	\$ 728	\$ 4,903	\$ -	\$ 485	\$ 728	\$ -	\$ 4,903	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	76
3-Folsom, City of-1	Sacramento	Rough and Ready Highway Roundabout Project	\$ 6,147	\$ 4,917	\$ 955	\$ 269	\$ 3,693	\$ -	\$ 451	\$ 504	\$ 269	\$ 3,693	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	75
3-Nevada County-2	Nevada	Truckee River Legacy Trail Phase 4A	\$ 4,032	\$ 2,727	\$ 195	\$ 2,532	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 95	\$ 2,532	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	75
3-Truckee, Town of-1	Nevada	Lompoc High School Corridor Sidewalk Infill and Crossing Improvement Project	\$ 8,079	\$ 6,215	\$ 6,215	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,215	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		75
5-Lompoc, City of-1	Santa Barbara		\$ 669	\$ 599	\$ 56	\$ 543	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 56	\$ -	\$ 543	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	75

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-Santa Barbara County-1	Santa Barbara	Old Town Orcutt Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project	\$ 6,806	\$ 6,396	\$ 225	\$ 400	\$ 5,771	\$ -	\$ 225	\$ 270	\$ 130	\$ 5,771	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	75
5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County 1	Monterey	Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway: CSUMB North Segment	\$ 12,950	\$ 10,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,100	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	75
6-Dinuba, City of-5	Tulare	Making Crawford Avenue Safe- Phase 1	\$ 4,414	\$ 4,033	\$ 427	\$ 3,606	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 106	\$ 321	\$ -	\$ 3,606	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	75
6-Selma, City of-1	Fresno	Rose Avenue Bike Path and Sidewalk Improvements	\$ 677	\$ 677	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ 557	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75	\$ 45	\$ 557	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	75
7-Oxnard, City of-2	Ventura	4th Street Mobility Improvements	\$ 6,900	\$ 6,900	\$ 650	\$ 6,250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 650	\$ -	\$ 6,250	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		75
7-Pasadena, City of-1	Los Angeles	Northwest Pasadena Active Transportation Plan (ATP)	\$ 243	\$ 243	\$ 243	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 243	Plan	x		75
7-South Gate, City of-1	Los Angeles	Tweedy Boulevard Traffic Safety Improvements	\$ 6,459	\$ 6,459	\$ 645	\$ -	\$ 5,814	\$ -	\$ 30	\$ 615	\$ -	\$ 5,814	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		75
8-California Department of Transportation-5	San Bernardino	Route 66 / Fifth Street Complete Street Improvements	\$ 23,988	\$ 23,988	\$ 1,950	\$ 5,391	\$ -	\$ 16,647	\$ 1,950	\$ 1,700	\$ 3,691	\$ 16,647	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		75
8-Fontana, City of-3	San Bernardino	San Sevaine Class I Multi-Use Trail: Valley to Foothill	\$ 14,171	\$ 14,171	\$ 1,050	\$ 2,220	\$ -	\$ 10,901	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,170	\$ 10,876	\$ 25	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		75
8-Ontario, City of-2	San Bernardino	Euclid East Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ -	\$ 165	\$ 1,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 165	\$ -	\$ 1,834	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		75
10-Stockton, City of-3	San Joaquin	California Street Separated Bikeway Project Phase 1	\$ 3,601	\$ 1,395	\$ 1,395	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,395	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	75
10-Stockton, City of-6	San Joaquin	Downtown East-West Connection (Park/Oak/Fremont)	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ 110	\$ 240	\$ 1,649	\$ -	\$ 110	\$ 240	\$ -	\$ 1,649	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		75
12-Santa Ana, City of-11	Orange	King ES_Lincoln ES_Monte Vista ES_Griset Academy	\$ 9,036	\$ 9,036	\$ 140	\$ 841	\$ 8,055	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ 841	\$ -	\$ 8,055	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	75
7-Cerritos, City of-2*	Los Angeles	Del Amo Boulevard Bridge Replacement and Signal Enhancements	\$ 27,436	\$ 7,111	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,111	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,111	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		75
12-Santa Ana, City of-15	Orange	Madison ES_Roosevelt ES_Walker ES_Century HS	\$ 8,693	\$ 8,693	\$ 132	\$ 988	\$ 7,573	\$ -	\$ 132	\$ 988	\$ -	\$ 7,573	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	74.5
1-Humboldt County-1	Humboldt	Annie & Mary Trail Phase 2 (Blue Lake to Glendale)	\$ 8,844	\$ 8,754	\$ 920	\$ -	\$ 814	\$ 7,020	\$ 920	\$ 614	\$ 200	\$ 7,020	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	74
3-Winters, City of-1	Yolo	SR128/I-505 Overcrossing (Br. 22-0110)/Russell Blvd Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 9,953	\$ 9,703	\$ 550	\$ 2,162	\$ -	\$ 6,991	\$ 550	\$ 745	\$ 1,417	\$ 6,991	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		74
8-Desert Hot Springs, City of-2	Riverside	Palm Drive Improvements - I-10 to Camino Aventura	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,154	\$ -	\$ 6,154	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,154	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		74
10-Lathrop, City of-1	San Joaquin	Class II Bikeway to ACE Station	\$ 1,054	\$ 1,001	\$ 178	\$ 823	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71	\$ 107	\$ -	\$ 823	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		74
11-El Centro, City of-1	Imperial	El Centro Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 3,998	\$ 3,598	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 3,298	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 3,298	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	74
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-2	San Diego	San Diego Regional Active Transportation Plan	\$ 1,990	\$ 1,750	\$ 1,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,750	Plan	x		74
12-Irvine, City of-1	Orange	JOST I-5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge	\$ 16,842	\$ 7,837	\$ 7,837	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,837	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		74
4-San Francisco County Transportation Authority-1	San Francisco	Yerba Buena Island Multi-use Pathway Project	\$ 89,400	\$ 3,800	\$ -	\$ 3,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		73
5-San Luis Obispo Council of Governments-2	San Luis Obispo	Active Campus: Equitable, Educational Programming	\$ 350	\$ 310	\$ 310	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 310	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	73
6-Fowler, City of-1	Fresno	Fremont Elementary/ Marshall Elementary/Fowler High Safe Routes to School	\$ 426	\$ 426	\$ 5	\$ 40	\$ 381	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ 381	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	73
6-Tulare County-1	Tulare	Poplar Avenue 145 Sidewalk Improvements Project	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,178	\$ 626	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,552	\$ -	\$ 256	\$ 370	\$ 1,552	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	73
6-Tulare County-3	Tulare	Tipton Sidewalk Improvements Project	\$ 4,800	\$ 4,752	\$ 841	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,911	\$ -	\$ 401	\$ 440	\$ 3,911	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	73
7-Carson, City of-1	Los Angeles	City of Carson Active Transportation Safety Improvement Project	\$ 1,800	\$ 1,800	\$ 70	\$ 1,730	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,730	\$ 70	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x		73
9-Tehachapi, City of-2	Kern	Valley Boulevard and Mill Street Gap Closure Project	\$ 3,509	\$ 2,934	\$ 284	\$ 2,650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 100	\$ 2,650	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		73
10-Calaveras County-2	Calaveras	Murphys State Route 4 Complete Streets Project	\$ 3,839	\$ 3,775	\$ 66	\$ 365	\$ -	\$ 3,344	\$ 66	\$ 365	\$ -	\$ 3,344	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	73

