

2025 REGIONAL COMPETITIVE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (rATP) CYCLE 7

MTC Resolution No. 4633, Revised

For the Nine-County San Francisco Bay Area Region
Fiscal Year 2025-26 through FY 2028-29



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

February 26, 2025

<http://mtc.ca.gov/atp>

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Bay Area Metro Center • 375 Beale Street • San Francisco, CA 94105-2066
Tel. 415.778.6700 • TDD/TTY 415.778.6769 • e-mail: info@bayareametro.gov



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105
415.778.6700
www.mtc.ca.gov

Sue Noack, Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

April 22, 2025

*Stephanie Moulton-Peters,
Vice Chair*
Marin County and Cities

Margaret Abe-Koga
Santa Clara County

Eddie Abn
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Candace Andersen
Contra Costa County

Marilyn Eszy Ascraft
Cities of Alameda County

Pat Burt
Cities of Santa Clara County

David Canepa
San Mateo County

Dina El-Tarwany
California State
Transportation Agency

Victoria Fleming
Sonoma County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Alicia Jobn-Baptiste
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Rebecca Kaplan
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

Matt Mahan
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Amber Manfree
Napa County and Cities

Mitch Mashburn
Solano County and Cities

Myrna Melgar
City and County of San Francisco

Nate Miley
Alameda County

Gina Papan
Cities of San Mateo County

Belia Ramos
Association of Bay Area
Governments

Libby Schaaf
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Andrew B. Fremier
Executive Director

Alix Bockelman
Chief Deputy Executive Director

Tanisha Taylor, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Room 2221 – MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Anja Aulenbacher, Associate Deputy Director

Dear Executive Director Taylor:

With this letter, I am pleased to transmit MTC's adopted program of projects for the 2025 Regional Active Transportation Program (rATP), Cycle 7.

The 2025 ATP Fund Estimate, as revised, identified \$14.5 million of programming capacity to the region. Following the competitive Call for Projects, MTC staff received 35 applications requesting \$324 million. Based on scores provided by the CTC from the state evaluation process and a thorough evaluation of MTC's regional supplemental questions, MTC adopted the Cycle 7 rATP on February 26, 2025. The Bay Area regional program includes five projects, with 100% of the funds benefiting disadvantaged communities. MTC requests that the CTC approve MTC's rATP project list in June 2025.

As allowed by our Regional Guidelines adopted in March 2024, MTC also adopted a list of contingency projects in case there are any funding augmentations, project failures or savings. The Contingency List includes eight projects totaling \$135.5 million and is listed in priority order.

Please contact Karl Anderson at (415) 778-6645 if you need further information about our regional program. We look forward to working with you in finalizing the 2025 rATP and delivering the selected projects.

Sincerely,

Theresa Romell
Section Director, Funding Policy and Programs
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

TR:KA

cc: Dee Lam, Caltrans HQ Local Assistance

Attachments: MTC Cycle 7 Regional ATP Program

J:\PROJECT\Funding\ATP\Regional ATP\2025 rATP (Cycle 7)\Final 2025 rATP\01_2025 rATP7 Transmittal Letter.docx

2025 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RATP)

INTRODUCTION



METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
2025 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (rATP)
CYCLE 7

INTRODUCTION
FEBRUARY 26, 2025

Attached is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) proposal for the 2025 Regional Active Transportation Program (rATP). The State established the Active Transportation Program (ATP) in September 2013. Current law distributes ATP funding as follows:

- 50% to the state for a statewide competitive program ("Statewide Competitive ATP");
- 10% to the small urban and rural area competitive program to be managed by the state; and
- 40% to the large urbanized area competitive program, with funding distributed by population and managed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization ("Regional ATP").

MTC is responsible for developing the region's guidelines for the Regional ATP, and for submitting the projects to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for adoption. CTC approved MTC's Regional ATP Guidelines on March 27, 2024, and applications for the Regional Program were due to MTC by June 17, 2024. About \$14.5 million is available for programming under the 2025 (Cycle 7) Regional ATP.

MTC's 2025 rATP submittal includes the following sections:

- 2025 rATP Project Lists
- MTC Regional ATP Guidelines and Program Adoption– MTC Resolution No. 4633, Revised
- Project Programming Request (PPR) Forms for all selected projects

The projects are consistent with the Guidelines set forth in MTC Resolution No. 4633, Revised, the Statewide ATP Guidelines adopted by the CTC in March 2024, and MTC's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, *Plan Bay Area 2050*, which was developed pursuant to Government Code Section 65080.

Application Summary

MTC received 35 regional supplemental applications requesting a total of \$324 million through the Regional ATP Call for Projects. Caltrans and MTC staff confirmed that all submitted projects were eligible, and none were removed from consideration. The State did not fund any applications through the Statewide Competitive ATP. All but two of those projects were considered for the regional program. The two excluded applications did not submit the required regional supplemental forms and were deemed unresponsive. The applications MTC received for the Regional ATP Call for Projects are broken down by county in Table 1, below. The full list is included in Attachment 1 to this Introduction.

Table 1: Applications Received by County

| County | Number of Applications Submitted | % of Total | Amount of ATP Funding Requested (\$1,000s) | % of Total |
|---------------|---|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| Alameda | 6 | 17% | \$68,452 | 21% |
| Contra Costa | 6 | 17% | \$42,352 | 13% |
| Marin | 3 | 9% | \$11,353 | 3% |
| Napa | 3 | 9% | \$41,350 | 13% |
| San Francisco | 3 | 9% | \$44,791 | 14% |
| San Mateo | 3 | 9% | \$33,157 | 10% |
| Santa Clara | 4 | 11% | \$49,756 | 15% |
| Solano | 4 | 11% | \$20,505 | 6% |
| Sonoma | 3 | 9% | \$12,658 | 4% |
| Total | 35 | 100% | \$324,374 | 100% |

Project Selection

This cycle, MTC staff used the scores provided by the CTC from their evaluation process for the state application as the baseline score. Once MTC staff received the state scores staff audited the scores for accuracy and then scored the regional supplemental questions to develop a composite score and rank the applications. The MTC staff review team used the scores from Statewide Competitive ATP, plus an additional 10 maximum points for consistency with MTC’s complete streets policy, vision zero policy, environmental documentation, and regional priorities, such as consistency with MTC’s Safe Routes to School Program, Bay Trail and Regional Bike Network build-out, and multi-jurisdictional projects. The maximum total regional score possible is 110.

Statewide Competitive ATP Program Results

Concurrent with the Regional ATP process, the CTC released the staff recommendations for the Statewide Competitive ATP projects on November 1, 2024. At its December 5-6, 2024 meeting, CTC approved the statewide component of the 2025 ATP, and unfortunately, no projects in the Bay Area were included in the final program recommendations.

Regional ATP Project Selection

MTC considered projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition. However, as mentioned above, two applicants did not submit the MTC’s required regional supplemental application and were deemed unresponsive. These were the Pruneridge Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements project in the City of Santa Clara and the McCoy Creek Trail Phase 3 Improvements Project in Suisun City. Based on the evaluation team’s score of each application, MTC ranked all remaining applications from highest to lowest. MTC approved funding the highest-scoring projects, which are detailed in Table 2 on the next page. Further analysis of the adopted rATP is included in Table 3.

On February 26, 2025, MTC adopted the 2025 Regional ATP program of projects, which fully funds four projects and partially funds one project for a total of \$14.5 million.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
 2025 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

High-Scoring Projects Without Recommended Funds

The recommended programming does not include funding for the fourth- and fifth-highest scoring projects, Oakland’s 73rd Ave project and Napa County’s Vine Trail – Yountville to St. Helena segment. Both projects requested significantly more funds (\$30 million and \$25 million, respectively) than were available after funding higher-scoring projects (\$4 million). Awarding the remaining program funds would have left either project with a major gap in its funding plan. To account for this scenario, the regional ATP guidelines include a requirement for sponsors requesting more than \$10 million to submit scalability plans with their application. The City of Oakland included a segmenting strategy for the 73rd Ave project; however, the plan did not demonstrate that remaining ATP funds could fund a high-scoring deliverable segment without substantial local funding. Napa County’s Vine Trail application did not include a scalability plan in their application and would require tens of millions of dollars to deliver the full application benefits. Therefore, MTC recommended funding projects further down the list, specifically the Southwest Berkeley Bicycle Boulevards project and the City of Alameda’s Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements project.

Partial Funding

The City of Alameda requested \$6.6 million in ATP funds for the Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements project; however, only \$673,000 of ATP funds remain after funding higher-scoring projects. Therefore, MTC recommends partially funding the project with \$673,000 in ATP funds. Alameda also submitted the same project application for the same request amount as a part of MTC’s concurrent Regional Measure 3: Safe Routes to Transit and Bay Trail (SR2TBT) program call for projects. The Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements project scored highly in the SR2TBT evaluation process and MTC approved the project for funding under that program adopted on February 26, 2025. MTC staff expects the full project benefits to be delivered as the funding plan will be completed between the recommended funding in the Regional ATP and SR2TBT programs and local funds.

Caltrans Eligibility Determination

Caltrans examined scope eligibility and deliverability for all projects applying for ATP funds and flagged potential issues for further review. During this review, Caltrans found no significant eligibility or deliverability concerns for the adopted projects.

