



**Fresno Council
of Governments**

Cycle 8

**2027 REGIONAL COMPETITIVE ACTIVE
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM**

SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION

Due Date: November 18, 2026

SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applications will be screened for eligibility. Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible based on the guidelines and if the project application is incomplete. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition, but deemed eligible for the regional program, will be considered.

In addition to the statewide ATP application form, applicants applying for the regional competitive ATP must complete this supplemental application. If you did not submit an application to the statewide competitive ATP, your project will not be eligible for the Regional (MPO) competition. If a project is not funded at the Statewide level:

- It automatically moves into consideration for the Regional competition.
- The applicant may submit a supplemental application to:
 - Down-scope the project (reduce cost/size), or
 - Provide a scalability plan (identify what can be built if partial funding is awarded).

All project sizes (small, medium, and large) remain eligible for Regional consideration. However, due to limited regional funding and the use of the small infrastructure scoring rubric, projects that are smaller in scale or that include clearly defined phasing or scalability may be more competitive.

Infrastructure projects will be scored following the statewide ATP scoring rubrics for the [small infrastructure application](#), except where points differ from the statewide ATP, scores will follow the rubrics shown in this application. Additional information on the Fresno COG regional competitive ATP and application materials is available at: <https://www.fresnocog.org/project/active-transportation-program-atp/>.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Applicant Agency: _____

Project Title (must match Caltrans ATP application project name if applicable): _____

Project Application Number (must match Caltrans ATP application if applicable): _____

ATP \$ Requested: _____

Total Project Cost: _____

Was this project submitted to the statewide competitive ATP? Y / N _____

Are you altering your application for the regional ATP? Y/N _____

If yes, what are you altering? (check all that apply).

- Adding leveraging funding to maximize regional ATP criteria points
- Scaling project to meet the encouraged maximum funding award request of less than \$3.5m. If checked, please complete the scalability plan information.
- Requesting pre-construction funding only including PA&ED, PS&E, and/or ROW.

If you are altering your application, the implementing agency will be required to submit an updated PPR including the updated scope and financial plans at minimum. Additional information may be requested.

REGIONALLY SCALED OPTIONS

Agencies are allowed to phase or segment a project for the Regional ATP if the project was submitted to the statewide ATP to meet our encouraged maximum funding award request. The agency must show that the project phase or segment submitted for consideration in the Regional ATP is a functional segment and meets all eligibility requirements for ATP funding. If the project is selected in the regional ATP based on the scalability plan, the implementing agency will be required to submit an updated PPR including the updated scope and financial plans. Additional documents may be requested by Caltrans, the Commission or Fresno COG, to reflect the awarded phase or segmented project. An agency may also choose to request pre-construction phases only in the regional ATP.

Please provide the scalability plan, if applicable.

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Scaled ATP Funding Request | \$ |
| Scaled Total Project Cost | \$ |

The scalability plan should include updated scope, benefits, and funding plan, and the updated financial plan.

REGIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

LEVERAGING (3 points)

No local match is required. Points will be based on the amount of non-ATP funding pledged to the project. If the project application has been altered to maximize regional ATP points, an updated PPR is required. The Commission will only consider cash funds for leveraging. Pre-construction phases funded by the local agency will be considered for leveraging even if the funds were expended before the application deadline. Previous ATP funds do not quality.

- Project is requesting 100% ATP funds
- Project is leveraging non-ATP funds as shown in the PPR
 - Total Project Cost: \$ _____
 - Total ATP Funding Request: \$ _____
 - Total Non-ATP Funding (if applicable): \$ _____

| Points | Amount Leveraged |
|----------|---|
| 1 Point | More than 11.47% to 15% of total project cost |
| 2 Points | More than 15% to 20% of total project cost |
| 3 Points | More than 20% of total project cost |

CONSISTENCY WITH FCOG ADOPTED 2022 RTP OR ADOPTED ATP PLAN (1 point)

Please attach documentation highlighting the project listing on the adopted plan.