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
12-Santa Ana, City of-18	Orange	Mendez Fundamental Int_Hoover ES_Santiago ES_Sierra Int SRTS	\$ 10,122	\$ 10,122	\$ 155	\$ 942	\$ 9,025	\$ -	\$ 155	\$ 942	\$ -	\$ 9,025	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	73
4-Daly City, City of-1	San Mateo	Bayshore and Woodrow Wilson Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 3,400	\$ 2,780	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,780	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,780	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	72
4-Napa, City of-1	Napa	Westwood Neighborhood Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 2,258	\$ 2,258	\$ 336	\$ 1,922	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 331	\$ 7	\$ 1,915	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		72
4-San Mateo, City of-1	San Mateo	Delaware Street Safe Routes to School Corridor	\$ 1,661	\$ 1,661	\$ 260	\$ 1,401	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37	\$ 213	\$ 10	\$ 1,401	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	72
6-Bakersfield, City of-3	Kern	Garces Memorial Circle	\$ 172	\$ 172	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 172	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	72
7-Los Angeles, City of-12	Los Angeles	Linking Warner Center as an Active Transportation Hub to Jobs/Housing	\$ 470	\$ 374	\$ 374	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 374	Plan	x		72
8-Apple Valley, Town of-2	San Bernardino	Bear Valley Road Class 1 Bike Path Project Phase 2	\$ 1,768	\$ 1,538	\$ 260	\$ 1,278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 1,278	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		72
11-Encinitas, City of-2	San Diego	Leucadia Streetscape - Phase 2	\$ 41,577	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Large			72
3-Citrus Heights, City of-1	Sacramento	Old Auburn Road Complete Streets - Phase I	\$ 12,096	\$ 9,984	\$ 609	\$ -	\$ 1,506	\$ 7,869	\$ 609	\$ 914	\$ 592	\$ 7,869	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		71
5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County-2	Monterey	Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway: California Avenue Segment	\$ 4,202	\$ 3,582	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,582	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,582	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	71
7-Burbank, City of-1	Los Angeles	Burbank Citywide Safe Routes to School Plan Holly Drive Pedestrian and Bikeway Improvements	\$ 569	\$ 569	\$ 569	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 569	Plan	x	x	71
10-Tracy, City of-2	San Joaquin	Folsom Boulevard Complete Street Improvements, Phase 2	\$ 1,830	\$ 1,632	\$ 163	\$ 1,469	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 163	\$ -	\$ 1,469	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	71
3-Sacramento County-1	Sacramento	Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	\$ 4,777	\$ 4,201	\$ 635	\$ 3,566	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 521	\$ 114	\$ 3,566	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		70
5-Monterey County-1	Monterey	Strathmore Complete Streets Improvements Project	\$ 4,424	\$ 4,424	\$ 1,158	\$ 3,266	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 300	\$ 25	\$ 3,241	\$ 833	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	70
6-Tulare County-4	Tulare	Alhambra Active Transportation Plan with Multi-Modal Connectivity	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,574	\$ 744	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,830	\$ -	\$ 324	\$ 420	\$ 1,830	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	70
7-Alhambra, City of-1	Los Angeles	Pioneer Road Regional Path	\$ 15,226	\$ 11,756	\$ -	\$ 1,857	\$ -	\$ 9,899	\$ -	\$ 1,400	\$ 457	\$ 9,899	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		70
10-Sonoma, City of-1	Tuolumne	Dragoon Gulch Connector Trail	\$ 4,435	\$ 3,954	\$ 315	\$ 561	\$ 3,078	\$ -	\$ 315	\$ 300	\$ 261	\$ 3,078	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		70
11-El Cajon, City of-2	San Diego	Main Street - Green Street Ph II	\$ 1,998	\$ 1,838	\$ -	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ 1,668	\$ -	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ 1,668	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		70
12-Santa Ana, City of-17	Orange	MacArthur Intermediate and Taft Elementary SRTS	\$ 4,278	\$ 4,278	\$ 65	\$ 486	\$ 3,727	\$ -	\$ 65	\$ 486	\$ -	\$ 3,727	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	70
3-Oroville, City of-1	Butte	Foothill Blvd. Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 1,965	\$ 1,965	\$ 50	\$ 220	\$ 400	\$ 1,295	\$ 50	\$ 220	\$ 400	\$ 1,295	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	69
3-Rancho Cordova, City of-2	Sacramento	Olson Drive Corridor Safety Enhancement Project	\$ 1,042	\$ 1,042	\$ 186	\$ 856	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 186	\$ -	\$ 856	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		69
4-Danville, Town of-1	Contra Costa	Diablo Road Trail	\$ 3,840	\$ 1,807	\$ -	\$ 1,807	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,807	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium			69
5-Monterey County-2	Monterey	San Ardo Community & School Connections Through Active Transportation	\$ 2,399	\$ 2,399	\$ 905	\$ 1,494	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 250	\$ 25	\$ 1,469	\$ 605	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	69
6-California Department of Transportation-7	Tulare	Ivanhoe Safe Route To School	\$ 1,788	\$ 1,070	\$ 120	\$ 181	\$ -	\$ 769	\$ 120	\$ 90	\$ 91	\$ 769	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	69
6-Kingsburg, City of-1	Fresno	Roosevelt & Reagan Elementary Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 1,900	\$ 1,900	\$ 235	\$ 1,665	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 225	\$ 120	\$ 1,545	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	69
7-Covina, City of-1	Los Angeles	Covina High School Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 1,720	\$ 1,710	\$ 130	\$ 1,580	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 1,580	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	69
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-3	San Diego	Uptown Phase Four: Mission Hills to Old Town Bikeway	\$ 5,689	\$ 3,950	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,950	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,950	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	69
12-Orange, City of-1	Orange	Santiago Creek Bike Trail Gap Closure	\$ 9,184	\$ 8,741	\$ 2,122	\$ 66	\$ 6,553	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 317	\$ 1,805	\$ 6,553	\$ 66	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		69
12-Santa Ana, City of-14	Orange	Lathrop Intermediate_Lowell ES_Martin ES_Pio Pico ES_Franklin ES	\$ 7,515	\$ 7,515	\$ 114	\$ 854	\$ 6,547	\$ -	\$ 114	\$ 854	\$ -	\$ 6,547	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	69

