

**2023 Active Transportation Program
Staff Recommendations
Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components**

The Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The Active Transportation Program consists of three components: the Statewide component (50% of the funds), the Small Urban & Rural component (10% of the funds), and the large Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component (40% of the funds).

The 2023 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components are attached as Attachments A and B, respectively. Please be advised that these are the staff recommendations only. The program of projects will not be finalized until the Commission adopts the program at its December 7-8, 2022 meeting. Projects located within the boundaries of one of the ten large MPOs (Fresno Council of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments) that were not selected in the Statewide component will be considered for funding through the MPO component. Recommendations for the MPO component will be released on May 12, 2023 and considered by the Commission at its June 2023 meeting.

The 2023 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components are summarized below.

Statewide Component

- 67 projects worth \$1.149 billion with \$853.52 million in Active Transportation Program funding
- 100% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities
- 43 projects are Safe Routes to School projects

Small Urban and Rural Component

- 26 projects worth \$209.187 million with \$170.704 million in Active Transportation Program funding
- 100% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities
- 19 projects are Safe Routes to School projects

The one-time, \$1.049 billion augmentation included in the Budget Act of 2022 significantly boosted the number of projects the Commission can fund through the 2023 Active Transportation Program. Without the augmentation, staff recommendations would have included 23 projects in the Statewide component and seven projects in the Small Urban & Rural component.

Background

The Active Transportation Program continues to experience tremendous unmet demand, as communities across the state look to the program to fund critical active transportation projects necessary to meet safety, climate, and equity goals. In light of the unmet need, the Commission recently embarked on a year-long effort to secure more funding for the program. This effort commenced in March 2021, when the Commission proposed a one-time, \$2 billion augmentation to reduce the backlog of critically needed, high-quality projects that had not received funding in previous cycles due to the program's lack of adequate funding. In June 2022, the Governor signed the Budget Act of 2022, which included a one-time Active Transportation Program funding augmentation of \$1.049 billion. While the Commission greatly appreciates this significant one-time augmentation from the Governor and Legislature to fund more projects, the need for additional funding for the program remains.

The Commission held a stakeholder workshop in July 2022 to discuss the distribution and implementation of the funding augmentation. Over 150 stakeholders attended, and there was widespread consensus to distribute all augmentation funding to the 2023 Active Transportation Program. Therefore, the Commission adopted an amended 2023 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate at its August 2022 meeting, bringing the total funding available for the 2023 program to \$1.707 billion. Under the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, the Commission may program up to \$7 million of this total to Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program projects in the Statewide component.

Applications to the 2023 Active Transportation Program were due on June 15, 2022. The California Transportation Commission (Commission) received 434 applications, with projects valued at \$4.3 billion and funding requests totaling a record \$3.1 billion. Additionally, the Commission received 11 applications to the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program, with projects valued at \$8.7 million and funding requests totaling \$8.2 million.

The Commission recruited 98 volunteer evaluators, who were divided into teams of two individuals. Each team reviewed nine to ten applications and scored them based on the screening and evaluation criteria set forth in the Commission's adopted 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. The evaluator teams consisted of active transportation stakeholders with a wide range of expertise and from a variety of organizations, including local government agencies, regional transportation planning organizations, state agencies, community-based organizations, and advocacy organizations. Evaluator teams provided scores based on consensus for each question within each application and were required to provide constructive comments on all score sheets. Concurrently, Commission scored each project application and compared the evaluator consensus score to the staff score, and Caltrans staff reviewed the applications for eligibility and deliverability. Once the evaluations were complete, Commission and Caltrans staff met with each evaluator team to discuss any scoring differences and significant technical issues.

Commission staff evaluated the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program project applications based on the project selection criteria outlined in Appendix D of the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. Caltrans staff reviewed the projects for eligibility, deliverability, and alignment with quick-build project materials and principles.

The Active Transportation Program uses a sequential project selection process based on the scores the project applications received during the evaluation process. The project recommendation scoring threshold was 89 points for the Statewide component. There is not sufficient funding to fully fund all projects that achieved this scoring threshold. Therefore, consistent with the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, Commission staff used a secondary ranking system to choose which projects to recommend. This secondary ranking consisted of first prioritizing project readiness and then prioritizing projects that scored the highest on Question 2 of the application – Potential for Increased Walking and Biking. None of the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program project applications met the scoring threshold for the Statewide component. Therefore, no quick-build projects are recommended for funding. The project recommendation scoring threshold was 78 points for the Small Urban & Rural component. Only one Small Urban & Rural-eligible project achieved a score of 78, so a secondary ranking was not necessary.

