

Active Transportation Program-Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
 Thursday, November 12, 2015
 9:30AM – 4:00PM

CSU Sacramento, Modoc Hall, Suite 3

Attendees: Laurel Janssen, April Nitsos, Laurie Waters, Ted Davini, Teresa McWilliam, Kevin Atkinson, Tamy Quigley, Rose Agacer, David Cohen, Kate White, Steve Castleberry, Joel Goldberg, Daryl Grigsby, Sarah Jepson, Dan Little, Sarkes Khachek, Melissa Garza, Jerry Barton, Chad Riding, Will Ridder, Tony Dang, Oona Smith, Jeanie Ward-Waller, Eric Bruins, Chanell Fletcher, Jeanne LePage, Robert Chavez, Meredith Lee, Jim Townsend, Darold Heikens,

By Phone: Michele Hasson, Kenneth Ryan, Nicola (Last name unknown), Daisy Ramirez

LEGEND

- Comments
- Responses

Time	Topic	Lead(s)
9:30AM	<i>Introductions, expectations and objectives for the TAC</i>	April Laurel
9:45AM	<i>Committee Introductions</i>	All
10:15AM	<p><i>General ATP Status Update: Cycle 1, 2 & 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle 2 Program was recently adopted, and adopting the MPO component soon • Receiving input and preparing for January working group workshops on the guidelines and application • Fund estimate is anticipated to remain the same for the next two years, depending on budget • Adoption of guidelines and call for solicitation is anticipated for March of 2016, and applications due June 1 <p>Cycle Timeline Answers to Member Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The law requires adoption of April 1 of the odd years • Eventually, every other year is when cycles will occur • There has been a lot of discussion about an early look at applications to ensure we aren't evaluating ineligible projects 	Laurie
10:30AM	<p><i>General Status Updates:</i></p> <p>ATP Cycle 1 Programmed & Allocated Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report developed tracking projects programmed vs. allocated • Due to projects straddling 2 FYs, the report focused on project phases. i.e. PA&ED, PS&E, RW and CON • In FY14/15, 74% of the project received their allocation. The remaining, have received time extensions • No projects is completed to date • In FY15/16, agencies have until June 30th of 2016 to request allocation, therefore very few have received allocations • Agencies work through Caltrans Local Assistance Staff, Caltrans district staff assist agencies through with program requirements 	Jaime Teresa

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time extension requests need to document justification for delay; reasons vary by project, by phase and by type (allocation, expenditure, contact award) • ATP goal is for 100% delivery • Some lapsed funds are due to agencies opting to use local funding • If there are delays, they must document justification • Cycle 2: MPO list is out and April's team will be reaching out after lists are adopted <p>Cycle 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caltrans is working with IT to create an online application but a deadline of March may not allow time to incorporate until Cycle 4. Guidelines drive the application, and if those aren't approved until March, the application won't be final in time for IT 	
10:45AM	<p><i>Review and Comment on the Final "Draft" of the TAC-Charter</i></p> <p>Mission & Purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charter-Mission/Goals need more reference to recreational trails: Outcome – Maintain a pure list of high-level goals within the mission and consider inserting rec trails elsewhere <p>Desired Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should "local agencies" be changed to "applicants" or "project sponsors and partners"? • Missing a bullet regarding monitoring • Should "future calls" be re-phrased as "program priorities" • Should include "effective in meeting the needs of the community" • Should include a connection to CA funding, making the pie bigger is a good goal...something like "supports efforts to..." <p>Frequency of Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcommittees may seek outside expertise with the approval of the co-chairs • When a member is missing multiple meetings in a row, an alternate/replacement should be proposed, or the co-chairs may designate one • Meetings will normally be held in Sacramento • The org-chart should be attached to the charter <p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group is divided on adding more members, moving forward as is to see how it accommodates • For some the TAC is large enough; if more representation is needed for a position – consider it for a subcommittee • Meeting notes will be posted for the public 	Ted All
1:00PM	<p><i>Roundtable Discussion on Cycle 2</i></p> <p>Application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants should submit their part A of an application to the Caltrans District Local Assistance Office for review prior to submitting for evaluation • Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning is working with a consultant to address concerns on the B/C Tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All B/C Tool comments should go to rose.agacer@dot.ca.gov • Perhaps there should be a different application for non-infrastructure projects • How can non-infrastructure projects be more competitive <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluator training was insufficient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There were experts available yet hardly any were used • In general, the commission wants to see concrete on the ground, and that's their bias • May ask the big work group about recommending to separate the programs 	Laurie

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common theme between incident data and public health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Needs more “project-area specific” or “localized” to the incident, directing applicants to show how they are going to deal with the issue at hand • Kevin Atkinson is working to update the Safe Routes to School mapping program 	
1:30PM	<p><i>Discussion on the Potential for Making Changes for Cycle 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application size and complexity is an issue • Moving the timeline out, gives time to get the application online <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cycle timelines are mandated by legislature • 	Laurel Laurie
2:00PM	<p><i>Topic Introduction: Eligible vs. Ineligible Items</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caltrans is seeking guidance on how to make this program fund the best projects with the most need • Justification should be necessary for some types of trees and how many are suggested • Justification should be necessary for certain questionable types ineligible items (trees, lighting, fencing, etc.) • There’s room for generally agreed upon eligible and ineligible items • Main items considered for restriction are enhancement and replacement items • More training is needed to educate communities on eligible projects/items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training was provided for cycles 1 and 2 but the attendance was unfortunately low ○ Webinars are in discussion to increase attendance • Eligibility is not the issue, safety should be the issue • Eligibility should be limited so applicants don’t apply for undoable projects • Project elements shouldn’t be the question if it’s contributing in the best possible manner • Calculating mode shift is often a made up number <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreed, a better calculation is needed ○ Major goal is to focus on application and questions • Can we give consideration to project sponsors who are bringing in funded enhancement features but the core ATP investment is really functional. Give them a point or two if local funding can help enhance 	April Ted Teresa
3:30PM	<p><i>Overall Expectations for Upcoming TAC Meetings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for the Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC) • Use of Funds • Application and Guidelines • Subcommittees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If meeting, let April and Laurel know ○ Send proposed subcommittee information to Mary Hartegan 	Ted
3:50PM	<p><i>Next Meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibly the week of December 14-18 	April
4:00PM	<i>End of Meeting</i>	

Action Items

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Consider options for expanding the Cycle 3 timeline ➤ More detailed report on Project Delivery ➤ Develop lists for ineligible and low-priority items (I & NI) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Develop component cost/ranges for major eligible items, consider design tips ➤ Update on ATRC ➤ Update on conversion of application to web-base |
|---|---|