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
11-Escondido, City of-2*	San Diego	Hidden Valley Middle School Safe Routes to School Improvements	\$ 6,997	\$ 6,907	\$ 89	\$ 3,357	\$ -	\$ 3,461	\$ 89	\$ 297	\$ 3,060	\$ 3,461	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	68
3-Butte County-1	Butte	SOUTH OROVILLE BIKE AND PED CONNECTIVITY PROJECT	\$ 6,055	\$ 4,555	\$ -	\$ 4,555	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,555	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	68
6-Parlier, City of-1	Fresno	City of Parlier Pedestrian Facilities Improvements Project	\$ 1,995	\$ 1,995	\$ 1,995	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 1,638	\$ 87	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	68
7-Los Angeles, City of-8	Los Angeles	Telfair Avenue Multimodal Bridge Over Pacoima Wash	\$ 7,000	\$ 6,800	\$ 1,100	\$ 5,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 900	\$ 200	\$ 5,700	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	68
8-Moreno Valley, City of-1	Riverside	South City Trail Project	\$ 7,781	\$ 7,781	\$ 80	\$ 1,150	\$ 6,551	\$ -	\$ 80	\$ 900	\$ 250	\$ 6,551	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	68
11-Lemon Grove, City of-1	San Diego	Connect Main Street - Phases 4 thru 6	\$ 5,666	\$ 5,609	\$ 75	\$ 843	\$ 4,691	\$ -	\$ 75	\$ 843	\$ -	\$ 4,691	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		68
3-Nevada County-1	Nevada	Combie Road Active Transportation Project	\$ 980	\$ 980	\$ 55	\$ 925	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 925	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	67
4-San Jose, City of-5	Santa Clara	Five Wounds Trail (Story to Julian) - PA&ED and CON	\$ 34,035	\$ 29,387	\$ 97	\$ -	\$ 220	\$ 29,070	\$ 97	\$ 220	\$ -	\$ 29,070	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	67
6-Wasco, City of-1	Kern	Central Avenue Class I & Class II Bicycle Trails, Wasco	\$ 409	\$ 404	\$ 35	\$ 369	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 369	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		67
7-Commerce, City of-1	Los Angeles	Slauson Avenue Corridor & Citywide Transit, Pedestrian, Bike Improvements Project	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ 350	\$ 1,649	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 1,649	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	67
7-South Pasadena, City of-1	Los Angeles	Fremont Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects	\$ 1,900	\$ 1,672	\$ 216	\$ 1,456	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72	\$ 144	\$ -	\$ 1,456	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			67
7-Ventura County-3	Ventura	Santa Rosa Road Bike Lane Improvement and Pedestrian Project (SRRBLP)	\$ 1,103	\$ 1,103	\$ 75	\$ 122	\$ 906	\$ -	\$ 75	\$ 122	\$ -	\$ 906	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	67
8-Eastvale, City of-2	Riverside	Cucamonga Creek Multipurpose Path Bridge and Trail Gap Closures	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,999	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 1,849	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		67
9-California Department of Transportation-6	Inyo	SR 168 (W. Line Street) Sidewalk Extension - Bishop CA	\$ 4,215	\$ 4,215	\$ 380	\$ 1,160	\$ 2,675	\$ -	\$ 380	\$ 660	\$ 500	\$ 2,675	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	67
4-Vacaville, City of-1	Solano	Ulatis Creek Safe Routes to Transit Gap Closure	\$ 5,603	\$ 3,468	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,468	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,468	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		66
7-Long Beach, City of-3	Los Angeles	11th Street Bicycle Boulevards	\$ 6,715	\$ 6,043	\$ 135	\$ 1,189	\$ -	\$ 4,719	\$ 135	\$ 675	\$ -	\$ 4,719	\$ 514	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		66
8-Needles, City of-1	San Bernardino	ATP In-Fill Sidewalk, Curbs & Gutter Improvements Project (Three Areas)	\$ 1,921	\$ 1,921	\$ 1,921	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ -	\$ 1,781	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	66
7-Glendale, City of-1	Los Angeles	Glendale Systemic Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	\$ 5,365	\$ 4,828	\$ 402	\$ -	\$ 4,426	\$ -	\$ 96	\$ 306	\$ -	\$ 4,426	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	65.5
4-Alameda County-5	Alameda	Closing the gap in Niles Canyon; the Niles Canyon Pathway	\$ 26,522	\$ 2,800	\$ 2,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			65
4-East Bay Regional Park District-1	Contra Costa	Martinez Intermodal Station - Crockett Bay Trail Gap Closure Project	\$ 2,796	\$ 2,209	\$ 2,209	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,209	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		65
4-East Palo Alto, City of-1	San Mateo	University Avenue at 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	\$ 14,900	\$ 12,800	\$ 12,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,800	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	65
5-Carpinteria, City of-1	Santa Barbara	Carpinteria Avenue and Palm Avenue Crossing Improvements	\$ 406	\$ 406	\$ 70	\$ 12	\$ 324	\$ -	\$ 24	\$ 46	\$ 12	\$ 324	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	65
10-San Joaquin County-2	San Joaquin	Country Club Boulevard Complete Streets Corridor Plan	\$ 303	\$ 242	\$ 242	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 242	Plan	x		65
12-Yorba Linda, City of-1*	Orange	Transportation/Safe Routes to Schools/Trail Plan	\$ 350	\$ 350	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350	Plan	x	x	65
7-Los Angeles County-2*	Los Angeles	Quarry Clasp / Peck Park Bike Trail	\$ 3,440	\$ 1,800	\$ 200	\$ 1,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		65
4-Dublin, City of-1	Alameda	City of Dublin Safe Routes to Schools Project	\$ 5,323	\$ 3,456	\$ 54	\$ 424	\$ 2,978	\$ -	\$ 42	\$ 424	\$ -	\$ 2,978	\$ 12	Infrastructure + NI - Medium		x	64
6-Kings County-1	Kings	Becky Pease Street Sidewalk Improvements	\$ 2,000	\$ 885	\$ 5	\$ 80	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 5	\$ 80	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		64
2-Department of Transportation-2	Tehama	Mineral Multi Use Path	\$ 4,562	\$ 1,897	\$ -	\$ 634	\$ -	\$ 1,263	\$ -	\$ 634	\$ -	\$ 1,263	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		63
3-Woodland, City of-1	Yolo	Matmor Road and E. Gum Avenue Complete Streets Project	\$ 5,094	\$ 3,994	\$ -	\$ 3,994	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,994	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		63
4-San Carlos, City of-1	San Mateo	Holly Street/US-101 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Overcrossing	\$ 11,600	\$ 8,300	\$ -	\$ 8,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,300	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		63