During the eligibility screening process, Commission staff determined ten projects to be ineligible, including four quick-build projects. Commission staff contacted these applicants and informed them of their project's ineligible status prior to posting the staff recommendations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&E	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
10-Tuolumne County-1	Groveland Community Connectivity Project	Tuolumne	\$ 3,036	\$ 3,036	\$ 160	\$ 220	\$ 100	\$ 2,556	\$ 160	\$ 220	\$ 100	\$ 2,556	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	89
10-Sonora, City of-1	SR 49 Gold Rush Multi-Use Path Phase 1	Tuolumne	\$ 6,418	\$ 5,018	\$ 233	\$ 1,220	\$ 3,565	\$ -	\$ 233	\$ 520	\$ 700	\$ 3,565	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	89
3-Butte County-1	South Oroville Bike and Ped Connectivity Project	Butte	\$ 9,286	\$ 7,786	\$ 7,786	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,904	\$ 882	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88.5
5-Monterey County-3*	Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 6,463	\$ 6,463	\$ 1,045	\$ 488	\$ 4,930	\$ -	\$ 37	\$ 450	\$ 38	\$ 4,930	\$ 1,008	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88.5
5-Arroyo Grande, City of-1	Halcyon Road Complete Streets Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 9,170	\$ 8,169	\$ 1,304	\$ 6,865	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 648	\$ 656	\$ 6,765	\$ 100	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88
10-Groveland Community Services District-1*	Hetch Hetchy Railroad Trail Project	Tuolumne	\$ 5,443	\$ 4,299	\$ 146	\$ 308	\$ 118	\$ 3,727	\$ 146	\$ 308	\$ 118	\$ 3,727	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	88
5-San Luis Obispo County-1	Morro Bay to Cayucos Multi-Use Trail Gap Closure Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 13,170	\$ 7,406	\$ -	\$ 7,406	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,406	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	88
5-California Department of Transportation-1	Los Alamos Connected Community Project (SR 135)	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,525	\$ 8,075	\$ 710	\$ -	\$ 1,956	\$ 5,409	\$ 710	\$ 1,044	\$ 912	\$ 5,359	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88
1-Eureka, City of-1	Bay to Zoo Trail	Humboldt	\$ 9,999	\$ 8,999	\$ 118	\$ 525	\$ 8,356	\$ -	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ 525	\$ 8,356	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	87
3-Paradise, Town of-2*§	Go Paradise: Neal Gateway Project	Butte	\$ 13,068	\$ 12,348	\$ 1,838	\$ -	\$ 10,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 352	\$ 1,486	\$ 10,510	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	86
5-Santa Barbara County-2*	Isla Vista Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,998	\$ 7,107	\$ 308	\$ 517	\$ 6,272	\$ 10	\$ 308	\$ 375	\$ 142	\$ 6,272	\$ 10	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	87
5-Monterey County-2*	Chualar Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 6,349	\$ 6,349	\$ 1,694	\$ 4,655	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270	\$ 513	\$ 38	\$ 4,617	\$ 911	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	86
2-Modoc County-2*	Surprise Valley School Safety and Community Connectivity Project	Modoc	\$ 3,021	\$ 3,021	\$ 144	\$ 208	\$ 2,669	\$ -	\$ 144	\$ 196	\$ 12	\$ 2,669	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	86
5-Salinas, City of-2*	Alisal Safe Routes to School Project	Monterey	\$ 1,084	\$ 998	\$ 998	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 913	\$ 85	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	86
5-Santa Cruz, City of-2*	Swanton Delaware Multiuse Path	Santa Cruz	\$ 2,968	\$ 2,968	\$ 140	\$ 25	\$ 2,803	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ 25	\$ 2,803	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	86
1-Mendocino Council of Governments-1	Gualala Downtown Streetscape Enhancement Project	Mendocino	\$ 9,995	\$ 7,780	\$ 447	\$ -	\$ 7,333	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 265	\$ 182	\$ 7,333	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	85
6-Madera County-1	La Vina Community Mobility and Safety Enhancements Project	Madera	\$ 2,837	\$ 2,837	\$ 325	\$ 95	\$ 2,417	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 300	\$ 95	\$ 2,417	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	85
2-Redding, City of-2*	Victor Improvement Project	Shasta	\$ 9,992	\$ 7,993	\$ 904	\$ 1,045	\$ -	\$ 6,044	\$ 700	\$ 1,045	\$ -	\$ 6,044	\$ 204	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	84
5-Santa Cruz Health Services Agency-2	Safe Routes for Watsonville School Families and Community	Santa Cruz	\$ 1,921	\$ 1,881	\$ 1,881	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,881	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	Yes	84
5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County-1*	Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway: California Avenue Segment	Monterey	\$ 10,670	\$ 8,429	\$ 1,508	\$ 6,921	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 528	\$ -	\$ 6,921	\$ 980	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	84
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-2*§	SR 49 Multimodal Corridor Improvements, Nevada City	Nevada	\$ 17,357	\$ 13,863	\$ 1,250	\$ -	\$ 1,900	\$ 10,713	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,750	\$ 150	\$ 10,637	\$ 76	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	83.5
5-King City, City of-1*§	San Antonio Drive Path & Safe Routes to Schools	Monterey	\$ 14,543	\$ 11,043	\$ 3,695	\$ 12	\$ 7,336	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 1,050	\$ 12	\$ 7,336	\$ 2,295	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	81
3-Paradise, Town of-1*	Go Paradise: Skyway Link Project	Butte	\$ 6,810	\$ 6,704	\$ 424	\$ 1,073	\$ -	\$ 5,207	\$ 424	\$ 715	\$ 358	\$ 5,207	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	80
3-Williams, City of-1*	E Street Complete Streets Project	Colusa	\$ 11,760	\$ 9,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,141	\$ 200	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	80
5-University of California - Santa Cruz-1	UCSC "SlugBikeLife" Bike Safety and Education Program Phase 2	Santa Cruz	\$ 742	\$ 712	\$ 712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 712	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	No	79
5-Salinas, City of-1*‡	Harden Parkway Path & Safe Routes to School project	Monterey	\$ 15,562	\$ 8,079	\$ 3,528	\$ -	\$ 10,478	\$ -	\$ 405	\$ 1,575	\$ -	\$ 10,478	\$ 1,548	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	78
			\$ 209,187	\$ 170,704													

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

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