- Project is consistent with Fresno COG’s adopted 2022 RTP, Fresno COG’s Regional Active Transportation Plan or an adopted local Active Transportation Plan including Bicycle/Pedestrian, Master Trails, Vision Zero, or Safe Routes to School Plans.

RTP Constrained List Link 2022 RTP: [Appendix-C Transportation-and-Land-Use_Final_062122.pdf \(planfresno.com\)](#)

Regional ATP Link (Appendix D): [Appendix-D Public-Participation-Review-and-Adoption_Final_081122.pdf \(planfresno.com\)](#)

- Project is NOT on an adopted plan (0 Points)

ATTACHMENTS

Council/Board resolution of local support

FRESNO COG REGIONAL SCORING CRITERIA AND SCORING RUBRICS

| | Scoring Topic | Infrastructure or Infrastructure/ Non-Infrastructure Applications | Plan Application | Non-Infrastructure Only Application |
|----|--|---|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. | Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) | 6 | 30 | 10 |
| B. | Need | 50 | 20 | 40 |
| C. | Safety | 25 | | 10 |
| D. | Public Participation & Planning | 10 | 25 | 15 |
| E. | Scope and Plan Layout Consistency and Cost Effectiveness | | | |
| F. | Scope and Plan Layout Consistency | 5 | | 10 |
| G. | Implementation & Plan Development | | 25 | |
| H. | Context Sensitive & Innovation | | | 5 |
| I. | Transformative Projects | | | |
| J. | Evaluation and Sustainability | | | 10 |
| K. | Leveraging | 3 | | |
| L. | Corps (0 or -5) | 0 or -5 | | 0 or -5 |
| M. | Past Performance (0 to -10) | 0 to -10 | 0 to -10 | 0 to -10 |
| N. | Consistency with FCOG adopted 2022 RTP or adopted ATP Plan | 1 | | |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

STATEWIDE ATP SCORING RUBRICS

[2027 ATP Small Infrastructure Project Application Scoring Rubric \(PDF\)](#)

[2027 ATP Non-Infrastructure Project Application Scoring Rubric \(PDF\)](#)

[2027 ATP Plan Project Application Scoring Rubric \(PDF\)](#)

FRESNO COG SCORING RUBRICS

The following rubrics will be used by the Fresno COG Regional Scoring Committee based on the information provided in the Caltrans ATP application for the Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities, Need and Scope and Plan Layout Consistency categories.

Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities (6 Points)

Severity (0-4 Points)

| Points | Median Household Income (MHI) Statewide MHI = \$99,122, 80% = \$79,297.60 | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| 0 Points | Greater than 80% of the statewide MHI | \$79,297.60 or greater |
| 1 Point | 75% through <80% of the statewide MHI | \$74,341.50 to \$79,297.59 |
| 2 Points | 70% through <75% of the statewide MHI | \$69,385.40 to \$74,341.49 |
| 3 Points | 65% through <70% of the statewide MHI | \$64,429.30 to 69,385.39 |
| 4 Points | Less than 65% of the statewide MHI | \$64,429.29 or less |
| Points | CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Criteria | |
| 0 Points | Above 25% most disadvantaged | less than 40.05 |
| 1 Point | 20% through 25% most disadvantaged | 40.05 through 43.38 |
| 2 Points | 15% through < 20% most disadvantaged | 43.39 through 47.54 |
| 3 Points | 10% through < 15% most disadvantaged | 47.55 through 51.98 |
| 4 Points | < 10% most disadvantaged | 51.98 through 93.18 |
| Points | National School Lunch Program Free or Reduced-Price Meals Percentage | |
| 0 Points | Less than 75% of students receive free or reduced lunches | |
| 1 Point | ≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches | |
| 2 Points | > 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches | |
| 3 Points | > 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches | |
| 4 Points | > 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches | |
| Points | Healthy Places Index 3.0 Score* | |
| 0 Points | Healthy Places Index Score above 25 th Percentile | |
| 1 Point | Healthy Places Index Score 20 th through 25 th Percentile | |
| 2 Points | Healthy Places Index Score 15 th through <20 th Percentile | |
| 3 Points | Healthy Places Index Score 10 th through <15 th Percentile | |
| 4 Points | Healthy Places Index Score <10 th Percentile | |

*Healthy Places Index Score inputted should only be the overall HPI Score. Other indicator numbers can be discussed in the narrative, but only the overall percentile can be used for Disadvantaged Communities qualification.