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
7-Duarte, City of-1	Los Angeles	Donald & Bernice Watson Multi-Use Pathway Improvement Project	\$ 1,225	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,050	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	63
2-Shasta Lake, City of-1	Shasta	Ashby-to-Downtown	\$ 12,131	\$ 11,964	\$ 600	\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 10,164	\$ 600	\$ 1,200	\$ -	\$ 10,111	\$ 53	Infrastructure + NI - Large	x		62
4-Lafayette, City of-2	Contra Costa	Pleasant Hill Road Class I Pathway	\$ 3,070	\$ 2,830	\$ 2,830	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,830	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	62
5-San Luis Obispo Council of Governments-1	San Luis Obispo	Active Campus: Arrival/Dismissal Outreach and Education Program	\$ 260	\$ 240	\$ 240	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 240	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	62
6-Tulare County-2	Tulare	Cutler George Road and 2nd Drive Sidewalk Improvements Project	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,278	\$ 545	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,733	\$ -	\$ 269	\$ 276	\$ 1,733	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	62
10-Manteca, City of-2	San Joaquin	Manteca Citywide Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$ 6,800	\$ 6,800	\$ 486	\$ 729	\$ -	\$ 5,585	\$ 486	\$ 729	\$ -	\$ 5,585	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		62
11-San Diego County-5	San Diego	Camino San Bernardo at Deer Ridge Road Traffic Signal	\$ 318	\$ 318	\$ 318	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 318	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	62
12-Santa Ana, City of-21	Orange	Fairhaven ES Muir Fundamental ES	\$ 6,206	\$ 6,206	\$ 94	\$ 705	\$ 5,407	\$ -	\$ 94	\$ 705	\$ -	\$ 5,407	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	62
4-Lafayette, City of-1	Contra Costa	School Street/Topper Lane Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 5,216	\$ 4,016	\$ 1,675	\$ 2,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 325	\$ 1,300	\$ 2,341	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	61
12-Santa Ana, City of-12	Orange	Adams ES Carr Intermediate Godinez Fund HS Harvey ES Sepulveda ES Valley HS	\$ 9,052	\$ 9,052	\$ 137	\$ 1,029	\$ 7,886	\$ -	\$ 137	\$ 1,029	\$ -	\$ 7,886	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	61
4-Tiburon, Town of-1	Marin	Trestle Glen Boulevard Class II Bikeway	\$ 3,518	\$ 3,113	\$ 88	\$ 467	\$ 2,558	\$ -	\$ 88	\$ 445	\$ 22	\$ 2,558	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	60
5-Monterey County-4	Monterey	Chualar Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 4,178	\$ 4,178	\$ 1,175	\$ 3,003	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 350	\$ 25	\$ 2,978	\$ 625	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	60
6-Bakersfield, City of-1	Kern	California Avenue (Oleander Avenue to R Street)	\$ 770	\$ 770	\$ 770	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 89	\$ -	\$ 681	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	60
7-Camarillo, City of-1	Ventura	Camarillo Active Transportation Plan	\$ 370	\$ 370	\$ 370	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 370	Plan	x		60
11-San Diego, City of-2	San Diego	Downtown Mobility Complete Streets Phase 3B	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 300	\$ 1,700	\$ 7,000	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 1,700	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		60
4-Novato, City of-1	Marin	San Marin High School Area Multimodal Access Project	\$ 1,743	\$ 1,432	\$ -	\$ 1,432	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,432	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	59
4-Vallejo, City of-1	Solano	Vallejo Bluff Trail Phase 1	\$ 3,786	\$ 3,786	\$ 547	\$ 350	\$ 2,889	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 527	\$ 350	\$ 2,889	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		59
7-Palmdale, City of-1	Los Angeles	Eight-School Students-to-Classrooms Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 200	\$ 250	\$ 6,550	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 6,550	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	59
8-Big Bear Lake, City of-2	San Bernardino	Rathbun Creek Trail Extension	\$ 1,637	\$ 1,571	\$ 133	\$ 1,438	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43	\$ 28	\$ 62	\$ 1,438	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		59
5-Monterey County-5	Monterey	Carmel Valley Road Class II Bike Lanes Project	\$ 531	\$ 425	\$ 76	\$ -	\$ 349	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 76	\$ -	\$ 349	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	58
6-Bakersfield, City of-5	Kern	Kern River at 24th Street	\$ 1,368	\$ 1,368	\$ 127	\$ -	\$ 117	\$ 1,124	\$ 127	\$ 117	\$ -	\$ 1,124	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	57
7-Pasadena, City of-2	Los Angeles	Northwest Pasadena Continental Crosswalk Implementation	\$ 967	\$ 967	\$ 160	\$ 807	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ 807	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		57
11-San Diego County-3	San Diego	Allen School Road SRTS Sidewalk and Bicycle Lanes	\$ 1,964	\$ 1,964	\$ 392	\$ 1,572	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 202	\$ 90	\$ 1,572	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	57
1-Lake County-1	Lake	Konocti Road Safe Routes To School Project	\$ 811	\$ 770	\$ 770	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 770	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	56
3-Biggs, City of-1	Butte	Biggs E Street & Second Street Safe Routes to School	\$ 1,937	\$ 1,777	\$ 1,777	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,517	\$ 260	Infrastructure + NI - Small	x	x	56
3-El Dorado County-6	El Dorado	San Bernardino Class 1 Bike Trail Project	\$ 3,352	\$ 1,395	\$ 1,395	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,395	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	56
5-San Benito County-1	San Benito	San Benito Comprehensive Active Transportation Plan	\$ 424	\$ 424	\$ 424	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 424	Plan	x		56
10-Tracy, City of-1	San Joaquin	Tracy Boulevard Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 1,441	\$ 1,416	\$ 180	\$ 1,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 180	\$ -	\$ 1,236	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		56
11-San Diego County-4	San Diego	Arnold Way Sidewalk	\$ 1,612	\$ 1,612	\$ 339	\$ 1,273	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 184	\$ 55	\$ 1,273	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			56
7-Cerritos, City of-1	Los Angeles	Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 1,350	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	55

