Active Transportation Program Technical Advisory Committee—Meeting Minutes – 7/17/23

Date: July 17, 2023	**Time: 1:00pm – 4:00pm**	**Location: Zoom**
Attendees:		
TAC	**TAC Facilitators**	**Notetaker**
Laurie Waters, California Transportation Commissions *Cathy McKeon, Caltrans*	*Michael Hutnick, Caltrans, Active Transportation Resource Center*	*Kendall Lim, Caltrans*
Other Attendees:		
• *Darwin Moosavi, CalSTA* • *Beverley Newman-Burckhard, CTC* • *Elika Changizi, CTC* • *Desiree Fox, Caltrans* • *Elijah Hall, Caltrans* • *Cirilo Salillican, Caltrans* • *Dancy Yang, Caltrans* • *Anika Jesi, Caltrans* • *Nancy Wolf, Caltrans* • *Victoria Custodio, CDIC* • *Richard Rendon, State Parks* • *Miguel Vasquez, Riverside Co DPH* • *Laura Cohen, Rails to Trails* • *Maura Twomey, OMBAG* • *Claire Gallogly, Santa Cruz* • *Kenneth Kao, Bay Area Metro* ○ *Karl Anderson* • *Joel Campos, SJCOG* • *Ariana Lopez, Orange County* • *Courtney Aguirre, SCAG* • *Kendee Vance, Caltrans* • *Trinity Smith, CDPH* • *Nickolas Mueller, Local Corps and CCC* • *Jenny Russo, SANDAG* • *Adam Fukushima, City of SLO* • *Jesse Gothan, City of Sac*		

• *Kevin Shin, CalWalks* • *Oona Smith, HCAOG* • *John Yi, LA Walks* • *Jonathon Matz, SRTS* • *Jeanne LePage, Santa Cruz SRTS* • *Axel Santana, Policy Link Disadvantaged Communities Rural South* • *Kevin Jensen, SF DPW* • *Joi Jackson, Advocacy: Bicycle-Statewide* • *Jacob Lieb, LA Metro: Transit* • *Keith Williams, SRTA: Small MPO* • *Ivan Garcia, Butte County Associates of Governments RTPA* • *Sarkes Khackek, SBCAG* • *Robert Yano* • *Marc Mattox: City of Chico*		

Key Decisions and Action Items:

- Decisions:
- Action Items:
    - Will email absent ATP TAC members to verify if they still intend to participate in the TAC.
    - Kendee will explain a need for tribes to be on TAC at next meeting.

Item 1. Welcome, opening remarks

Speaker: Michael Hutnick, CT

- Welcome and Introductions.

Item 2. TAC Membership Audit

Speaker: Cathy McKeon, CT

- What should we do with people that are not attending? Should we put as vacant and find new people? We will send out an email to everyone if they are part of this TAC.
- Kendee Vance: get actual tribes on TAC for a better voice and needs

Item 3. CTC Updates

Speakers: Laurie Waters and Elika Changizi

- Last TAC meeting, talked about Cycle 7 because funding was uncertain
- Do not have to take $200 million from Cycle 7 for Cycle 6
- Making recommendation for another normal ATP Cycle
- Will have the standard funding amount for Cycle 7
- Total Funding available for Cycle 7: $550.5 million

Component	Funding	Cutoff Score Worst Case	Projects Funded Worst Case	Cutoff Score Best Case	Projects Funded Best Case
SW	$277,770	95	20	92	39
SUR	$55,550	92	5	90	8
MPO	$222,200	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

- Jesse Gothan: Knows escalation is factored in and projects come in at the same scale, we might be overstating it
    - Laurie: there is no escalation included in this. Talking about all of the scenarios, it was decided to go with this
- Laura Cohen: Where did we end up on the funding
    - $500 million was taken back but then backfilled with State Highway Account (SHA) and general fund
- ATP Engagement – Elika Changizi
    - 2 kick-off workshops
        - One in north and South and one online
    - Central Workshop – Virtual
    - Branch Workshop – noted after holding them virtual, that there was less engagement so they will be held in person
        - Bundle this with site visits
        - Imperial County, San Bernadino/Riverside, Stanislas, and San Joaquin County
            - Imperial County is the most disadvantaged county in the state so CTC will give more attention to them
                - Will need a contact there
            - Courtney Aguirre will help with SB/Riverside Counties
            - Stanislas, we are not getting many applications there
            - More engagement with tribes because not a lot of tribes are applying
            - Joel Campos will participate for San Joaquin
        - Last cycle, they were virtual and there was no engagement so they will be help in person
    - Site Visits – Virtual
        - 129 visits for Cycle 6
        - Tuesday and Thursdays beginning September 2023 – March 2024
        - There will be registration form like last cycle
    - Application Debriefs – Virtual by request
    - Claire Gallogly: How to request Branch Workshop
        - Reach out to Elika
    - Kendee Vance: Tribes Meeting – August 2nd
- Draft Engagement Schedule