Table 2: MTC’s Adopted 2025 Regional ATP – February 26, 2025 (Alphabetical Order)

| County | Sponsor | Project | ATP Amount (\$1,000s) |
|---------------|---------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Alameda | Alameda | Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements Project* | \$673 |
| Alameda | Berkeley | Southwest Berkeley Bicycle Boulevards | \$3,430 |
| Contra Costa | Contra Costa County | Verde K-8 Safe Routes to School | \$4,360 |
| Marin | San Rafael | Downtown San Rafael North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project | \$4,355 |
| Solano | Solano County | Benicia Road Complete Streets Phase 2 | \$1,630 |
| Total | | | \$14,448 |

* Indicates project will receive partial funding

Table 3: MTC 2025 Regional ATP – Analysis of Adopted Program of Projects

| County | Number of Regional ATP Projects | % of Total | Amount of Regional ATP (\$1,000s) | % of Total |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Alameda | 2 | 40% | \$4,103 | 28.4% |
| Contra Costa | 1 | 20% | \$4,360 | 30.2% |
| Marin | 1 | 20% | \$4,355 | 30.1% |
| Solano | 1 | 20% | \$1,630 | 11.3% |
| Total | 5 | 100% | \$14,448 | 100% |

Broad Spectrum of Projects Benefiting Bicyclists and Pedestrians

The selected project list of five projects represents a broad spectrum of projects that benefit pedestrians and bicyclists. All projects in the regional recommendations will benefit MTC Equity Priority Communities, and all projects support MTC initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and expand MTC’s Active Transportation Network. The funding recommendations also include \$6.7 for projects promoting safe walking and bicycling to schools (Safe Routes to School type projects). Other project types include regional trail connections and completions (including the Downtown San Rafael North-South Greenway Gap Closure project in Marin County), complete streets improvements, and safety improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Contingency Project List

As approved in MTC’s Regional ATP Guidelines, MTC also adopted a list of contingency projects, ranked in priority order based on the project’s evaluation score and tiebreak priority. The proposed contingency list is larger than the previous ATP cycles to accommodate any potential funding restorations or augmentations in response to the 2024-2025 State Budget rescission. MTC would fund projects on the contingency list should there be any project failures, ineligibility determinations, savings in the Cycle 7 Regional ATP, or restoration of funds to the program. This will ensure that the Regional ATP will fully use all ATP funds and that no ATP funds are lost to the region. The contingency projects are listed under Table 4.

Table 4: MTC 2025 Regional ATP – Contingency List (Score Order)

| MTC Score | County | Sponsor | Project | Contingency Amount (\$1,000s) |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 96.0* | Alameda | City of Oakland | 73rd Avenue Active Routes to Transit | \$30,706 |
| 96.0* | Napa | Napa County | Napa Valley Vine Trail - Yountville through St. Helena Gap Closure | \$25,000 |
| 95.0 | Contra Costa | City of Concord | Monument Boulevard Trails-to-Transit | \$19,247 |
| 94.0* | Alameda | ACPWA | Oakland Moves with Purpose: Community at the Center | \$999 |
| 94.0* | San Francisco | SFCTA | YBI Multi-use Path Project | \$25,000 |

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
 2025 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

| MTC Score | County | Sponsor | Project | Contingency Amount (\$1,000s) |
|--------------|---------------|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 94.0* | Napa | City of Calistoga | Oak Street Pedestrian Bridge and Community Facilities Access Improvement | \$2,330 |
| 94.0* | Alameda | City of Oakland | Franklin Street Complete Streets | \$13,531 |
| 93.0 | San Francisco | SFMTA | Howard Streetscape Project | \$18,691 |
| Total | | | | \$135,504 |

**Projects with a tie-score are listed in programming priority order consistent with the State ATP Guidelines*

Consistency with ATP Fund Estimate

The ATP Fund Estimate (FE) prescribed funding amounts by type and year and also included a minimum amount of funds that must be programmed to projects that benefit disadvantaged communities. In the MTC region, the Regional ATP Guidelines specify that MTC’s Equity Priority Communities definition will be used to meet the disadvantaged community target. Table 5 details the programming amounts against the targets in the ATP FE. Note that 100% of regional ATP funding benefits Disadvantaged Communities, greatly exceeding the 25% target. While there is no regional target for Safe Routes to Schools projects, 46% of regional ATP funding benefits SRTS-type projects.

Table 5: Regional ATP Consistency with ATP Fund Estimate (\$1,000s)

| | Total | FE Target | Over (Under) Target |
|--|----------|-----------|---------------------|
| MTC Regional ATP Programming | \$14,448 | \$14,448 | \$- |
| Benefit to MTC Equity Priority Communities (Disadvantaged Communities) | \$14,448 | \$3,612 | \$10,836 |
| Safe Routes to Schools Projects | \$6,663 | N/A | N/A |

2025 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RATP)

GUIDELINES: POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

2025 REGIONAL ATP ADOPTION

MTC RESOLUTION No. 4633, REVISED



Date: March 27, 2024
W.I.: 1515
Referred by: PAC
Revised: 02/26/25-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4633, Revised

This resolution adopts the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Regional Program Cycle 7 Guidelines for the San Francisco Bay Area, for submission to the California Transportation Commission (CTC), consistent with the provisions of Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101.

This resolution includes the following attachments:

- Attachment A – Guidelines: Policies, Procedures, and Project Selection Criteria
- Attachment B – 2025 Regional ATP Program of Projects

This resolution was amended via Commission action on February 26, 2025 to update the funding targets identified in Attachment A, Appendix A-2, to reflect the revised 2025 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate adopted by the California Transportation Commission on August 15, 2024 and to update Attachment B, 2025 Regional ATP Program of Projects.

Further discussion of these actions is contained in the Summary Sheet to the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee dated March 13, 2024 and February 12, 2025.

Date: March 27, 2024
W.I.: 1515
Referred by: PAC

RE: Adoption of Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 7 Guidelines and Program of Projects

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4633

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 *et seq.*; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted and periodically revises, pursuant to Government Code Sections 66508 and 65080, a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region and is required to prepare and endorse a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which includes federal funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated recipient for federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) assigned to the MPO/Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) of the San Francisco Bay Area for the programming of projects (regional federal funds); and

WHEREAS, the California State Legislature passed and the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes 2013), establishing the Active Transportation Program (ATP); and

WHEREAS, MTC adopts, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381(a)(1), an Active Transportation Program of Projects using a competitive process consistent with guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2382(a), that is submitted to the CTC and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); and

WHEREAS, MTC has developed, in cooperation with CTC, Caltrans, operators of publicly owned mass transportation services, congestion management agencies, countywide

transportation planning agencies, and local governments, guidelines to be used in the development of the ATP; and

WHEREAS, MTC will use state evaluation scores for the statewide application portion, and will assemble a multi-disciplinary evaluation panel to evaluate the regional supplemental application portion, to recommend candidate ATP projects for MTC inclusion in the Active Transportation Program of Projects; and

WHEREAS, the ATP is subject to public review and comment; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the guidelines to be used in the evaluation of candidate projects for inclusion in the ATP, as set forth in Attachment A of this resolution, and be it further

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the Active Transportation Program of Projects, as set forth in Attachment B of this resolution, and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee can make technical adjustments and other non-substantial revisions; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director shall forward a copy of this resolution, and such other information as may be required to the CTC, Caltrans, and to such other agencies as may be appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



Alfredo Pedroza, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a duly called and noticed meeting held in San Francisco, California and at other remote locations, on March 27, 2024.

Date: March 27, 2024
W.I.: 1515
Referred by: PAC
Revised: 2/26/2025-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4633
Page 1 of 14

2025 Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP)

Cycle 7

Guidelines

March 27, 2024

**MTC Resolution No. 4633
Attachment A**

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Funding Policy and Programs Section**
<http://mtc.ca.gov/funding>

2025 Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 7 Guidelines Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2025 Regional Active Transportation Program Cycle 7 Guidelines | 3 |
| Background..... | 3 |
| Development Principles..... | 3 |
| CTC Guidelines | 4 |
| ATP Development Schedule..... | 4 |
| ATP Regional Shares | 4 |
| Public Involvement Process | 4 |
| ATP Projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) | 4 |
| Deviations from Statewide Policies | 4 |
| 1. Application Process and Additional Regional Screening/Evaluation Criteria | 4 |
| 2. Definition, Evaluation, and Funding Minimum for Disadvantaged Communities <i>Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs)</i> | 5 6 |
| <i>Vision Zero Policy or Bike and Pedestrian Safety Policy or Plan</i> | 6 |
| 3. Match Requirement..... | 7 |
| 4. Large Funding Requests..... | 7 |
| 5. Contingency Project List | 7 |
| Application Process..... | 7 |
| Project Application..... | 7 |
| Additional Project Screening Criteria, Including Readiness..... | 8 |
| Additional Project Evaluation Criteria | 9 |
| Additional Regional Policies | 10 |
| Title VI Compliance..... | 10 |
| MTC Resolution No. 3606 Compliance – Regional Project Delivery Policy..... | 10 |
| MTC Resolution No. 4493 Compliance – Complete Streets Checklist | 10 |
| 2025 Regional Active Transportation Program (rATP) Cycle 7..... | 12 |
| Appendix A-1: ATP Development Schedule (Subject to Change)..... | 12 |
| Appendix A-3: Regional ATP Project Application..... | 14 |

2025 Regional Active Transportation Program Cycle 7 Guidelines

Background

In September 2013, the Governor signed Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 254, Statutes 2013) into law, creating the Active Transportation Program (ATP). The State envisions the ATP to consolidate several other funding sources intended to promote active transportation, such as the Bicycle Transportation Account and Transportation Alternatives Program, into a single program.