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
7-Manhattan Beach, City of-6	Los Angeles	Manhattan Village Senior Villas ADA Pathway Project	\$ 1,310	\$ 990	\$ 990	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 990	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			55
12-Rancho Santa Margarita, City of-1	Orange	Traffic Calming at Avenida De Los Fundadores Project	\$ 375	\$ 375	\$ 375	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 375	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			55
12-Santa Ana, City of-13	Orange	Jefferson ES_Thorpe Fundamental_McFadden Int_Greenville Fund ES_Segerstrom HS	\$ 7,653	\$ 7,653	\$ 120	\$ 717	\$ 6,816	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ 717	\$ -	\$ 6,816	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	55
4-Half Moon Bay, City of-1	San Mateo	Highway 1 Safety and Operational Improvements North	\$ 11,162	\$ 4,462	\$ 4,462	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,462	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			54
4-San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District-1	Contra Costa	Bicycle, pedestrian, and ADA improvements at Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	\$ 1,996	\$ 1,198	\$ -	\$ 1,198	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,198	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		54
5-San Luis Obispo County-5	San Luis Obispo	Pedestrian Plan & Prioritization - Countywide	\$ 218	\$ 218	\$ 218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 218	Plan	x		54
10-Patterson, City of-1	Stanislaus	Pedestrian Controlled Crosswalk Project	\$ 909	\$ 805	\$ 111	\$ -	\$ 694	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111	\$ -	\$ 694	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		54
11-Encinitas, City of-1	San Diego	Birmingham Drive Complete Streets Project	\$ 9,517	\$ 7,639	\$ 7,599	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,599	\$ 40	Infrastructure + NI - Large		x	54
12-Costa Mesa, City of-1	Orange	Adams Avenue Multipurpose Trail Project	\$ 6,942	\$ 5,500	\$ 5,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,500	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	54
3-Placer County-2	Placer	North Tahoe Regional Multi-Use Trail - Segment 1	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		53
6-Tulare County-5	Tulare	East Porterville Crabtree Avenue Sidewalk Improvements Project	\$ 2,100	\$ 2,079	\$ 786	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,293	\$ -	\$ 221	\$ 565	\$ 1,293	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	53
7-California Department of Transportation-1	Los Angeles	State Route 110 (SR-110)/Figueroa Multi-Modal Mobility and Operational Improvements	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		53
5-Morro Bay, City of-1	San Luis Obispo	SR 1/SR 41 Interchange Operational Improvements	\$ 8,341	\$ 3,424	\$ 3,424	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91	\$ 3,333	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	52
5-San Luis Obispo County-3	San Luis Obispo	Front Street Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 1,730	\$ 1,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,400	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	52
12-Santa Ana, City of-4	Orange	Bishop Street Bicycle Boulevard Project	\$ 5,579	\$ 5,579	\$ 81	\$ 815	\$ 4,683	\$ -	\$ 81	\$ 815	\$ -	\$ 4,683	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		52
4-Millbrae, City of-1	San Mateo	Millbrae Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing Bridge Project	\$ 17,500	\$ 14,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			51
3-Paradise, Town of-2	Butte	Paradise ATP Gateway	\$ 11,922	\$ 9,133	\$ 630	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,503	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 630	\$ 8,503	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		51
4-Contra Costa County-5	Contra Costa	San Pablo Dam Road Pedestrian Crossings	\$ 1,984	\$ 1,984	\$ 180	\$ 130	\$ 1,674	\$ -	\$ 180	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 1,674	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	51
7-Manhattan Beach, City of-2	Los Angeles	High Traffic Beach Area Pedestrian Access Crosswalk Safety Improvements	\$ 4,311	\$ 4,311	\$ 250	\$ 550	\$ 3,511	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 450	\$ 100	\$ 3,511	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium		x	50
8-Yucaipa, City of-1	San Bernardino	Yucaipa Blvd. Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements (3rd St. to 4th St.)	\$ 944	\$ 944	\$ -	\$ 944	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 944	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		50
11-San Diego County-2	San Diego	Bridging the Safe Routes to School Gap in El Cajon	\$ 800	\$ 800	\$ 800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 800	Non-Infrastructure	x	x	50
11-San Diego, City of-4	San Diego	Active Transportation Engagement Program	\$ 317	\$ 317	\$ 317	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 317	Non-Infrastructure			50
12-Laguna Hills, City of-1	Orange	Safe Routes for Students-La Paz Road Southerly Sidewalk Widening	\$ 1,006	\$ 909	\$ 111	\$ 798	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111	\$ 798	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	50
11-San Diego, City of-5*	San Diego	Streamview Drive Improvements Phase 2	\$ 14,562	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		50
7-Los Angeles County-1	Los Angeles	San Jose Creek Regional Access	\$ 16,728	\$ 2,171	\$ 315	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,856	\$ 315	\$ 1,775	\$ 81	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		49
8-Moreno Valley, City of-2	Riverside	Heacock Street Improvements / Atwood Avenue to Myers Avenue	\$ 2,265	\$ 2,265	\$ 50	\$ 860	\$ -	\$ 1,355	\$ 50	\$ 200	\$ 660	\$ 1,355	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	49
10-Merced County-1	Merced	Planada Sidewalk Infill Project	\$ 734	\$ 734	\$ 55	\$ 76	\$ 603	\$ -	\$ 55	\$ 76	\$ -	\$ 603	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	49
11-San Diego County-1	San Diego	SR-67 Multi-Use Undercrossing	\$ 4,653	\$ 4,653	\$ 370	\$ 580	\$ 3,703	\$ -	\$ 370	\$ 330	\$ 250	\$ 3,703	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		49
3-El Dorado County-2	El Dorado	Diamond Springs Parkway Phase 1B	\$ 28,294	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		47
10-Ripon, City of-1	San Joaquin	Ripon Safe Routes to School Improvements	\$ 1,645	\$ 1,315	\$ 1,315	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,315	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	47