Milestone	Date
CTC staff holds Central Workshops	August 2023 – February 2024
CTC staff holds Branch Workshops	September 2023 – March 2024
CTC staff holds Site Visits	September 2023 – March 2024
CTC staff presents Draft ATP Guidelines to the Commission	January 25-26, 2024
Commission adopts ATP Guidelines	March 21-22, 2024
Commission releases call for projects	March 21-22, 2024

Milestone	Date
Week of August 14, 2023 (San Diego CTC Meeting)	Kick-Off (South)
Week of September 4, 2023	Kick-Off (North)
Week of September 18, 2023 (San Benito Town Hall)	Guidelines
Week of October 2, 2023	Guidelines
Week of October 16, 2023 (Central Valley CTC Meeting)	Guidelines
Week of October 23, 2023	Guidelines
Share Draft Guidelines with Equity Advisory Committee	
Week of November 6, 2023	Guidelines
Week of November 13, 2023	Quick Build Program
Finalize Draft Guidelines	
Week of December 4, 2023 (Riverside CTC Meeting)	PSR Equivalency Workshop
Week of January 8, 2024	Applications
Week of February 5, 2024	Scoring Rubrics

    - Kickoff Workshop at San Diego CTC meeting
        - Can get more people there if at the same time as CTC meeting
        - CTC will work with Jenny Russo
    - Joel Campos: Is there a cap in the level of funding for cycle 7? Or increase points for leveraged funds?
    - Maura Twomey: Agrees to do the branch workshops because people are leery to speak out. It wasn't like it should be last cycle, it is better in person.
    - Keith Williams: Agrees the branch workshops should be in person and at the same time as the meetings
- Application & Guidelines Changes – Beverley
    - Submittable
        - In process of getting a submittable, which is an application process to be more user friendly
        - Make it easier to implement and monitor application and evaluation processes
        - Shows video example of Submittable application process
        - All attachments will be the same
        - Need to ask about access in application?
        - Would you be able to edit submitted documents?
            - Yes, but they would need permission from CTC
        - Is this a project management software?

                - The applicant will be able to invite another person from their association for review
                - Can we see a beta version on what this will look and feel like?
                - Once the contract in place, Submittable offered for presentation for TAC
                    - They can get a program out in two weeks but they have several months
            - Evaluators
                - This will have dedicated portal for evaluators
                - All the information will be there
                - All the attachments will be accessible through portal
                - Scoreboards will be imbedded in platform
                - Can ask CTC question in portal
            - CTC Staff
                - Submittable will work with staff on applications
                - CTC staff can edit application easily
                - Can see applications as they come in
                - Can easily communicate with applicants in portal
                - Can easily communicate with evaluators and monitor progress
                - Can see which teams have not gotten started yet or are stalled
            - Jesse, Sacramento: Art department uses this platform
            - This makes making changes to the application much easier. Gives direct access for changes.
            - Scoring forms will be imbedded but don't know if the auto summing is in there. Beverley will ask.
- Limit ATP $ Request
    - Issue
        - Projects are getting larger and that makes funding projects fewer
        - Likely funding less projects.
    - Possible Revision
        - Put a cap on the ATP request
    - Claire: will this be limited to Cycle 7? There are less options to get funding on bigger projects as to the smaller projects
        - All funding was restored in budget
        - This would be up to the stakeholder group if this is what we do moving forward
    - Courtney Aguirre: what is driving this?
        - Increase in average requests across the cycles
    - Kar Anderson: How are they thinking about putting the cap? There may be portions of state that may not be eligible on other competitive programs
        - Possibly cap on the amount per county – this might be unfair
        - Potentially alternating cycles – one cycle doing large projects and then the next project doing smaller ones, but this might delay projects
        - They are proposing cap on overall application
        - Not a big fan of set aside idea. Doesn't seem fair on applicants who score high but set aside is full

