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Active Transportation Resource Team

• Focus Communities: Riverside County & Tulare County
• Training Workshops: June 2017 & April 2018
• Technical Assistance Consultations: 2018
• Webinars: Separated Bikeways (2017); Applying to ATP (2018)
• Supported by The California Endowment

ATRT 2017-18 Program Resources
Agenda

• Welcome + Introductions
• Overview of the Active Transportation Program (ATP)
• Key Changes to ATP Guidelines
• Overview of Application Types
• Lessons Learned from Previous Cycles & Top Tips for Competitive Applications
• Q&A

Introductions

ATP Overview
What is the Active Transportation Program?

- Dedicated funding for walking, biking, trails, and Safe Routes to School projects
- Funded at roughly $223 million annually
- Call for projects every even numbered year, Cycle 4 to open Spring 2018

What Types of Projects are Accepted?

- **Infrastructure**
  - New or improved bikeways/walkways
  - Safe Routes to School/Transit projects
  - Bike Parking
  - Recreational trails/trailheads that improve connections to non-motorized corridors
- **Non-Infrastructure**
  - Safe Routes to School programs
  - Education, encouragement, evaluation, or enforcement programs (not focused on Safe Routes to School)
  - Temporary demonstrations/pop up events
- **Plans**
  - Community-wide walk, bike, SRTS, or active transportation plans in a disadvantaged community

Who Can Apply?

- Local, Regional, or State Agencies
- Transit Agencies
- Public Schools or School Districts
- Tribal Governments (Federally-recognized)
- Private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations may apply for Recreational Trail Projects only
ATP Statutory Goals

- Increasing walking and biking for transportation
- Improve safety for people walking and biking
- Reduce vehicle use and greenhouse gas emissions
- Enhance public health and reduce childhood obesity
- Ensure benefits to disadvantaged communities

Competitive Funding Opportunities

- Statewide Competition (Administered by CTC)
- Regional Competitions (Administered by Large MPOs)
- Small Urban/Rural Competition (Administered by CTC)

Current ATP Funding Sources

- State Highway Account (SHA)
- Other Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSP) or STBGP
- Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RRMA, or SB 1)
- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, Transportation Alternatives Set Aside (STBGP-TAP)
SB 1 Impact

ATP Cycle 3
$264 mn

ATP Cycle 4
$446 million

*$100 million is reserved in FY21-22 and FY22-23 for ATP Cycle 5

SB 1 Impact

$ in Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Cycle 3</th>
<th>Cycle 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available Funding
Requested Funding

ATP Cycle 4 Timeline

May 16 • Guidelines Adoption
May 16 • State Call for Projects Opens
Jul 31 • State Call for Project Closes
Dec 31 • Staff Recommendations: Statewide + Small Urban/Rural

See Page 2 of Guidelines for Full Timeline
Active Transportation Resource Team

Key Guidelines Changes

- 4 year Programming Cycle
- Transformative Project Language
  - Commission encourages projects that provide a transformative benefit to a community or a region
  - In future cycles, Commission may elect to fund one or more large transformative projects

http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/

Key Guidelines Changes

- Start Up Non-Infrastructure Language/Definition
  - Commission intends to focus funding on start-up projects
  - Project is considered start-up when no program currently exists
- Public Health added to statement of need
- Disadvantaged Community (DAC) Definition Revisions

http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/
**DAC Definition Revisions**

- **Same**
  - Federally Recognized Tribes
  - Quantitative Assessment of Income

- **Updated**
  - < 80% Statewide Median Household Income (<$51,026)
    - Can use census block or place data for smaller or unincorporated communities
  - ≥ Top 25% CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Scores (≥ 39.34)
  - ≥ 75% Participation in Free or Reduced Price Meal Program

- **Changed**
  - Regional Definitions: Must be developed through public process and approved by CTC

**Key Guidelines Changes**

- **5 application types**
  - Plans
  - Non-Infrastructure
  - Small Infrastructure (total cost < $1.5M)
  - Medium Infrastructure (b/w $1.5M – $7M)
  - Large Infrastructure (total cost > $7M)

http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/

**Overview of Application Types**

Active Transportation Resource Team
Overview of Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modified Questions</th>
<th>New Question</th>
<th>Potential Deductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
<td>Statement of Need</td>
<td>Partnering with Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Context Sensitive/Innovation</td>
<td>Past Poor Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>Transformative Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope/Plan Consistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Infrastructure/Plan Specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Plains