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&E	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
11-La Mesa, City of-1	San Diego	La Mesa Bike and Sidewalk Connections Project	\$ 4,488	\$ 4,418	\$ 555	\$ 3,863	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 375	\$ -	\$ 3,863	\$ 180	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x		47
11-Escondido, City of-1	San Diego	Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategy Plan, Escondido	\$ 250	\$ 250	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	Plan	x		45
12-Santa Ana, City of-16	Orange	Esquedra ES_Chavez High_Washington ES_Saddleback HS	\$ 8,017	\$ 8,017	\$ 121	\$ 911	\$ 6,985	\$ -	\$ 121	\$ 911	\$ -	\$ 6,985	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	45
10-Lodi, City of-1	San Joaquin	Garfield Street Safe Route to School Project	\$ 800	\$ 705	\$ 705	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 705	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	44
5-Greenfield, City of-1	Monterey	12th Street Pedestrian and Bike Route Improvements	\$ 694	\$ 694	\$ 694	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 694	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x	x	42
8-Big Bear Lake, City of-1	San Bernardino	Moonridge Road Complete Streets	\$ 6,993	\$ 2,280	\$ 2,280	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,280	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		39
4-Hercules, City of-1	Contra Costa	Willow/Palm Pedestrian Corridor Transit Center Connector	\$ 1,299	\$ 1,124	\$ 1,124	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,124	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			38
11-San Diego, City of-1	San Diego	Southeastern San Diego Safe Routes to School	\$ 22,957	\$ 18,147	\$ 18,147	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,147	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x	x	38
11-Santee, City of-1	San Diego	Santee Safe Routes to School pedestrian ramp project	\$ 1,868	\$ 1,868	\$ 160	\$ 1,708	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 1,708	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	38
1-Rio Dell, City of-1	Humboldt	Eel River Trail	\$ 1,962	\$ 1,962	\$ 322	\$ 1,640	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 97	\$ 217	\$ 8	\$ 1,640	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		36
3-Marysville, City of-1	Yuba	City of Marysville -14th Street Corridor ATP Improvements	\$ 549	\$ 499	\$ 40	\$ 459	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ 459	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		36
7-Diamond Bar, City of-1	Los Angeles	Diamond Bar Boulevard Complete Street Project	\$ 5,972	\$ 2,556	\$ 2,556	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,556	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		36
7-Hawaiian Gardens, City of-1	Los Angeles	Bike Master Plan Preparation and General Plan Circulation Element Amendment	\$ 200	\$ 180	\$ 180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 180	Plan	x		36
4-Danville, Town of-2	Contra Costa	Cameo Drive Pedestrian Safety Improvements	\$ 960	\$ 849	\$ 849	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 849	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	35
11-San Diego County-6	San Diego	Hillsdale Middle School SRTS Crosswalk with Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon	\$ 154	\$ 154	\$ 154	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 154	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	34
4-Solano County-1	Solano	Benicia Road Complete Street Project	\$ 4,200	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	33
8-Coachella, City of-1	Riverside	Coachella Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity Project	\$ 2,974	\$ 2,974	\$ 250	\$ 2,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 2,724	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		32
5-Monterey County-3	Monterey	San Lucas Community & School Connections Through Active Transportation	\$ 2,292	\$ 2,292	\$ 907	\$ 1,385	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 250	\$ 25	\$ 1,360	\$ 607	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	x	x	31
8-Riverside County-7	Riverside	Skyview Road Pedestrian Bridge	\$ 10,343	\$ 7,970	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,970	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,870	\$ 100	Infrastructure + NI - Large		x	31
5-San Luis Obispo County-4	San Luis Obispo	Burton Drive Pedestrian Path - Cambria, CA	\$ 749	\$ 629	\$ 157	\$ -	\$ 472	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 109	\$ 28	\$ 472	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			29
4-San Ramon, City of-1	Contra Costa	Iron Horse Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing Crow Canyon Road	\$ 18,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 200	\$ 1,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 1,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large			28
4-South San Francisco, City of-1	San Mateo	Hillside and Lincoln Traffic Improvement Project	\$ 2,177	\$ 1,762	\$ -	\$ 1,762	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,762	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x	x	27
8-Adelanto, City of-1	San Bernardino	Active Transportation Improvements at Adelanto Public Park	\$ 439	\$ 365	\$ 365	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 20	\$ -	\$ 342	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		27
8-Murrieta, City of-1	Riverside	Copper Canyon Park Bridge	\$ 664	\$ 664	\$ 20	\$ 644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 60	\$ -	\$ 584	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	26
12-Orange County-3	Orange	Santa Ana River Parkway Extension	\$ 21,171	\$ 21,171	\$ 21,171	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,171	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	x		26
6-Kern County - D6-1	Kern	Kern River Parkway Multi-Use Path Safety Improvement Project	\$ 1,999	\$ 1,939	\$ -	\$ 1,939	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,939	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		25
5-Monterey County-6	Monterey	Esquiline Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvement Project	\$ 3,318	\$ 405	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 57	\$ 298	\$ 50	\$ 57	\$ -	\$ 298	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium			24
7-Manhattan Beach, City of-3	Los Angeles	Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Peck Avenue Traffic Signal Improvement Project	\$ 800	\$ 800	\$ 170	\$ 630	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 630	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small		x	20
4-Pacifica, City of-1	San Mateo	Palmetto Ave - Esplanade Ave Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements Project	\$ 340	\$ 306	\$ 306	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 306	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			17
6-Fresno, City of-2	Fresno	Palm and Belmont Protected Bikeway Project	\$ 1,781	\$ 1,310	\$ 1,310	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,310	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	x		WITHDRAWN