    - Ivan Garcia: Does not like limits. Not everything is going to be funded. Asks to not change the program too much because it takes the agencies a while to get there
    - Jonathan Matz: Could we try to see a broader diversity of projects funded and project sized funded?
    - Keith Williams: Thinks that you should let the best projects win. Many projects are waiting to enter the game. Reserve funds for quick build projects. Those projects can potentially be lower in cost and a greater return on investment.
    - Jacob Lieb: Costs are high. Would go for larger projects than smaller
    - Claire Gallogly: large projects are transformational projects. From the side of wanting to justify the program the most impactful projects will be better
    - Maura Twomey: Agrees to doing the large projects. The more we show that there's a huge demand for projects, we need more money. Putting limits does not help fund more projects and damages the project long term.
    - Kendee Vance: A need for a bridge is a restriction in some areas. Caltrans should do a much better job of creating that space. This program has the power to push for Caltrans to plan for future.
    - Quick vote supporting bringing this forward in guidelines or not?
        - In favor – 3
        - Opposed – 16
- Other Guidelines Changes
    - Kendee Vance: Master Agreement. This is large for tribes. Note watch AB630
    - Joel Campos: Proposing idea to be able to increase % or waiving for MPO component. If there is going to be a cap on plans maybe it can be 5% or larger than 2%.
        - CTC will have meeting about this and will discuss it. There is one commissioner who is passionate about this topic. They'll have discussion with TAC later.
- Evaluation Process
    - Issue – small number of evaluators
        - Do not use scoring rubrics
        - Use extraneous information
        - Cannot justify scores using scoring rubrics
    - Proposal – CTC staff can reassign an application to a new team if evaluation process is compromised
    - Can remove people from current/future rounds of evaluation
- Quick-Build Projects
    - Many applicants still submitting small infrastructure projects
        - More education needed quick-build projects
    - Applicants not following guidelines
        - Most 2023 quick-build applications requested environmental and pre-con, despite CON-only funding
    - Need to refine reporting process
    - Proposal
        - Create Quick Build Working Group to:
            - Develop recommendations on strengthening guidelines
            - Assist in planning educational workshop for applicatns

        - Need volunteers from TAC
    - CTC staff oversees reporting
    - Continue having funding cap on quick-builds
    - Volunteers: Jesse Gothan, Ali Doerr Westbrook, Victoria Custodio, Courtney Aguirre SCAG
    - CTC wants to keep doing them, but they need help.
- Bundled Project form Small Communities
    - Potential pilot program to allow regions to bundle projects from small regions into one application
    - Could be a way to alleviate burden on under-resourced applicants
    - Could allow small projects to show more benefits
    - May be difficult to describe benefits across multiple locations in current application
    - May be difficult administratively for Caltrans and the Commission
    - Claire Gallogly: Loves the idea of building the capacity, but this tool is already there and they have the ability to do so. Promoting this as an existing option would be beneficial.
    - Maura Twomey: Be difficult for under sourced region. Administering this would be challenging to do this. Not opposed to this but does not effectively alleviate the burden.
    - Laurie: Fresno County presented this. They were small and it was really hard for them to compete. We thought is they could combine the five communities into one, they could combine the benefits. We might have to do something where they can deliver it differently. This was another way to help the small projects that are important but aren't competing well.
    - Maura: If you have to do the application for them, then they might have the capacity to deliver the projects.
    - Laurie: What if is was phases?
    - Maura: It isn't so much as bundling. If you do that, how to deliver, but phasing could work really well.
    - Cathy McKeon: We have had some discussion in assisting to deliver the projects. We would need more guidance on this. We get a lot of asks for this.
    - Adam Fukushima: Agrees there is a need for this. There would be a problem with the application.
    - Laurie: This might not be a concept that is ready. The program should try different things. We need to keep identifying needs and ways that we can meet those needs. Any project that is discontinuous struggles in the application. Is there some way to help the small communities it was worth looking at.
    - Keith: What is one entity were willing to take on the responsibility to be the lead agency for the bundle of projects for application and delivery. Any reporting that would be needed would go through the lead agency.
    - Everyone can think about this more and TAC can talk about it later.
    - Oona Smith: If someone were to bundle and apply, flag scorers in looking at gaps.
- Other Comments
    - Jesse Gothan: Partnership with ATP
    - Laurie Waters: Discuss meeting in person. A lot of people had to leave for other commitments.

        - Claire: every other in person, or every three. Maura agrees.
        - Maybe one a year would be nice. It doesn't have to be in Sacramento, it can be everywhere.
        - Cathy: potentially send out a survey.
            - We will do a poll through email.
        - Ali: Do a tour while doing a meeting
- Cathy McKeon Announcements
    - Cirillo is new central ATP Program Manager
    - Ali Doerr is the new ATRC Program Manager

Item 4. Closing Updates

Speaker: Michael Hutnick

- Thanks to everyone. Follow up with email.

Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at 4pm