



**VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (VCTC)
CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/
SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
(CTAC/SSTAC)**

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2011 -- 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

County Government Center - Hall of Justice
Cafeteria Pacific Meeting Room
800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura 93003

Item # 1.	Call to Order	Action
Item # 2.	Self Introductions	Information
Item # 3.	Public Comments for Items <u>Not</u> on the Agenda	Information
Item # 4.	Approval of 4/12/11 Meeting Summary	Action
Item # 5.	Ranking of FY 11/12 Bicycle/Pedestrian Fund Requests – Mary Travis, VCTC Staff (Additional copies of the request packet will be available at the meeting)	Action
Item # 6.	Update on Countywide Human Transportation Services and Transit Services Coordination Plan – Vic Kamhi, VCTC Staff	Information
Item # 7.	Update on Ventura County Regional Transit Study - Vic Kamhi, VCTC Staff	Information
Item # 8	Chairman's Report	Information
Item # 9.	Staff Report	Information
Item #10.	Committee Member Reports	Information
Item # 11.	Adjournment	Action

NOTE CHANGE: The next meeting will be Tuesday, June 7th - same time and place!

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if special assistance is needed to participate in a Commission meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (805) 642-1591 ext 101. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to meeting time will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility at the meeting.

Item # 4
Action

CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
April 12, 2011

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by chair Jim White at 1:35 PM.

Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members and audience introduced themselves.

Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS (for items not on agenda)

There were no public comments.

Item # 4 MARCH 8, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was reviewed and approved after a correction was made to the meeting date.

**Item # 5 REVIEW OF FY 11/12 CITY/COUNTY REQUESTS FOR TRANSPORTATION
DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FUNDS**

The Committee briefly reviewed the projects under discussion, which will be ranked at the May meeting. Mary Travis, VCTC staff, reported that there is enough money to support all requests but the projects will be ranked just in case the money doesn't materialize as expected.

A discussion took place about the funds that will be left over this year and how they could be spent or carried over. Travis noted the TDA regulations allow the Commission to determine if they want to spend the money in another way, carry it over to next year's Article 3 program, or, carry it over to the general TDA fund. Further discussion about this leftover money will take place at the May meeting.

**Item # 6 FY 11/12 DRAFT FINDINGS FROM THE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC
HEARING**

Because Transit Director Vic Kamhi could not be at the meeting, Mary Travis reviewed the draft findings and discussed the legal as contrasted to practical purpose for the annual public hearing. While a State requirement, it has also become a very useful annual review of local transit plans and proposals. She also discussed how a finding of "no unmet transit needs" could be coupled with several recommendations for operational and study efforts.

Because there questions about both the Human Transportation Services and Transit Coordination plans noted in the draft findings, the Committee requested Transit Director Kamhi make a presentation to the group at the May meeting. After further discussion, the draft findings were approved.

Item # 5 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chair White thanked everyone who visited the Article 3 request sites and urged people to contact the cities/county if there were any questions about the projects.

Item # 6 STAFF REPORT

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, mentioned that the TDA funding picture looks much better in the upcoming year than it has for the past two.

Item # 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

Representative Bravo mentioned ongoing problems with street funding in Santa Paula.

Representative Hurlock asked for an update on the ongoing Transit Services Plan, this will be added to the May agenda.

Representative Morris noted some upcoming transit meetings; she will forward info about them to VCTC staff who will send it along to committee members.

Item # 8 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

May 12, 2011

TO: CTAC/SSTAC
FROM: VCTC STAFF
SUBJECT: RANK THE FY 11/12 APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION:

- Using the adopted criteria, rank the applications from cities/County for FY 11/12 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds.

DISCUSSION:

Each year, under Article 3 of the State regulations governing the TDA, two percent of the TDA funds estimated to be available in Ventura County are taken "off the top" of the apportionment and set aside to be claimed for bicycle and pedestrian projects. This Article 3 money is discretionary funding allocated by VCTC according to policies and procedures formulated by CTAC/SSTAC and approved by the Commission.

The FY 11/12 TDA revenue estimate has increased as the result of better than expected sales tax receipts and we currently estimate there will be a total of \$534,000 available in FY 11/12. After 15% or \$80,100 is deducted for Class I bicycle trail maintenance, \$453,900 remains available for discretionary allocation under the ranking criteria established by the Commission.

Applications for the discretionary funding were received from the County and the cities of Moorpark, Oxnard, Port Huenmen, San Buenaventura, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks. The cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Ojai and Santa Paula did not apply. The applications submitted total \$320,497; see Attachment # 1 for a summary of the requests.

Use Attachment # 2 as the ranking form. There is one copy of the form for each applicant - fill in the points you believe are appropriate for that project.

Bring your completed ranking forms (you should have seven of them or one for each applicant) to the meeting or send them to me, and I'll tally the results. If you have any questions, call or just come to the meeting, and assistance will be provided

Recommendations approved by the CTAC/SSTAC today will then be presented to the Commission for consideration at their June 3, 2011 meeting.

Attachment # 1

FY 11/12 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS

AGENCY	ARTICLE 3 REQUEST	PROJECT NAME	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS
Moorpark	\$27,444	Arroyo Vista Sidewalk/Bike lane	\$66,000	\$132,556*
Oxnard	73,053	Class II stripe/pedestrian crosswalk safety lights	73,053	146,106
Pt. Hueneme	50,000	Hueneme Beach Bikeway upgrade	50,000	100,000
San Buenaventura	40,000	Bicyclist safety training program/Safe Route to School	40,000	80,000
Simi Valley	20,000	LA Ave./Stow St. Sidewalk installation	20,000	40,000
Thousand Oaks	40,000	Hillcrest Dr. sidewalk installation	143,000	240,000**
County	70,000	El Roblar Sidewalk Phase II	80,000	150,000
TOTAL	\$320,497		\$472,053	\$888,662
<i>Funding Available</i>	<i>\$453,900</i>			

*Moorpark total project also includes FY 10/11 Article 3 money of \$38,556.

**Thousand Oaks total project also includes FY 10/11 Article 3 money of \$57,000.

MOORPARK PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	

OXNARD PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	

PORT HUENEME PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	

SAN BUENAVENTURA PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	

SIMI VALLEY PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	

THOUSAND OAKS PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	

COUNTY OF VENTURA PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (20 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?	YES	This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (25 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	