State and federal law segregate ATP funds into three main components, distributed as follows:

- 50% to the state for a statewide competitive program
- 10% to the small urban and rural area competitive program to be managed by the state
- 40% to the large urbanized area competitive program, with funding distributed by population and managed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – hereinafter referred to as the “Regional Active Transportation Program”

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) developed guidelines for the Cycle 7 ATP which were adopted on March 21, 2024. The CTC Guidelines lay out the programming policies, procedures, and project selection criteria for the statewide competitive program, as well as for the small urban/rural and large MPO regional competitive programs. Large MPOs, such as MTC, have the option of developing regional policies, procedures, and project selection criteria that differ from those adopted by CTC, provided CTC approves the regional guidelines.

This document serves as MTC’s Cycle 7 Regional ATP Guidelines that substantially follow those of the CTC, but include some differences based on the region’s existing policies and priorities.

Development Principles

The following principles will frame the development of MTC’s Regional ATP.

- MTC will work with CTC staff, Caltrans, Bay Area County Transportation Agencies (CTAs), transit operators, regional Active Transportation Working Group, and interested partners to develop the Regional Active Transportation Program.
- ATP investments must advance the objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).
- MTC will exceed the State’s 25% minimum programming requirement to projects benefiting disadvantaged communities.
- MTC will continue to work with Caltrans, CTAs, transit operators, and project sponsors to seek efficiencies and streamlining for delivering projects in the federal-aid process.
- MTC will continue to advocate that all project savings and un-programmed balances remain in the regional programs, consistent with federal guidance on the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Transportation Alternatives set-aside.
- MTC will not penalize project applicants for previous project delivery issues outside of the sponsor’s control.

CTC Guidelines

The CTC Statewide ATP Guidelines were adopted on March 21, 2024, and are available at <https://catc.ca.gov/programs/active-transportation-program>. The approved CTC Guidelines for the Active Transportation Program, as posted on the CTC website, are incorporated in MTC's Regional ATP Guidelines via this reference. All project sponsors are required to follow both the MTC and CTC ATP Guidelines in the development and implementation of the Regional ATP.

ATP Development Schedule

The development of the ATP will follow the schedule outlined in Appendix A-1 of this guidance, which is subject to change.

ATP Regional Shares

Appendix A-2 of this guidance provides the MTC regional shares for Cycle 7 of ATP funding (FY 2025-26 through FY 2028-29), consistent with the ATP Fund Estimate scheduled for adoption by the CTC. Appendix A-2 also includes the State's 25% minimum programming requirement to projects benefiting disadvantaged communities.

Public Involvement Process

In developing the ATP, MTC is committed to a broad, inclusive public involvement process consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan, available at <http://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/public-participation/public-participation-plan>.

ATP Projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Consistent with state and federal requirements, ATP funded projects must be programmed in the TIP before seeking a CTC allocation. Selected projects must complete and submit a Fund Management System (FMS) application by June 1, 2025, to be included in the TIP. In addition, MTC requires that a federal Request for Authorization (RFA) be submitted simultaneously with the ATP allocation request to Caltrans and CTC when the ATP project includes federal funds. Unless a state-only funding exception is granted, ATP funds will contain federal funds. Therefore, projects must receive a CTC allocation and a federal authorization to proceed before the expenditure of eligible costs or contract advertisement.

Deviations from Statewide Policies

Below are MTC-region specific policies as they apply to the Regional Active Transportation Program. These policies differ from CTC's Guidelines.

1. Application Process and Additional Regional Screening/Evaluation Criteria

MTC elects to hold a separate call for projects for the Regional Active Transportation Program and has additional evaluation and screening criteria. Further information on these changes, as well as instructions for the application process, are detailed later in this guidance.

Project sponsors may apply to the State ATP program alone or to the State and Regional ATP programs concurrently. Sponsors applying to the State ATP program, the Regional ATP program, or both must submit a copy of their state application to MTC. To be considered for the regional program, including consideration if unsuccessful in the statewide program, applicants must meet all regional requirements and submit a regional application by the application deadline.

2. Definition, Evaluation, and Funding Minimum for Disadvantaged Communities

Definition

The MTC region has already adopted a measure to define Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) known as “Equity Priority Communities”. MTC updated the Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) definition in 2020 as a part of *Plan Bay Area 2050* Equity Framework. To meet the State’s 25% DAC minimum requirement in the Regional ATP, MTC elects to use MTC’s EPC definition.

MTC’s Equity Priority Communities are defined as those census tracts that have a concentration of both people of color and low-income households, or that have a concentration of 3 or more of the remaining 6 factors below (#3 to #8), but only if they also have a concentration of low-income households. The concentration thresholds for these factors are described below.

| Disadvantage Factor | % of Regional Population | Concentration Threshold |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Minority Population | 58% | 70% |
| 2. Low Income (<200% of Poverty) Population | 21% | 28% |
| 3. Limited English Proficiency Population | 8% | 12% |
| 4. Zero-Vehicle Households | 9% | 15% |
| 5. Seniors 75 Years and Over | 6% | 8% |
| 6. People with Disability | 10% | 12% |
| 7. Single-Parent Families | 13% | 18% |
| 8. Severely Rent-Burdened Households | 10% | 14% |

Based on this definition, 21% of the region’s population is located in Equity Priority Communities. MTC’s Equity Priority Communities definition of Disadvantaged Communities meets the State’s legislative intent and has already been in use in the MTC region for planning and programming purposes.

Additional discussion of the Equity Priority Communities definition and methodology are included in the *Plan Bay Area 2050* Equity Analysis Report, available online at <https://bayareametro.github.io/Spatial-Analysis-Mapping-Projects/Project-Documentation/Equity-Priority-Communities/>. The last link also includes a static map of the EPC locations. An interactive online map is available at <https://opendata.mtc.ca.gov/datasets/equity-priority-communities-plan-bay-area-2050>.

Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs)

The Community-Based Transportation Planning Program is a collaborative planning process that involves residents in low-income Bay Area communities, community- and faith-based organizations that serve them, transit operators, CTAs, and MTC. Each plan includes locally identified transportation needs, as well as solutions to address them. Each plan reflects the objectives of the program, which are to:

- emphasize community participation in prioritizing transportation needs and identifying potential solutions;
- foster collaboration between local residents, community-based organizations, transit operators, CTAs, and MTC; and
- build community capacity by involving community-based organizations in the planning process.

Project findings are forwarded to applicable local or county-level policy boards, as well as to MTC, for consideration in planning, funding, and implementation discussions.

Vision Zero Policy or Bike and Pedestrian Safety Policy or Plan

Vision Zero is a traffic safety policy that takes an ethical approach toward achieving safety for all road users, setting the goal of zero traffic fatalities or severe injuries. Vision Zero policies maintain that traffic deaths and severe injuries are preventable and focus attention on the shortcomings of the transportation system itself, including the built environment, policies, and technologies that influence behavior. Vision Zero sets the highest level of responsibility on the system designers – transportation planners and engineers, policymakers, police, etc. Each Vision Zero policy contains five core resolutions:

- Traffic deaths and severe injuries are acknowledged to be preventable.
- Human life and health are prioritized within all aspects of transportation systems.
- Acknowledgment that human error is inevitable and transportation systems should be forgiving.
- Safety work should focus on systems-level changes above influencing individual behavior.
- Speed is recognized and prioritized as the fundamental factor in crash severity.

Alternatively, jurisdictions may adopt policies or a plan addressing bicycle and pedestrian safety, in the spirit of Vision Zero.

MTC elects to change the statewide application's scoring point value for Disadvantaged Communities, assigning the value to 60% of the statewide scoring value. Twenty percent of the statewide scoring value will be awarded for projects within a jurisdiction (city or county) with a Vision Zero or Bike and Pedestrian Safety Policy or Plan, and the remaining twenty percent to projects identified in an approved Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). The applicant will provide proof of Vision Zero safety policy or plan adopted by resolution and CBTP consistency in the supplemental regional application.

3. Match Requirement

The CTC Guidelines do not require a match for Statewide ATP project nominations. The CTC Guidelines allow MPOs to define different match requirements for the Regional ATP.

Differing from CTC Guidelines, MTC elects to impose a local match requirement for the regional ATP of 11.47%, with match waivers for projects benefiting Disadvantaged Communities, stand-alone non-infrastructure projects, and safe routes to schools projects. As an added provision, a project sponsor may request the local match requirement be waived for the construction phase of an infrastructure project if the pre-construction phases are entirely funded using non-federal and non-ATP funds. This provision minimizes the number of federalized phases requiring an E-76 through Caltrans Local Assistance.

4. Large Funding Requests

MTC intends to fund a variety of projects across the region. If an ATP application request is larger than \$10 million, the applicant must provide evidence that the project can be scaled or segmented and can deliver commensurate benefits. A smaller segment of the project may be selected for funding if there is not enough funding available for the full request. The applicant will provide an explanation of scalability in the supplemental regional application. MTC will not consider an application requesting more than \$10 million without a scalability strategy.

5. Contingency Project List

MTC will adopt a list of projects for programming the Regional ATP that is financially constrained against the amount of ATP funding available (as identified in the approved ATP Fund Estimate). In addition, MTC will include a list of contingency projects, ranked in priority order based on the project's evaluation score. MTC intends to fund projects on the contingency list should there be any project failures or savings in the Cycle 7 Regional ATP. This list will ensure that MTC will fully program all regional ATP funds and that no ATP funds are lost to the region. The contingency list is valid until the adoption of the next ATP Cycle.

Application Process

Project Application

Upon CTC's concurrence of MTC's Regional ATP Guidelines, MTC will issue a call for projects for the Regional Active Transportation Program. Project sponsors must complete an application for each project proposed for funding in the ATP, consisting of the items included in Appendix A-3 of this guidance. Project sponsors must submit an electronic Project Programming Request (ePPR) form provided by Caltrans for all projects. The ePPR must be submitted electronically in CalSMART. All application materials, in the form of 1 electronic copy must be received by MTC no later than June 17, 2024, to be considered.