---

Plan Application

**Eligible Plans:**
- Bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan that encompasses or is predominantly located in a disadvantaged community
- Up to 2% of the statewide competitive funding and small urban and rural; Large MPOs can set aside up to 2% of funding for Plans in DACs
- Appendix A of Guidelines – Guidance for plans, list of components that must be included
Plan Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode Share</th>
<th>Non-Infrastructure</th>
<th>Prioritization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/ Destinations</td>
<td>Collision Analysis</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Equity Analysis</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</th>
<th>30 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Map of DAC boundaries + project area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification of DAC Census tracts + selection of DAC qualifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% DACs in Plan Area (0-15 Points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity (0-15 Points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</th>
<th>30 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority for New Plans v. Updates</td>
<td>0 to 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Need</td>
<td>0 to 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
<td>0 to 25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation + Plan Development</td>
<td>0 to 25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Performance on Caltrans Grants</td>
<td>-10 to 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</th>
<th>30 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Map of DAC boundaries + project area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification of DAC Census tracts + selection of DAC qualifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% DACs in Plan Area (0-15 Points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity (0-15 Points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plan Application

#### State Priority

**10 Points**
- Applicant has no master plan: 10 points
- Applicant has one master plan type but not the other: 7 points
- Applicant updating master plan older than 5 years: 4 points
- Applicant updating master plan less than 5 years old: 1 point

#### Statement of Need

**10 Points**
- Qualitative discussion of need + how plan would address need described
- Encouraged to discuss specific + local public health concerns

#### Public Participation

**25 Points**
- Who (5 points)
- How (15 points)
- Continued Engagement/Updates (5 points)
Plan Application

**Implementation**

25 Points

- Discussion of Implementation Strategies (10 points)

- 22-Plan Document (15 points)

Plan Application – 22-Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Plan Document</td>
<td>Includes...</td>
<td>02/22</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Application

Resources

- Cal Bike Statewide Plan Inventory
  http://www.calbike.org/bike_ped_plan_inventory

- Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html
Non-Infrastructure

Eligible Projects:
- Education, encouragement, evaluation, and enforcement activities that further the goals of the ATP
- Non-infrastructure programs DO NOT have to be SRTS focused
- Can be start-up programs and new or expanded components of existing programs; cannot fund existing or ongoing program operations
- Commission priority on start-up programs; all NI must demonstrate program sustainability

Non-Infrastructure Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Points Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
<td>0 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Need</td>
<td>0 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
<td>0 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation + Sustainability</td>
<td>0 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Program Elements</td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Scope + Implementation</td>
<td>0 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with Conservation Corps</td>
<td>-5 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Performance on Caltrans Grants</td>
<td>-10 to 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 Total Possible Points
Non-Infrastructure Application

**Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities**

**10 Points**
- Screening Criteria
  - Map of DAC boundaries + project area
  - Identification of DAC Census tracts + selection of DAC qualifier
- Direct Benefit to DACs (0-4 Points)
- Project Located within DAC (0-2 points)
- Severity (0-4 Points)

Non-Infrastructure Application

**Statement of Need**

**40 Points**
- Screening Criteria
  - Current/Estimated Counts
- Qualitative discussion of community’s needs (20 points)
- Discussion of how plan would address need described (20 points)
- Encouraged to discuss specific + local public health concerns

Non-Infrastructure Application

**Safety**

**10 Points**
- Screening Criteria
  - Collision Data (quantitative or qualitative)
- Discussion of Project Area Collision History (10 points)
- Encouraged to use UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS ATP Tool
## Non-Infrastructure Application

**Public Participation**
- 15 Points
  - Who + How (5 points)
  - Continued Engagement/Implementation (10 points)

## Non-Infrastructure Application

**Evaluation/Sustainability**
- 10 Points
  - Program Effectiveness (5 points)
  - Program Sustainability (5 points)

## Non-Infrastructure Application

**Innovative Elements**
- 5 Points
  - Elements new to the region
  - Use of recognized best practices
### Non-Infrastructure Application

#### Scope/Implementation

**10 Points**
- Completion of 22-R Document

---

### Non-Infrastructure Application

#### Resources

- **Active Transportation Safety Program**
  (California Dept. of Public Health)  
  atsp@cdph.ca.gov

---

### Break
Infrastructure

• Application type will depend on **total project cost**
  • Small INF (total cost <$1.5M)
  • Medium INF (b/w $1.5M-$7M)
  • Large INF (total cost >$7M)

• Larger projects will have more sub-questions/requirements

Small Infrastructure Application

100 Total Possible Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-53</td>
<td>Statement of Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Scope/Plan Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Partnering with Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Poor Performance on Past Caltrans Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Medium Infrastructure Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Range</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 43</td>
<td>Statement of Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 25</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>Context Sensitive Bike/Walkways &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>Leveraging Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>Scope/Plan Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5 to 0</td>
<td>Partnering with Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10 to 0</td>
<td>Poor Performance on Past Caltrans Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**100 Total Possible Points**