**California Transportation Commission  
2021 Active Transportation Program  
All Applications by Score - Revised March 17, 2021  
(\$1000s)**

Application ID	County	Project Title	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	PA&ED	PS&E	ROW	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
3-El Dorado County-7	El Dorado	Fallen Leaf Road Recreational Access Project	\$ 2,473	\$ 420	\$ 250	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		INELIGIBLE
3-El Dorado County-8	El Dorado	South Tahoe Greenway - Upper Truckee Bridge at Johnson Meadow	\$ 3,700	\$ 850	\$ 400	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	x		INELIGIBLE
8-Riverside County-3	Riverside	Lakeview/Nuevo Active Transportation Plan	\$ 300	\$ 270	\$ 270	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270	Plan	x		INELIGIBLE
11-Coronado, City of-1	San Diego	Age-Friendly Mobility Plan, Coronado	\$ 150	\$ 135	\$ 135	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135	Plan			INELIGIBLE
12-Yorba Linda, City of-2	Orange	Yorba Linda Boulevard Bike Lanes and Pedestrian Path PS&E	\$ 735	\$ 587	\$ 587	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 587	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small			INELIGIBLE
			<b>\$ 3,426,451</b>	<b>\$ 2,258,298</b>													

\*Score adjusted due to the identification of a scoring error.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms
<b>CON:</b> Construction Phase
<b>DAC:</b> Disadvantaged Community
<b>NI:</b> Non-Infrastructure
<b>PA&amp;ED:</b> Environmental Phase
<b>PS&amp;E:</b> Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase
<b>ROW:</b> Right-of-Way Phase
<b>SRTS:</b> Safe Routes to School

# ***AGENDA ITEM 9***

<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	May 16, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	James Simpson, Management Analyst
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Future Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Locations

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to concur on the two concurrent meeting locations for future in-person TAC meetings.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Currently, the Commission’s TAC falls under the monthly resolution approved by the Commission pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 361, which allows public meetings to be held in a virtual setting. This is permissible under the state of emergency declared by the state of California as a result of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

For the March 2022 TAC meeting, in anticipation of the emergency declaration being lifted and/or the expiration of AB 361, staff initiated discussion and requested input from the TAC on how to proceed once in-person meetings are to return. In the same meeting, staff’s suggestion was for the TAC to continue meeting virtually until virtual meetings are no longer permissible.

Staff proposed two options to begin the conversation; the first option being to return to alternating locations between Riverside and the Coachella Valley, and the second option being to have two simultaneous meeting locations, one in Riverside and one in the Coachella Valley. In the second option, video conferencing would be utilized for TAC members to interact between the two meeting sites.

TAC members inquired about the possibility of adding a third meeting location, located in either the pass area (Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa) or in the southwest region. The City of Temecula offered to host a TAC meeting location in the southwest region. Based on the comments received, staff concluded that further research was warranted, and an item would be brought back at the May TAC meeting.

**DISCUSSION:**

To address the feedback received from the TAC at the March 2022 meeting, staff researched the logistics of having three or more concurrent TAC meeting locations. RCTC and CVAG were determined to be the two primary locations, as they were prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Other locations considered were Banning and Temecula. Distances from each TAC member

agency to each of the potential locations were recorded to determine which location is closest for each agency and how many potential miles traveled were saved or added.

Upon review, staff observed that RCTC is closest to 23 member agencies and CVAG is closest to 13 member agencies. When introducing Temecula or Banning as a third location, it is worth noting that the shortest travel distance did not change for any of the 13 agencies closest to CVAG. While offering a third TAC meeting location, in either southwest county or the pass area, would reduce the travel distance for some attendees, it does not improve the travel distance for those coming from the sub-region without a meeting site. Additionally, staff is concerned that adding a third concurrent meeting site would pose logistical challenges, particularly when having two concurrent meeting sites has never been executed for TAC meetings in the past. Staff encourages TAC members and meeting attendees to establish carpool arrangements with adjacent members and attendees to reduce unnecessary vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. Attachment 1 is a park and ride location map for Riverside County.