Additional Project Screening Criteria, Including Deliverability

In addition to the CTC Guidelines, all projects included in the ATP must meet the following screening criteria.

- A. Prohibition of Multiple Phases in the Same Year.** Project sponsors must provide sufficient time between the scheduled allocation of environmental funds and the start of design, right of way or construction. Therefore, projects may not have more than one phase programmed per fiscal year, except for the design and right of way phases, which may be programmed in the same fiscal year. Exceptions may be made on a case-by-case basis.
- B. Deliverability.** Project sponsors must demonstrate they can meet the delivery timeframe of the Active Transportation Program. Projects that can be delivered (receive a CTC allocation and federal authorization to proceed for federal funds) earlier shall receive priority for funding over other projects. As specified in MTC's Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, Revised), sponsors must receive the CTC allocation and receive the federal authorization to proceed (E-76 / federal obligation) for federally funded projects by January 31 of the programmed fiscal year. There are no extensions to these regional delivery deadlines.
- C. One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 3 Requirements.**
- a. Consistency with OBAG 3 Housing Element Requirement. Jurisdictions (cities and counties) must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) by the extended deadline of December 31, 2024. Jurisdictions without a certified general plan housing element will be ineligible for future regional ATP cycles until they comply. Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year.
 - b. Consistency with OBAG 3 Local Road Safety Plan Policy. To reinforce the region's focus on safety, cities and counties will be required to adopt a Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) or equivalent safety plan and supply documentation that the jurisdiction(s) in which the projects is located meets the OBAG 3 Local Road Safety Plan Policy by December 31, 2023. Jurisdictions without an adopted LSRP or equivalent safety plan will be ineligible for future regional ATP cycles until they comply.. Jurisdictions OBAG 3 funds may be used to complete an LRSP or equivalent safety plan.
- D. Transit Agency Coordination.** Applicants must demonstrate coordination with affected transit agencies in the supplemental regional application. Evidence of coordination should be in the form of a support letter or other discussion showing coordination with affected transit operators. Projects that do not impact transit operations should indicate "no impact." Otherwise, an application may be disqualified based on a lack of coordination with affected transit operators.

Additional Project Evaluation Criteria

MTC will use the application scores as provided by the CTC, with additional points and criteria for the Regional Active Transportation Program. The additional criteria and point values are:

- **Consistency with Regional Priorities and Planning Efforts. (0 to 7 points)**
Applicants shall describe the project's consistency with previously-approved regional priorities, and how the project supports *Plan Bay Area 2050*. MTC staff will award points for the degree of the proposed project's consistency with regional priorities, such as:
 - Consistency with *Plan Bay Area 2050* Health and Safety goals & Transportation strategies.
 - Consistency with MTC's Spare the Air Youth & Safe Routes to School Program, making it safer and easier for students and teachers to walk or bike to school.
 - Bay Trail build-out and gap closures
 - Regional active transportation network build-out
 - Gap closures in the regional active transportation network
 - Multi-jurisdictional projects
 - Applications only requesting construction phase funds
 - Demonstration of meeting regional project delivery requirements
 - Prior ATP cycle programming
- **Completion of Approved Environmental Document. (0 or 3 points)**
While the Active Transportation Program may fund pre-construction phases of projects, including the environmental document phase, the region prefers projects which are environmentally cleared in order to promote certainty in project delivery and project scope. Applicants that provide evidence of an approved environmental document consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) will receive additional points. If requesting state-only funding, only CEQA documentation is required. Evidence may be provided by the following methods:
 - Copy of the approved environmental document cover and executive summary;
 - Link to the approved environmental document available online;
 - Full soft copy of the environmental document provided on the electronic copy of the application;
 - Documentation from Caltrans regarding environmental approval; and/or
 - Other Council/Board action, such as resolutions and/or Planning Department approval of the environmental document.

This provision does not apply to planning activities or stand-alone non-infrastructure projects, which receive the full points to this criterion regardless of environmental status at the time of application. These projects must still follow any applicable CEQA and NEPA requirements to receive ATP funding.
- **Countywide Plans/Goals Consistency Determination. (0 or -2 point)**
Following the application due date, MTC will share the received applications with the CTAs. The CTAs will review the applications for consistency with adopted countywide transportation plans, active transportation plans, and/or other countywide goals, as

applicable. The CTAs will provide MTC a list of projects determined to be inconsistent with countywide plans and/or goals no later than August 1, 2024. Inconsistent projects will receive a 2 point penalty; consistent projects will be held harmless.

- **Deliverability Determination. (0 or -5 points)**

MTC staff will review each application's project delivery schedule for the ability to meet regional deadlines as described in MTC Resolution No. 3606, Revised. Projects that are deemed unable to allocate ATP funds within the four programming years of Cycle 7 (FY 2025-26 through FY 2028-29) shall receive a 5-point penalty. Projects that are deemed able to be allocated within the four programming years of Cycle 7 will be held harmless.

Additional Regional Policies

Title VI Compliance

Investments made in the ATP must be consistent with federal Title VI requirements. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, disability, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.

MTC Resolution No. 3606 Compliance – Regional Project Delivery Policy

The CTC ATP Guidelines establish timely use of funds and project delivery requirements for ATP projects. Missing critical milestones could result in deletion of the project from the ATP, and a permanent loss of funds to the region. Therefore, these timely use of funds deadlines must be considered in programming the various project phases in the ATP. While the CTC Guidelines provide some flexibility with respect to these deadlines by allowing for deadline extensions under certain circumstances, the CTC is very clear that deadline extensions will be the exception rather than the rule. MTC Resolution No. 3606 details the Regional Project Delivery Policy for regional discretionary funding, which may be more restrictive than the State's delivery policy. All projects in the regional ATP are subject to the Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606), including the adoption of a Resolution of Local Support for selected projects by April 1, 2025. For additional information, refer to <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/project-delivery>.

MTC Resolution No. 4493 Compliance – Complete Streets Checklist

MTC's Resolution No. 4493 sets forth MTC's regional policy for provision of Complete Streets, which are transportation facilities that provide safe mobility and improved connectivity to community destinations for all road users, and especially for people biking, walking, rolling and taking transit. The Complete Streets resolution also requires project sponsors to complete a checklist that considers the needs of bicycles and pedestrians for applicable projects. The Complete Streets Checklist is available through MTC's website online at <https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets>.

Furthermore, it is encouraged that all bicycle projects programmed in the ATP support MTC's Regional Active Transportation Plan and county-wide bicycle plans. Guidance on considering bicycle transportation can be found in MTC's 2022 Regional Active Transportation Plan and Caltrans Deputy Directive 64. MTC's Regional Active Transportation Plan, containing federal, state, and regional

policies for accommodating bicycles and non-motorized travel, is available on MTC's Web site at:
<https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/investment-strategies-commitments/climate-protection/regional-active-transportation-plan>.

| METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC) 2025 Regional Active Transportation Program (rATP) Cycle 7 Appendix A-1: ATP Development Schedule (Subject to Change) February 26, 2025 | |
|---|--|
| January 2024 | CTC released draft ATP Guidelines |
| Early 2024 | Regional ATP updates presented to MTC Working Groups |
| March 13, 2024 | MTC PAC review of Regional ATP Guidelines MTC submits recommended Regional ATP Guidelines to CTC for consideration |
| March 21, 2024 | CTC adoption of State ATP Guidelines CTC adoption of MTC's Regional ATP Guidelines |
| March 21, 2024 | CTC released ATP Call for Projects for Statewide Competitive Program |
| March 27, 2024 | MTC Commission adoption of Regional ATP Guidelines MTC released ATP Call for Projects for Regional Program |
| June 17, 2024 | State Quick-build Pilot Program Applications Due to CTC (Statewide Program) |
| June 17, 2024 | State ATP Applications Due to CTC (Statewide Program) Regional ATP Applications Due to MTC (Regional Program) |
| November 1, 2024 | CTC releases staff recommendations for ATP Statewide Competitive and Quick-build Pilot Programs |
| December 5, 2024 | ATP Statewide Quick-build Pilot Program Adoption: CTC scheduled to adopt the statewide quick-build pilot program |
| December 5, 2024 | ATP Statewide Program Adoption: CTC scheduled to adopt the statewide program and transmit unsuccessful projects to the Regions for consideration |
| February 5, 2025 | MTC releases staff recommendation for ATP Regional Program |
| Early 2025 | Working Group discussions of staff recommendations |
| February 12, 2025 | MTC Programming and Allocation Committee (PAC) scheduled review and recommendation of final ATP Regional Program |
| February 26, 2025 | ATP Regional Program Adoption: MTC Commission scheduled approval of ATP regional program and transmittal to CTC for consideration |
| April 1, 2025 | TIP Amendment Deadline: Successful ATP project sponsors to submit 2025 TIP Amendment, including Resolution of Local Support |
| March 19, 2025 | CTC Approval of ATP Regional Program |
| January 31, 2026 | Allocation Deadline for Regional ATP projects programmed in FY 2025-26 |
| January 31, 2027 | Allocation Deadline for Regional ATP projects programmed in FY 2026-27 |
| January 31, 2028 | Allocation Deadline for Regional ATP projects programmed in FY 2027-28 |
| January 31, 2029 | Allocation Deadline for Regional ATP projects programmed in FY 2028-29 |