### Large Infrastructure Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Range</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 18</td>
<td>Statement of Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 20</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>Context Sensitive Bike/Walkways &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>Transformative Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>Cost Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>Leveraging Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>Scope/Plan Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5 to 0</td>
<td>Partnering with Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10 to 0</td>
<td>Poor Performance on Past Caltrans Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**100 Total Possible Points**
### Large Infrastructure Application

- **Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities**: 0 to 10 points
- **Statement of Need**: 0 to 38 points
- **Safety**: 0 to 20 points
- **Public Participation & Planning**: 0 to 10 points
- **Context Sensitive Bike/Walkways & Innovation**: 0 to 5 points
- **Transformative Projects**: 0 to 5 points
- **Cost Effective**: 0 to 5 points
- **Leveraging Funds**: 0 to 5 points
- **Scope/Plan Consistency**: -5 to 0 points
- **Partnering with Conservation Corps**: -10 to 0 points
- **Poor Performance on Past Caltrans Grants**: -10 to 0 points

**100 Total Possible Points**

### Infrastructure Applications

#### Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities
- **10 Points**
  - **Screening Criteria**
    - Map of DAC boundaries + project area
    - Identification of DAC Census tracts + selection of DAC qualifier
  - **Direct Benefit to DACs** (0-4 Points)
    - Med/Large INF: Physical Access + Documentation of DAC resident Support/Request
  - **Project Located within DAC** (0-2 points)
  - **Severity** (0-4 Points)

#### Statement of Need
- **38 (L), 43 (M), 53 (S) or Points**
  - **Screening Criteria**
    - Current/Estimated Counts
  - **Qualitative discussion of community’s needs**
  - **Discussion of how plan would address need described**
  - **Encouraged to discuss specific + local public health concerns**
Infrastructure Applications

Documenting and Estimating Bicyclists and Pedestrians

ATP Application
• Strengthen statement of need (data required, not scored)
• Build measures into project design
  • Include counters in project cost, use for ongoing data collection
  • Manual counts – utilize volunteers to engage community

ATP Final Reporting
• Post-project counts required

Build Support and Secure Funding:
• Raise awareness of impact of walking/biking projects
• Gain support from elected officials and key stakeholders
• Improve grant applications

Sources of Existing Bicyclist and Pedestrian Count Data

- U.S. Census and American Community Survey (ACS) – commute trips by mode
- Metropolitan Planning Organization / Regional Transportation Planning Agency, Congestion Management Agency (CMA), local jurisdiction
  • Bicycle/pedestrian plan
  • Bicycle/pedestrian count program
  • Travel forecasting models
  • Transportation corridor studies
  • Environmental Impact Reports (EIR)

Data collection method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Counts people</th>
<th>Counts people</th>
<th>Observational data in g.</th>
<th>Personal data in g.</th>
<th>Background preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual counts in real time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual counts based on cameras</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic tubes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile automated counters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent automated counters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Useful Bicycle/Pedestrian Count Resources

- Go Counter app – iOS or Android app for collecting manual counts with smart phone/tablet

Infrastructure Applications

Safety

- 25 (S, M) or 20 (L) Points
  - Screening Criteria
    - Collision Data (quantitative or qualitative)
  - Discussion of Project Area Collision History
  - Discussion of Safety Countermeasures
  - Encouraged to use UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS ATP Tool

TIMS ATP Tool

- tims.berkeley.edu/tools/atp/
  - Produces 3 main outputs to attach to application
    - Collision Heat Map
    - Project Area Collision Map
    - Collision Summaries/Reports
  - Aids in presentation and analysis of collision data
Infrastructure Applications

TIMS ATP Tool

10 Points

- Community-Based Public Participation Process
- Discussion of Stakeholders
- Continued Engagement
- Med + Large INF:
  - Discussion of Feedback
  - Analysis of alternatives
- Large INF
  - Documentation of Outreach/Engagement
  - Listed in adopted transportation Plan
## Infrastructure Applications

### Scope/Plan Consistency

**2 Points**
- Evaluation of consistency between application narrative, project scope, and project plans

### Context Sensitive + Innovation

**5 Points**
- Med + Large INF ONLY
  - Context Sensitive Walkways/Bikeways
  - Innovative Project Elements

### Leveraging Funds

**5 Points**
- Med + Large INF ONLY
  - Sliding scale based on funds brought to table
  - In-kind staff funding does not qualify
Infrastructure Applications

Transformative
5 Points
• Large INF ONLY

• Qualitative discussion of transformative nature of project

Cost Effectiveness
5 Points
• Large INF ONLY

• Qualitative discussion of safety/mobility benefit compared to total project cost and the funds provided