As such, once TAC meetings are required to be held in person again, staff proposes to offer two concurrent meeting site locations: RCTC's Lemon Street office and CVAG's office in Palm Desert.

Attachment: Riverside County Park and Ride Locations Map

# Riverside County Park & Ride Lots



- 1 CORONA**  
20 E Grand Blvd at SR 91/Main St  
• Stalls: 272  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 2 Living Truth Christian Fellowship**  
1114 West Ontario Ave  
• Stalls: 70  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 3 Canyon Community Church of the Nazarene**  
1504 Taber St  
• Stalls: 75  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 4 Tom's Farms, 23900 Temescal Canyon Rd**  
• Stalls: 48  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141  
• Restrictions: No Overnight or Weekend Parking
- 5 LAKE ELSINORE**  
Laker Elsinore Market, 15887 Grand Ave  
• Stalls: 79  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 6 18600 Dexter Ave at I-15/Central Ave**  
• Stalls: 50  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 7 Lake Elsinore Outlets (north end)**  
17600 Collier Ave at I-15/Nichols Rd  
• Stalls: 186  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 8 Shepherd of Life, 30400 Grand Ave**  
• Stalls: 50  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141  
• Restrictions: No Weekend Parking
- 9 JURUPA VALLEY**  
10180 Granite Hill Dr at SR 60/Country Village Rd  
• Stalls: 75  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 10 12105 Limonite Ave at I-15**  
• Stalls: 76  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 11 11060 E. Mission Blvd at SR 60**  
• Stalls: 22  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 12 MORENO VALLEY**  
Moreno Valley Mall, 22650 Centerpoint Dr.  
@ Centerpoint Dr. & Town Cir  
• Stalls: 74  
• Operator: Moreno Valley Mall  
• Contact: (951) 653-1177  
• Restrictions: No Parking Between Thanksgiving and Christmas Day
- 13 12255 Pigeon Pass Rd, next to Home Depot at SR 60**  
• Stalls: 200  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 14 MURRIETA**  
Mulligan Family Fun Center, 24950 Madison Ave  
• Stalls: 50  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141  
• Restrictions: No Weekend Parking
- 15 Promise Lutheran Church, 25664 Madison Ave**  
• Stalls: 46  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 16 NORCO**  
Hamner Ave at I-15/6th St  
• Stalls: 100  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 17 PERRIS**  
Perris Station Transit Center, C Street and San Jacinto Ave  
• Stalls: 24  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 18 South Perris Station, 1304 Case Rd**  
• Stalls: 74  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 19 RIVERSIDE**  
Galleria at Tyler, 10260 Magnolia Ave on southeast corner of Tyler and Magnolia, west of RTA bus stop  
• Stalls: 100  
• Operator: Mall  
• Contact: (951) 637-2002
- 20 2212 Orange St at SR 60/Main St**  
• Stalls: 142  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 21 Moreno Valley/March Field Station, 14160 Meridian Pkwy**  
• Stalls: 38  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 22 Hunter Park Station, 1101 Marlborough Ave**  
• Stalls: 45  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 23 La Sierra Metrolink Station, 10901 Indiana Ave**  
• Stalls: 172  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 24 TEMECULA**  
41327 Winchester Rd at I-15 (Next to Starbucks)  
• Stalls: 87  
• Operator: CalTrans  
• Contact: (909) 383-4631
- 25 Promenade Mall in Temecula, 40780 Winchester Rd @ Ring Rd & Promenade Way, top level of parking structure**  
• Stalls: 75  
• Operator: Promenade Mall  
• Contact: (951) 296-0975  
• Restrictions: Permit Required
- 26 United Methodist Church, 42690 Margarita Rd**  
• Stalls: 71  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 27 Orchard Christian Fellowship, 42101 Moraga Rd**  
• Stalls: 105  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 28 Rancho Community Church, 31300 Rancho Community Way**  
• Stalls: 100  
• Operator: City of Temecula  
• Contact: (951) 303-6789  
• Restrictions: No Overnight Parking
- 29 St. Thomas of Canterbury Episcopal Church 44651 Avenida de Misiones**  
• Stalls: 42  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 30 Temecula Parkway, 30100 Temecula Parkway**  
• Stalls: 157  
• Operator: City of Temecula  
• Contact: (951) 694-6411
- 31 Grace Presbyterian Church, 31143 Nicolas Rd**  
• Stalls: 64  
• Operator: RCTC  
• Contact: (951) 787-7141
- 32 THOUSAND PALMS**  
72376 Varner Road, next to I-10 between Ramon Rd and Monterey Ave  
• Stalls: 5 handicapped stalls, 79 standard stalls  
• Operator: SunLine Transit Agency  
• Contact: (760) 343-3456

# ***AGENDA ITEM 10***

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

<b>DATE:</b>	May 16, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jenny Chan, Planning and Programming Manager
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance Update

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive and file an update from Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Caltrans' Local Assistance Program oversees more than one billion dollars annually available to over 600 cities, counties, and regional agencies for the purpose of improving their transportation infrastructure or providing transportation services. This funding comes from various Federal and State programs specifically designated to assist the transportation needs of local agencies. Annually, over 1,200 new projects are authorized through the Local Assistance Program of which approximately 700 are construction projects.

Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance is responsible for obligating and allocating federal and state funds, providing guidance on federal and state regulations, and direction on processes and procedures that are tied to each funding program. Local Assistance is responsible for the current funding programs as identified in Table 1.

**Table 1: Caltrans Local Assistance Funding Program Responsibilities**

<b>Federal Programs</b>	<b>State Programs</b>
Active Transportation Program (ATP)	Active Transportation Program (ATP)
Emergency Relief (ER)	Local Partnership Program (LPP) <i>Off-system</i>
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) <i>Off-system</i>
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) <i>Off-system</i>
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) <i>Off-system</i>
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) <i>Off-system</i>	
Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)	