Shaded Area – Actions by State, CTC, or Caltrans

Appendix A-2: MTC ATP Share Targets

Cycle 7 Program - FY 2025-26 through FY 2028-29

ATP Regional Share

| Fund Source | FY 2025-26 | FY 2026-27 | FY 2027-28 | FY 2028-29 | Total |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Federal (TAP, Recreational Trails, Other) | \$1,806 | \$1,806 | \$1,855 | \$2,920 | \$8,387 |
| State | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,758 | \$4,303 | \$6,061 |
| Total ATP Regional Share | \$1,806 | \$1,806 | \$3,613 | \$7,223 | \$14,448 |

State's 25% Disadvantaged Communities Minimum Requirement

| Classification | FY 2025-26 | FY 2026-27 | FY 2027-28 | FY 2028-29 | Total |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 25% - Benefiting Disadvantaged Communities | \$452 | \$452 | \$903 | \$1,806 | \$3,612 |
| 75% - Anywhere in the Region | \$1,355 | \$1,355 | \$2,710 | \$5,417 | \$10,836 |
| Total ATP Regional Share | \$1,806 | \$1,806 | \$3,613 | \$7,223 | \$14,448 |

Appendix A-3: Regional ATP Project Application

Project sponsors must submit a completed project application for each project proposed for funding in the Regional Active Transportation Program. The application consists of the following parts and are available on the Internet (as applicable) at: <http://mtc.ca.gov/atp>

1. Cover letter on Agency letterhead signed by the applicant's Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant's governing board.
 - a. If the proposed project is implemented by an agency other than the project sponsor, documentation of the agreement between the two entities must be included.
 - b. If proposing matching funds, the letter should include confirmation that these matching funds are available for the proposed project.
2. Project application forms
 - a. Statewide ATP Application Form, available at <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/active-transportation-program/cycle7>.
 - b. Regional ATP Supplemental Application Form, available at <http://mtc.ca.gov/atp>, including back-up documentation, as applicable, such as:
 - i. Equity Priority Community benefit evidence
 - ii. Scalability plan for applications requesting more than \$10 million.
 - iii. Environmental Documentation certification evidence for infrastructure projects
 - iv. Evidence of project on the Regional Active Transportation Network
 - v. OBAG 3 Complete Streets Policy, Housing Element compliance, and Local Road Safety Plan compliance
 - vi. Vision Zero Policy or Bike and Pedestrian Safety Policy or Plan evidence
 - vii. Community-Based Transportation Plan evidence
 - viii. Transit Agency Coordination evidence
3. Electronic Project Programming Request (ePPR) form
 - a. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/financial-programming/office-of-capital-improvement-programming-ocip>
4. Complete Streets Checklist
 - a. Available at: <https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets>
 - b. Not necessary for Planning or Non-Infrastructure projects.

Note: Selected projects are also required to provide a Resolution of Local Support for the project no later than April 1, 2025.

**Attachment B
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
2025 Active Transportation Program (ATP)
Cycle 7
FY 2025-26 through FY 2028-29
Regional ATP Cycle 7 Program of Projects**

MTC Resolution No. 4633
Attachment B
Adopted: 03/27/24-C
Revised: 02/26/25-C

Regional ATP Cycle 7 Projects (in order by county)

| County | Implementing Agency | Project | Regional ATP |
|---------------|---------------------|--|-----------------|
| Alameda | City of Alameda | Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements | \$ 673 |
| Alameda | City of Berkeley | Southwest Berkeley Bicycle Boulevards | \$ 3,430 |
| Contra Costa | Contra Costa County | Verde K-8 Safe Routes to School | \$ 4,360 |
| Marin | San Rafael | Downtown San Rafael North-South Greenway Gap Closure | \$ 4,355 |
| Solano | Solano County | Benicia Road Complete Streets Phase 2 | \$ 1,630 |
| TOTAL: | | | \$14,448 |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\02-Feb PAC 2025\[tmp-RES-4633_Attachment-B.xlsx]rATP - 2025-01

Regional ATP Cycle 7 Contingency List (in descending score order)

| County | Implementing Agency | Project | Regional ATP |
|---------------|---------------------|---|------------------|
| Alameda | City of Oakland | 73rd Avenue Active Routes to Transit | \$ 30,706 |
| Napa | Napa County | Napa Valley Vine Trail - Yountville to St. Helena | \$ 25,000 |
| Contra Costa | City of Concord | Monument Boulevard Trails-to-Transit | \$ 19,247 |
| Alameda | ACPWA | Oakland Moves with Purpose: Community at the Center | \$ 999 |
| San Francisco | SFCTA | YBI Multi-use Path Project | \$ 25,000 |
| Napa | City of Calistoga | Oak St. Pedestrian Bridge and Community Facilities Access Imps. | \$ 2,330 |
| Alameda | City of Oakland | Franklin Street Complete Streets | \$ 13,531 |
| San Francisco | SFMTA | Howard Streetscape Project | \$ 18,691 |
| TOTAL: | | | \$135,504 |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\02-Feb PAC 2025\[tmp-RES-4633_Attachment-B.xlsx]rATP - 2025-01

2025 REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RATP)

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST (PPR) FORMS

| Agency | Project Title |
|------------------------|---|
| City of Alameda | Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements Project |
| City of Berkeley | Southwest Berkeley Bicycle Boulevards |
| Contra Costa County | Verde K-8 Safe Routes to School |
| City of San Rafael | Downtown San Rafael North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project |
| Solano County | Benicia Road Complete Streets Project Phase 2 |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

General Instructions

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-------|--|---------------------------------|--|----|----|
| Amendment (Existing Project) No | | | | | Date: | 4/8/25 | | | | |
| District | | EA | | Project ID | | PPNO | | MPO ID | | |
| 04 | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | | Route/Corridor | | PM Bk | | PM Ahd | | Nominating Agency | | |
| ALA | | | | | | | | Metropolitan Transportation Commission | | |
| | | | | | | | | MPO | | |
| | | | | | | | | MTC | | |
| | | | | | | | | Element | | |
| | | | | | | | | Capital Outlay | | |
| Project Manager/Contact | | | | Phone | | E-mail Address | | | | |
| Susie Hufstader | | | | 510-747-6873 | | shufstader@alamedaca.gov | | | | |
| Project Title | | | | | | | | | | |
| Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements Project | | | | | | | | | | |
| Location (Project Limits), Description (Scope of Work) | | | | | | | | | | |
| In City of Alameda, along Willie Stargell Avenue which is located in the northwestern part of the main island of Alameda; the project extends from Main Street (in the west) to Mariner Square Loop (in the east). | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scope of Work: Design and construct bike path and sidewalk with lighting, trees and bioretention; install ped crossing improvements at three intersections; and install a connecting Class IV bikeway. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Component | | | | | | | | | | |
| Implementing Agency | | | | | | | | | | |
| PA&ED | | Alameda, City of | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | Alameda, City of | | | | | | | | |
| Right of Way | | Alameda, City of | | | | | | | | |
| Construction | | Alameda, City of | | | | | | | | |
| Legislative Districts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assembly: | | 18 | | Senate: | | 9 | | Congressional: | | 12 |
| Project Benefits | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project closes critical active transportation gaps along and across Stargell Ave. It will add a 0.5 miles of Class I bike path and sidewalks on the north side of the street, which is now vacant land, directly adjacent to two affordable housing communities; add crossing safety improvements and traffic calming elements; and add 0.2 miles of Class IV bikeway (westbound). | | | | | | | | | | |
| Purpose and Need | | | | | | | | | | |
| The Stargell corridor is an “incomplete street,” that lacks safe, low-stress facilities for bicycling and walking, in a disadvantaged community. The busy, two-lane roadway carries about 8,800 vehicles a day, most of which are traveling at least 15 miles over the posted 25 mph speed limit, and yet only has sharrows on 14’ wide travel lanes, creating scary biking conditions that deter many users. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | | | Outputs | | | | Unit | Total | | |
| Active Transportation | | | Bicycle lane-miles | | | | LF | 3325 | | |
| Active Transportation | | | # Signs, lights, greenway, safety/beautification | | | | EA | 94 | | |
| Active Transportation | | | Crosswalk | | | | EA | 16 | | |
| Active Transportation | | | Sidewalk miles | | | | LF | 2450 | | |
| NHS Improvements | | Y/N | N | Roadway Class | | NA | Reversible Lane analysis | | No | |
| Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals | | | | Yes | | Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | Yes | | |
| Project Milestone | | | | | | | Existing | Proposed | | |
| Project Study Report Approved | | | | | | | 06/30/22 | | | |
| Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase | | | | | | | | 07/01/25 | | |
| Circulate Draft Environmental Document | | | | Document Type | | CE | | 01/08/26 | | |
| Draft Project Report | | | | | | | | 03/25/26 | | |
| End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone) | | | | | | | | 04/01/26 | | |
| Begin Design (PS&E) Phase | | | | | | | | 07/31/26 | | |
| End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone) | | | | | | | | 06/30/27 | | |
| Begin Right of Way Phase | | | | | | | | 02/01/27 | | |
| End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone) | | | | | | | | 06/01/27 | | |
| Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone) | | | | | | | | 10/18/27 | | |
| End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone) | | | | | | | | 10/16/28 | | |
| Begin Closeout Phase | | | | | | | | 10/30/28 | | |
| End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report) | | | | | | | | 04/30/29 | | |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

Date: 4/8/25

Additional Information

Additional Outputs:

ADA Improvements - New Curb Ramps - 12

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

Date: 4/8/25

| District | County | Route | EA | Project ID | PPNO | |
|--|--------|-------|----|------------|------|--|
| 04 | ALA | | | | | |
| Project Title: Willie Stargell Avenue Safety Improvements Project | | | | | | |

| Existing Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Implementing Agency | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------------------|--|
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Alameda, City of | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | Alameda, City of | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | Alameda, City of | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | Alameda, City of | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | Alameda, City of | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | Alameda, City of | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | 300 | | | | | 300 | | |
| PS&E | | | | 800 | | | | 800 | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | 6,308 | | | 6,308 | | |
| TOTAL | | | 300 | 800 | 6,308 | | | 7,408 | | |

| Fund No. 1: | Active Transportation Program (MPO Component) Cycle 7 | | | | | | | | Program Code | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|--|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | 20.30.720 | |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | Funding Agency | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Caltrans | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | 673 | | | 673 | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | 673 | | | 673 | | |

| Fund No. 2: | City of Alameda Local Match | | | | | | | | Program Code | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-----------------|--|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | Funding Agency | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | City of Alameda | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | 1,539 | | | 1,539 | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | 1,539 | | | 1,539 | | |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

General Instructions

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|--|---------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|----|
| Amendment (Existing Project) Y/N | | | | | Date: | 5/15/24 | |
| District | | EA | Project ID | | PPNO | MPO ID | |
| 04 | | | | | | | |
| County | Route/Corridor | PM Bk | PM Ahd | Nominating Agency | | | |
| ALA | multiple | | | | | | |
| | | | | MPO | Element | | |
| | | | | MTC | Capital Outlay | | |
| Project Manager/Contact | | Phone | | E-mail Address | | | |
| Eric Anderson | | | | Eanderson@berkeleyca.gov | | | |
| Project Title | | | | | | | |
| Southwest Berkley Bike Boulevards | | | | | | | |
| Location (Project Limits), Description (Scope of Work) | | | | | | | |
| The project is located in southwestern Berkeley, just south of Ashby Avenue. The route travels on Mabel Street, 66th Street, Idaho Street, Harmon Street, King Street, Alcatraz Avenue, and Prince Street. | | | | | | | |
| Component | | | | | | | |
| | | Implementing Agency | | | | | |
| PA&ED | City of Berkeley | | | | | | |
| PS&E | City of Berkeley | | | | | | |
| Right of Way | City of Berkeley | | | | | | |
| Construction | City of Berkeley | | | | | | |
| Legislative Districts | | | | | | | |
| Assembly: | 14 | | Senate: | 9 | | Congressional: | 12 |
| Project Benefits | | | | | | | |
| The Southwest Berkeley Bike Boulevards Project (Project) closes a gap in the active transportation network by expanding Berkeley's bicycle boulevard network into the southwest corner of the city, providing much-needed and often-requested connectivity to transit, parks, jobs and amenities for a historically overlooked community in Berkeley. | | | | | | | |
| Purpose and Need | | | | | | | |
| The Project includes critical improvements to optimize alternative routes to high-injury corridors in Southwest Berkeley, providing direct access to transit, schools, and community destinations. | | | | | | | |
| Category | | Outputs | | | Unit | Total | |
| ADA Improvements | | Modify crosswalk | | | EA | 29 | |
| Active Transportation | | Crossing island | | | EA | 3 | |
| Active Transportation | | # Signs, lights, greenway, safety/beautification | | | EA | 74 | |
| Active Transportation | | Bicycle lane-miles | | | LF | 575 | |
| NHS Improvements | No | Roadway Class | NA | Reversible Lane analysis | No | | |
| Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals | | | | Yes | Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Yes | |
| Project Milestone | | | | | Existing | Proposed | |
| Project Study Report Approved | | | | | | | |
| Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase | | | | | | 09/01/26 | |
| Circulate Draft Environmental Document | | | Document Type | CE | | 10/01/27 | |
| Draft Project Report | | | | | | 11/01/27 | |
| End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone) | | | | | | 06/01/27 | |
| Begin Design (PS&E) Phase | | | | | | 11/01/27 | |
| End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone) | | | | | | 12/01/28 | |
| Begin Right of Way Phase | | | | | | 09/01/28 | |
| End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone) | | | | | | 12/01/28 | |
| Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone) | | | | | | 05/01/29 | |
| End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone) | | | | | | 01/01/31 | |
| Begin Closeout Phase | | | | | | 03/01/31 | |
| End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report) | | | | | | 06/01/31 | |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

Additional Information

The Southwest neighborhood of Berkeley is currently ringed and divided by major roadways that are designated as high-injury streets. These streets inhibit active transportation access to transit, education, and local destinations for residents in this neighborhood. The City of Berkeley already has a robust network of Bicycle Boulevards, traffic calmed streets with limited vehicle diversion, that act as a parallel network to larger, higher-volume, and higher-speed roadways. The Bicycle Boulevard network is well utilized in Berkeley because it creates a high degree of comfort and safety for people walking and bicycling and provides a competitive route option for travel times. The project creates a convenient, safer, lower stress environment for walking and bicycling by expanding the Bicycle Boulevard network into the Southwest Berkeley neighborhood. The route will connect with three other bicycle boulevards and other regional bike network connections.

The Project includes critical improvements to optimize the alternative route for walking and biking. Although vehicle volumes are lower along the Project corridor than adjacent major roadways, the major roadways act as significant barriers at their intersections with the Project route. The lack of adequate accessible facilities at some intersections make it challenging for people with mobility impairments to travel.

The Project uses traffic calming elements including traffic circles, speed tables, bicycle boulevard stencils, signage, and modal filters to limit and slow vehicle traffic along and across the Project corridor. The Project upgrades crosswalks and curb ramps across the Project corridor to improve the safety and comfort of crossings on foot or by bicycle and address accessibility deficiencies. The Project creates median island crossings of 2 major roadways, paired with a pedestrian hybrid beacon and a modal filter, to robustly address comfort and safety at the intersections of highest risk along the Project route. The Project uses a range of traffic calming and safety features along a 4-block-long segment of Alcatraz Avenue, a high-injury roadway, including new traffic signals, crosswalk upgrades, pedestrian bulb-outs, rapid-rectangular flashing beacons, and raised crosswalks. Also on Alcatraz Avenue, the Project will close a 2-block gap in the bike network with new bike lanes, connecting over a mile of continuous bike lanes in Oakland to Berkeley's bicycle boulevard network.

The Project provides an improved connection to important Berkeley community destinations currently reached major roadways, as well as additional destinations directly on the new route. With the new Project route, community residents have safer access to the same city and regional transit routes and downtown job center via bicycle or transit, as well as popular amenities on Adeline Street and Alcatraz Avenue.

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

Date: 5/15/24

| District | County | Route | EA | Project ID | PPNO | |
|---|--------|----------|----|------------|------|--|
| 04 | ALA | multiple | | | | |
| Project Title: Southwest Berkley Bike Boulevards | | | | | | |

| Existing Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Implementing Agency |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------------------|
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | City of Berkeley |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | City of Berkeley |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | City of Berkeley |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | City of Berkeley |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | City of Berkeley |
| CON | | | | | | | | | City of Berkeley |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | 85 | | | | | 85 | |
| PS&E | | | | | 340 | | | 340 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 3,450 | | 3,450 | |
| TOTAL | | | 85 | | 340 | 3,450 | | 3,875 | |

| Fund No. 1: | Active Transportation Program (MPO Component) Cycle 7 | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Funding Agency |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 3,430 | | 3,430 | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | 3,430 | | 3,430 | |

| Fund No. 2: | Alameda County Measure BB Sales Tax (Leveraging Funds) | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Funding Agency |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | 85 | | | | | 85 | |
| PS&E | | | | | 340 | | | 340 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 20 | | 20 | |
| TOTAL | | | 85 | | 340 | 20 | | 445 | |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

General Instructions

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------|-----|
| Amendment (Existing Project) No | | | | | Date: | 4/14/25 | |
| District | | EA | Project ID | | PPNO | MPO ID | |
| 04 | | | | | | | |
| County | Route/Corridor | | PM Bk | PM Ahd | Nominating Agency | | |
| CC | N/A | | | | Contra Costa County | | |
| | | | | MPO | | Element | |
| | | | | MTC | | Local Assistance | |
| Project Manager/Contact | | | Phone | | E-mail Address | | |
| Joe Smithonic | | | 925-313-2348 | | joe.smithonic@pw.cccounty.us | | |
| Project Title | | | | | | | |
| Verde K-8 Safe Routes to School | | | | | | | |
| Location (Project Limits), Description (Scope of Work) | | | | | | | |
| Location: On Market Street between Fred Jackson Way and 7th Street in unincorporated North Richmond. | | | | | | | |
| Description: Construct widened and ADA-compliant sidewalks and curb ramps, curb extensions at the intersection of Verde Street and Giaramita Street, and narrow travel lanes along 0.29 miles of Market Avenue. | | | | | | | |
| Component | Implementing Agency | | | | | | |
| PA&ED | Contra Costa County | | | | | | |
| PS&E | Contra Costa County | | | | | | |
| Right of Way | Contra Costa County | | | | | | |
| Construction | Contra Costa County | | | | | | |
| Legislative Districts | | | | | | | |
| Assembly: | 14 | | Senate: | 7 | | Congressional: | 8 |
| Project Benefits | | | | | | | |
| This project will make the roadway safer and will benefit the local residential community including pedestrians and drivers by slowing traffic and providing wider safer sidewalks. This project will encourage active modes of transportation and make is safer for pedestrians and bicyclists. | | | | | | | |
| Purpose and Need | | | | | | | |
| North Richmond is a disadvantaged community where many residents are dependent on active transportation modes for access to community facilities and commuting through the region. The improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities will improve the safety and comfort fo the non-motorized users who rely on this form of mobility. | | | | | | | |
| Category | | Outputs | | | Unit | Total | |
| Active Transportation | | Sidewalk miles | | | Miles | 0.29 | |
| ADA Improvements | | Modify crosswalk | | | EA | 4 | |
| ADA Improvements | | Repair/upgrade curb ramp | | | EA | 16 | |
| NHS Improvements | No | Roadway Class | | NA | Reversible Lane analysis | | No |
| Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals | | | Yes | | Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | Yes |
| Project Milestone | | | | | Existing | Proposed | |
| Project Study Report Approved | | | | | | | |
| Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase | | | | | | 10/07/25 | |
| Circulate Draft Environmental Document | | | Document Type | CE/CE | | | |
| Draft Project Report | | | | | | | |
| End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone) | | | | | | 12/31/26 | |
| Begin Design (PS&E) Phase | | | | | | 08/11/27 | |
| End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone) | | | | | | 01/02/29 | |
| Begin Right of Way Phase | | | | | | 10/15/27 | |
| End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone) | | | | | | 10/10/28 | |
| Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone) | | | | | | 06/07/29 | |
| End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone) | | | | | | 12/03/29 | |
| Begin Closeout Phase | | | | | | 03/29/29 | |
| End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report) | | | | | | 06/28/29 | |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

Date: 4/14/25

Additional Information

Empty box for providing additional information.