• Quantitative approach allowed

• Best use of State Resources

Examples from Successful Applications
Infrastructure Applications

Resources

• Caltrans Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC)
  http://caatpresources.org/
  • Upcoming Flash Training Webinars

• National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project
  http://bikepeddocumentation.org/

• UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS ATP Tool
  https://tims.berkeley.edu/tools/atp/

Lessons Learned from Previous Cycles
The best applications demonstrate:

1. Proposed projects meet the goals of the ATP
2. Multiple sectors and various stakeholders were consulted
3. Data gathered is meaningful, legitimate, based on target community, presented clearly and understandably
4. Employed a wide range of outreach and engagement strategies in developing their project

Lessons Learned From Previous Cycles

Tips for Success

1. Read instructions, guidelines, and scoring rubrics carefully – start now!
2. Focus application efforts on questions with largest amount of points – but don’t neglect any question
3. Learn from the winners – 3 Cycles worth of high scoring projects to review that may be similar to what you are proposing http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/
4. Incorporate best practices, innovation, connectivity, transformative approaches – not yesterday’s strategies

Additional Resources
Resources

- Active Transportation Resource Team
  - https://www.lgc.org/atrt/
- Caltrans Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC)
  - http://caatpresources.org/
  - Upcoming Flash Training Webinars
- ATRT TA Consultations
  - For DACs in Riverside or Tulare Counties
  - Contact Barry Bergman, barry@railstotrails.org
- Strategic Growth Council Pilot CCI ATP TA
  - In-Depth TA for 3-5 DACs
  - Survey Due April 6:
    - https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ATPtechnicalassistance
- Cal Walks ATP Application Guidance
  - One-on-one assistance for DACs in Central Valley, North State, North Coast, or San Bernardino County
  - Contact Esther Postiglione, esther@californiawalks.org

Active Transportation Resource Team

Questions?

Infrastructure Applications

Statement of Need

Model Answer
Infrastructure Applications

Public Participation

Model Answer

Network efforts began in early 2016, and continued through March 2017. Efforts included residents-led Take a Walk Campaign, which went from 112 to 30 public sessions between residents. In 2017, residents organized a "Make Jefferson Blue" awareness rally to raise visibility on safety improvements.

In 2015, 2016, and 2017 residents participated in the neighborhood clean-up on Make Jefferson Blue! Tree Planting and Neighborhood Cleanup events. Residents created a social media presence to share concerns and informative updates. Desert Sun Community Partnership (DCP), conducted public education workshops for school students and school staff on the Make Jefferson Beautiful campaign.

In June 2016, residents held two community meetings in June 2016 to discuss traffic and safety concerns on the Jefferson Boulevard, and voting for preferred improvements.

In June 2016, residents and city officials discussed the Jefferson Boulevard application to the City's traffic study and final design.
Infrastructure Applications

Model Answer

Public Participation

This is a brief writing, close-list comment that states being connected. The omission is clearly tied to being in a relatively negative comment that states the case for their safety. Similar shared denominator stories of humility experienced due to lack of adequate routes & safety concerns. However, they are internally guided & reachable, as part of the planning process. The primary focus of the project is to not just build a connection path, however, it is a result of all the components & elements of the master plan, a few key points to look at how we could incorporate more safety features. Additional features include crosswalk upgrades, street lighting, & e-design safety warning devices, making the project more effective for safety.

The rubber-bird engagement process has been invaluable in helping the County understand how residents and other users interact with the built environment in the Forever Park neighborhood and how best to accommodate those needs. For example, the County learned that, while one of the initial rubber birds advocated solely for streetcar use, the majority of point-counting lump onto rerouting routes in other areas of the City and found. Much of the rubber bird feedback was focused on specific, existing problems in the area where the project would be built. Around the central area in the district, the rubber bird feedback was focused on improving the connection from the County to the Forever Park Community (e.g., light rail, bus service, etc.). A number of rubber birds were also focused on creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment, across the multiple intersections currently being improved. Above, there are all of these elements have been incorporated into the overall design and will serve to increase the safety and efficiency for users, compared with the patchy.

Infrastructure Applications

Model Answer

Public Participation

As part of the bonding for public road construction phases of the city, additional rubber bird events will be conducted as part of the design process, which is anticipated to be an essential process focused on continuing to work with key property owners, Bike & Car Routes, Walk Oakland Bikes, Inc. (TOB), and GNCL.

Drawing from the success of the Topcon/Green Street Plan implementation, which included the City of Oakland's first parking-protected bike lane, the City plans to work with local business and building owners to develop this project, engaging property owners, and conduct business improvement districts to organize a similar “intervention” during project construction of the 10th Street. Such interest in the City project. This strategy is essential to providing advance notification of the project implementation and pre-implementation education, particularly given the dynamic nature of city design changes planned for 10th Street.