Project Location (0-2 Points)

| Points | Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project is located within a DAC. |
|----------|---|
| 2 Points | Project location(s) are/is fully (100%) located within a DAC. |
| 1 Point | Project location(s) are/is partially (less than 100%) within a DAC. |
| 0 Points | None of the project location(s) are/is within a DAC. |

Need (50 Points)

A. Statement of Project need (0-26 Points)

| Points | Applicant's ability to demonstrate a specific active transportation need. |
|--------------|---|
| 19-24 Points | <p>The application compellingly demonstrates "need" in the project area, and documents all of the following in a clear narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • data showing the local health concerns, including a comparison to statewide health data AND if applicable • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For NI components – the need for the education,encouragement and/or enforcement program |
| 13-18 Points | <p>The application duly demonstrates "need" in the project area, and documents: only 2 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • data showing the local health concerns, (does it include a comparison to statewide and/or countywide health data?), AND if applicable • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For I/NI projects – is the NI component duly discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program. |
| 7-12 Points | <p>The application somewhat demonstrates "need" in the project area, and documents only 1 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • Local health concerns AND if applicable • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component somewhat discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program. |
| 1-6 Points | <p>The application minimally demonstrates "need" in the project area, and partially documents 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • Local heath concerns AND if applicable • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component minimally discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program. |
| 0 Points | <p>The application does not demonstrate "need" in any way in the project area in any of the three areas of need, and there is no mention of the need of the disadvantaged community and there is no mention of the NI program (if applicable).</p> |

| Points | Applicant's ability to demonstrate the active transportation needs of STUDENTS. |
|----------|--|
| 2 Points | The application addresses the active transportation needs of students |
| 0 Points | The application does not address or mention the active transportation needs of students |

B. Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need: (0-24 points)

| Points | Applicant's ability to make a case that the project will address need for active transportation. |
|--------------|---|
| 18-23 Points | <p>The application clearly and convincingly demonstrates that the project will best address the active transportation need presented in part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community. |
| 11-17 Points | <p>The application demonstrates that the project will address the active transportation need presented in part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community. |
| 5-10 Points | <p>The application somewhat demonstrates that the project will address the active transportation need presented in part A by: (at least 1 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community. |
| 1-4 Points | <p>The application minimally demonstrates that the project may address the active transportation need presented in part A by: (partially 1 or more of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community. |
| 0 Points | The application did not demonstrate the project would address the need presented in Part A. |

| Points | Applicant's ability to make a case that the proposal that will increase the number of active transportation trips accomplished by STUDENTS. |
|----------|---|
| 1 Point | The project will increase the proportion of student trips accomplished by Active transportation |
| 0 Points | The project will not increase the proportion of student trips accomplished by active transportation |

Scope and Plan Layout Consistency (5 Points)

If your project was altered for the regional ATP, consistency with the scalability plan will also be taken into consideration.

| Points | Evaluating Layouts/Maps |
|----------|---|
| 2 Points | The submitted layouts/maps are complete and clear and provide sufficient detail to determine the full scope of the proposed project. |
| 0 Points | The submitted layouts/maps are poorly developed or vague in outlining the various elements of the proposed project, or the applicant failed. |

| Points | Evaluating Engineer's Estimate |
|----------|---|
| 2 Points | The submitted estimate is thorough and consistent with the proposed scope elements and phases of the proposed project. |
| 0 Points | The applicant failed to provide an estimate that matches the proposed elements, and it is clear the project is not cost-effective. |

| Points | Evaluating the Project Schedule |
|----------|---|
| 1 Point | The submitted schedule fully incorporates all project phases and provides adequate time to complete the phases (PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, CON and CON-NI). |
| 0 Points | The submitted schedule failed to incorporate all necessary phases and/or does not provide adequate time to complete the phases (PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, CON and CON-NI). |