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

Date: 4/14/25

| District | County | Route | EA | Project ID | PPNO |
|---|--------|-------|----|------------|------|
| 04 | CC | N/A | | | |
| Project Title: Verde K-8 Safe Routes to School | | | | | |

| Existing Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | Implementing Agency | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | | Total |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Contra Costa County |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | Contra Costa County |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | Contra Costa County |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | Contra Costa County |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | Contra Costa County |
| CON | | | | | | | | | Contra Costa County |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | Notes | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | 350 | | | | | | 350 |
| PS&E | | | | | 525 | | | | 525 |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | 68 | | | | | 68 |
| CON | | | 500 | | | 4,079 | | | 4,579 |
| TOTAL | | | 850 | 68 | 525 | 4,079 | | | 5,522 |

| Fund No. 1: | Active Transportation Program (MPO Component) Cycle 7 | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | Funding Agency |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Caltrans HQ |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | 276 | | | | | 276 | |
| PS&E | | | | | 362 | | | 362 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 3,222 | | 3,222 | |
| TOTAL | | | 276 | | 362 | 3,222 | | 3,860 | |

| Fund No. 2: | Active Transportation Program (MPO Component) Cycle 7 | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------------------------------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | Funding Agency |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Caltrans HQ |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | This ATP funding is for CON-NI only. |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | 500 | | | | | 500 | |
| TOTAL | | | 500 | | | | | 500 | |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

General Instructions

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Amendment (Existing Project) No | | | | | Date: | 4/7/25 |
| District | EA | Project ID | PPNO | MPO ID | | |
| 04 | | | | | | |
| County | Route/Corridor | PM Bk | PM Ahd | Nominating Agency | | |
| MRN | N/A | | | City of San Rafael | | |
| | | | | MPO | Element | |
| | | | | MTC | Capital Outlay | |
| Project Manager/Contact | | Phone | | E-mail Address | | |
| April Miller | | 415-485-3409 | | april.miller@cityofsanrafael.org | | |
| Project Title | | | | | | |
| Downtown San Rafael North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project | | | | | | |
| Location (Project Limits), Description (Scope of Work) | | | | | | |
| In the City of San Rafael, the project spans Mission Ave. (Tamalpais Ave. to Hetherton St.), Tamalpais Ave (Mission Ave. to 4th St.), and 4th St. (Tamalpais Ave. to Grand Ave.) in downtown San Rafael, CA. Install two-way bicycle facility, enhanced pedestrian crossings, wider sidewalk, and signage. | | | | | | |
| Component | | | | | | |
| | | Implementing Agency | | | | |
| PA&ED | | City of San Rafael | | | | |
| PS&E | | City of San Rafael | | | | |
| Right of Way | | City of San Rafael | | | | |
| Construction | | City of San Rafael | | | | |
| Legislative Districts | | | | | | |
| Assembly: | 10 | Senate: | 2 | Congressional: | 2 | |
| Project Benefits | | | | | | |
| The project will significantly increase mobility, helping residents safely and comfortably connect to both their city and the broader region. It will serve approximately 3,300 users daily, including students, seniors, and commuters, enhancing safety and accessibility within San Rafael's transportation network. | | | | | | |
| Purpose and Need | | | | | | |
| The project scope creates safe, comfortable, and accessible bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in Downtown San Rafael, California. The project will construct bicycle facilities along Tamalpais Avenue from Mission Avenue to 4th Street and along 4th Street from Tamalpais Avenue to Grand Avenue, creating a seamless, protected route to access the nearby transit center and downtown destinations | | | | | | |
| Category | | Outputs | | | Unit | Total |
| Active Transportation | | Bicycle lane-miles | | | LF | 2150 |
| ADA Improvements | | Repair/upgrade curb ramp | | | EA | 10 |
| | | | | | | |
| NHS Improvements | Y/N | Roadway Class | 3 | Reversible Lane analysis | Y/N | |
| Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals | | Y/N | Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | Y/N | |
| Project Milestone | | | | | Existing | Proposed |
| Project Study Report Approved | | | | | 06/17/24 | |
| Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase | | | | | | 07/01/26 |
| Circulate Draft Environmental Document | | | Document Type | CE | | 11/01/26 |
| Draft Project Report | | | | | | 01/01/27 |
| End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone) | | | | | | 04/01/27 |
| Begin Design (PS&E) Phase | | | | | | 07/01/27 |
| End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone) | | | | | | 11/01/27 |
| Begin Right of Way Phase | | | | | | 01/01/28 |
| End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone) | | | | | | 03/01/28 |
| Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone) | | | | | | 07/01/28 |
| End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone) | | | | | | 09/01/29 |
| Begin Closeout Phase | | | | | | 11/01/29 |
| End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report) | | | | | | 12/01/29 |

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

Additional Information

Project Benefits continued: This project directly responds to community-voiced needs, promoting equity and inclusivity in transportation.

Purpose and Need continued: The project also includes enhanced pedestrian crossings, a wider sidewalk at Mission Avenue, and signage. These measures address safety concerns and network deficiencies, facilitating safer and more efficient travel.

Downtown San Rafael is a high-traffic area with significant density that challenges active transportation users. It will enhance last-mile connections for people using the Downtown San Rafael Transit Center and the future bikeshare station at the SMART light rail station. The area also features existing retail, restaurants, and other destinations that will benefit from improved access and connectivity.

The project site is adjacent to San Rafael's Canal neighborhood, an Equity Priority Community where many residents rely heavily on active transportation and transit for travel to work, shopping, and other destinations both within San Rafael and regionally. Downtown San Rafael is also the site of several senior living facilities, whose residents are likely to walk to Downtown destinations.

Currently bicycle facilities are under construction on Grand Avenue and have been completed on nearby Lincoln Avenue and Francisco Boulevard. This project will fill the gap between existing and proposed facilities, ensuring a continuous and safe route for bicyclists and pedestrians.

The project will significantly increase mobility, helping residents safely and comfortably connect to both their city and the broader region. It will serve approximately 3,300 users daily, including students, seniors, and commuters, enhancing safety and accessibility within San Rafael's transportation network. This project directly responds to community-voiced needs, promoting equity and inclusivity in transportation.

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

LAPG -25I (Revised 6 Feb 2024 v1.02)

Date: 4/7/25

| District | County | Route | EA | Project ID | PPNO | |
|--|--------|-------|----|------------|------|--|
| 04 | MRN | N/A | | | | |
| Project Title: Downtown San Rafael North-South Greenway Gap Closure Project | | | | | | |

| Existing Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Implementing Agency |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------------------|
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | City of San Rafael |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | City of San Rafael |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | City of San Rafael |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | City of San Rafael |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | City of San Rafael |
| CON | | | | | | | | | City of San Rafael |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | 375 | | | | 375 | |
| PS&E | | | | | 600 | | | 600 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 4,469 | | 4,469 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 375 | 600 | 4,469 | | 5,444 | |

| Fund No. 1: | Active Transportation Program (MPO Component) Cycle 7 | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Funding Agency |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | 300 | | | | 300 | |
| PS&E | | | | | 480 | | | 480 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 3,575 | | 3,575 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 300 | 480 | 3,575 | | 4,355 | |

| Fund No. 2: | Local Funds | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Funding Agency |
| Component | Prior | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29 | 29-30+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | 75 | | | | 75 | |
| PS&E | | | | | 120 | | | 120 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 894 | | 894 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 75 | 120 | 894 | | 1,089 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Amendment (Existing Project) <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO | | | | | Date | 06/14/2024 13:20:18 | |
| Programs <input type="checkbox"/> LPP-C | | <input type="checkbox"/> LPP-F | <input type="checkbox"/> SCCP | <input type="checkbox"/> TCEP | <input type="checkbox"/> STIP | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other | |
| District | EA | Project ID | PPNO | Nominating Agency | | | |
| 04 | | | | Solano County | | | |
| County | Route | PM Back | PM Ahead | Co-Nominating Agency | | | |
| Solano County | | | | | | | |
| | | | | MPO | Element | | |
| | | | | MTC | Local Assistance | | |
| Project Manager/Contact | | | Phone | Email Address | | | |
| Matt Tuggle | | | 707-784-6072 | mrtuggle@solanocounty.com | | | |

Project Title

Benicia Road Complete Streets Project Phase 2

Location (Project Limits), Description (Scope of Work)

In the City of Vallejo, on Benicia Road, from the intersection of 9th Street to the intersection of Starr Avenue, which is located within 1.4 miles of downtown Vallejo in the Starr Subdivision, this project modernizes a relinquished highway by incorporating a road diet and improving conditions for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit riders. The corridor improvements, which span unincorporated Solano County and the City of Vallejo, have been designated as a high priority by both agencies. Its completion is crucial to provide a safe, unobstructed route for the residents of Benicia Road and the surrounding disadvantaged community.

The project reduces the number of vehicle travel lanes and transforms that space for pedestrians and cyclists. Existing sidewalks will be removed and replaced with wider sidewalks, bulb-outs, and ADA-compliant curb ramps. The roadway will be restriped with street parking, Class II bike lanes, and bus turnouts. All crosswalks will be restriped, and we will

| Component | Implementing Agency |
|--------------|---------------------|
| PA&ED | Solano County |
| PS&E | Solano County |
| Right of Way | Solano County |
| Construction | Solano County |

Legislative Districts

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----|---------|---|----------------|---|
| Assembly: | 11 | Senate: | 3 | Congressional: | 8 |
|-----------|----|---------|---|----------------|---|

| Project Milestone | Existing | Proposed |
|--|----------|------------|
| Project Study Report Approved | | |
| Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase | | 08/31/2025 |
| Circulate Draft Environmental Document Document Type CE | | 03/10/2022 |
| Draft Project Report | | 12/21/2025 |
| End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone) | | 05/27/2026 |
| Begin Design (PS&E) Phase | | 07/28/2026 |
| End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone) | | 09/26/2026 |
| Begin Right of Way Phase | | 05/28/2026 |
| End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone) | | 09/28/2026 |
| Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone) | | 03/15/2027 |
| End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone) | | 03/15/2028 |
| Begin Closeout Phase | | 03/25/2028 |
| End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report) | | 07/25/2028 |

Date 06/14/2024 13:20:18

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to provide better access to pedestrian amenities, reduce the number of accidents and calm traffic in the project area. The project area was once owned by Caltrans, which was proposing the road to be a freeway and was built with four lanes to accommodate traffic. Caltrans relinquished Benicia Road back to Solano County and is now a mixed-use community of residents and businesses. The county's portion of the road is four lanes, but the rest of Benicia Road is only two lanes on either side of the project area. The wider county section promotes speeding therefore creating the need for a road diet to reduce motorists' speeds and help increase pedestrian activity and safety. The aged sidewalks are narrow and have power poles located in them. Persons with mobility issues have difficulty navigating the outdated curb ramps and getting around the power poles in some locations. Crossing Benicia Road is difficult as expressed by area residents as they must navigate four lanes of traffic and cross 61.5 feet to reach the other side. Reducing the number of lanes will allow for wider sidewalks, street parking, bulb-outs at intersections (reducing crossing distance), pedestrian refuge islands, and class II bike lanes. Road diets are a proven safety countermeasure to reduce crashes by 19-47%, calm traffic, and provide opportunity to install a pedestrian refuge island, bicycle lanes, on street parking and better transit access. The complete streets approach fulfills the purpose as seen by county staff and completes the needs of area residents.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| NHS Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO | Roadway Class 2 | Reversible Lane Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | |

| Category | Outputs | Unit | Total |
|-----------------------|---|-------|-------|
| Active Transportation | Pedestrian/Bicycle facilities miles constructed | Miles | 0.55 |
| Active Transportation | Crossing Island | EA | 1 |
| Active Transportation | Crosswalk | EA | 10 |
| Active Transportation | # Signs, lights, greenway, or other safety / beautification | EA | 20 |

Date 06/14/2024 13:20:18

Additional Information

will install native vegetation, bus shelters with benches and trash can and a memorial plaque commemorating the areas unique history. The Starr Subdivision area, established in the late 1800s, was once a bustling mixed-use commercial, industrial, and residential community in unincorporated Solano County. Starr Subdivision was economically connected by Benicia Road as the major east-west thoroughfare between the cities of Vallejo and Benicia. In 1926, the eastern part of Starr Subdivision was connected with an at-grade intersection of Benicia Road to historic State Highway 40, providing access north to Sacramento and south to San Francisco. By 1935, the Benicia Road corridor was established with a 78-foot right-of-way and four lanes to accommodate the heavy arterial traffic between the cities of Vallejo and Benicia. Benicia Road has a unique and important history, particularly as a primary connector to the Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo. During World War II, over 50,000 personnel were active on Mare Island, it served as one of the most critical shipyard and submarine bases on the West Coast. Businesses and subdivisions were built all around the City of Vallejo over the decades that followed to support the shipyard, with Benicia Road serving as one of the main east-west arterial connections into the 1970s.

In 1964, I- 80 was built in California along the State Highway 40 route, bounding the eastern part of Starr Subdivision with a walled freeway and limiting some of the east-west connectivity. In 1976, State Highway 141 was reconstructed into I-780, which walled southern portions of Starr Subdivision. By this time, Vallejo had incorporated the areas north of Starr Subdivision. Once the I-780 reconstruction was completed, Starr Subdivision became an unincorporated island with limited access to historic routes east, north, and south. Starr Subdivision experienced stagnant growth and limited economic development due to the access constraints from the interstates. The once bustling roadway and surrounding community is now an aged mixed-use area with mostly single-family residences/apartments and 22 businesses. Starr Subdivision is an Equity Priority Community in the Plan Bay Area 2050 and an area of persistent poverty. The median income for the area is only \$61,010, and 14.4% of households do not have access to a vehicle (see ETC data).

In 2012, the Starr Subdivision community began asking Solano County for community investment and better mobility options. Solano County utilized redevelopment and housing authority funding opportunities to improve local housing rehabilitation and utility connections, but the area has seen only limited recovery. Mobility and access improvements became a priority, and new project planning was initiated for the area. The corridor is an important historical route between I-80 and Vallejo's downtown, providing access to key destinations including a major transit hub, the Vallejo ferry, a park, government services, and schools. As a four-lane parkway with no bike lanes, bicyclists must ride in the traveled way with fast-moving traffic or along the narrow existing sidewalks, putting cyclists and pedestrians at risk for collision. The existing aged sidewalks are of substandard width, are difficult to navigate, and provide very limited transit accessibility. The pedestrian crossing locations are very broad, with no pedestrian refuge.

The project reduces lanes for motorists and upgrades facilities for cyclists, pedestrians, and transit riders. Two travel lanes will be upgraded with newly striped Class II bike lanes and street parking. Sidewalks will be widened with landscaped curb extensions at each intersection. Crosswalks will be restriped with high visibility striping, and new bus shelters will provide shelter, a bench, and trash can. The project will benefit students at nearby schools, the new adjacent community recreation center, and the surrounding disadvantaged community.

| Performance Indicators and Measures | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|-------------|----------|-----------------|------------|
| Measure | Required For | Indicator/Measure | Unit | Build | Future No Build | Change |
| Air Quality & GHG (only 'Change' required) | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Particulate Matter | PM 2.5 Tons | 3.19 | 3.34 | -0.15 |
| | | | PM 10 Tons | 3.43 | 3.59 | -0.16 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂) | Tons | 286,895 | 300,398.12 | -13,503.12 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) | Tons | 805.24 | 843.14 | -37.9 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Sulphur Dioxides (SO _x) | Tons | 3.5 | 3.67 | -0.17 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Carbon Monoxide (CO) | Tons | 7,320.34 | 7,664.88 | -344.54 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x) | Tons | 539.68 | 565.08 | -25.4 |
| Safety | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Number of Fatalities | Number | 4.28 | 7.14 | -2.86 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Fatalities per 100 Million VMT | Number | 0.81 | 1.35 | -0.54 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Number of Serious Injuries | Number | 72.85 | 121.42 | -48.57 |
| | LPPC, SCCP, TCEP, LPPF | Number of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT | Number | 13.54 | 22.56 | -9.02 |
| | Optional | Number of Property Damage Only and Non-Serious Injury Collisions | Number | 72.85 | 121.42 | -48.57 |
| Accessibility | Optional | Number of Jobs Accessible by Mode | Number | 2,053 | 1,874 | 179 |
| System Preservation Pavement | Optional | Pavement Condition Index | Index | 100 | 57 | 43 |
| | | | Rating | Good | Poor | |

| District | County | Route | EA | Project ID | PPNO |
|----------|---------------|-------|----|------------|------|
| 04 | Solano County | | | | |

Project Title
 Benicia Road Complete Streets Project Phase 2

| Existing Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Implementing Agency |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------------------|
| Component | Prior | 23-24 | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| CON | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
|--|--|--|--|-----|--|-------|--|-------|-------|
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | 222 | | | | 222 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 1,930 | | 1,930 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 222 | | 1,930 | | 2,152 | |

| Fund #1: | Other State - Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (Committed) | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Funding Agency |
| Component | Prior | 23-24 | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29+ | Total | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Solano County |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | Notes |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|----|--|-----|--|-----|-------|
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | 54 | | | | 54 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 468 | | 468 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 54 | | 468 | | 522 | |

| Fund #2: | Active Transportation Program (MPO Component) Cycle 7 | | | | | | | | Program Code |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------------------|
| Existing Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | |
| Component | Prior | 23-24 | 24-25 | 25-26 | 26-27 | 27-28 | 28-29+ | Total | Funding Agency |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | Caltrans District 4 |
| PS&E | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Funding (\$1,000s) | | | | | | | | | |
| E&P (PA&ED) | | | | | | | | | |
| PS&E | | | | 168 | | | | 168 | |
| R/W SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| CON SUP (CT) | | | | | | | | | |
| R/W | | | | | | | | | |
| CON | | | | | | 1,462 | | 1,462 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 168 | | 1,462 | | 1,630 | |