

CRP SHOPP Managed Lanes Proposal Form

BACKGROUND AND INSTRUCTIONS

As part of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), California will receive \$200 million of federal Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) between fiscal years 2022 and 2026. These funds will flow through the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) to be programmed to projects that convert existing lanes to priced managed lanes. For more information, see the <u>CRP</u> <u>SHOPP Managed Lanes Guidance</u>.

This proposal form must be completed for a project to be considered to CRP SHOPP Managed Lanes funds. Proposals and attachments should be emailed to the Carbon Reduction Program Manager at <u>carbon.reduction@dot.ca.gov</u>.

SCHEDULE

September 5th : Call for Projects October 31st: Proposals Due January 25-26th: Anticipated CTC Action to Amend Selected Projects in 2022 SHOPP

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments may be submitted as separate files or links

Required	 Project Location Map Disadvantaged Communities Map 				
	Detailed Funding Plan				
	Approved PID/PSR				
Optional	Detailed SHOPP Eligible Cost Breakdown				
	Required for projects that include elements that are not SHOPP eligible				
	Detailed Funding Plan				
	Required for projects with uncommitted funds other than CRP SHOPP				
	Detailed VMT Mitigation Plan				
	Required for projects mitigating VMT with elements not included as project				
	features				

Contact:

Robert Cunningham, Carbon Reduction Program Manager Caltrans Director's Office of Equity, Sustainability, & Tribal Affairs <u>carbon.reduction@dot.ca.gov</u> Rev 8/2023

I. Applicant Information

All projects are required to answer all questions. The implementing agency is the agency that will be the recipient of the funds as the lead on construction.

- 1. Implementing Agency:
- 2. Implementing Agency Contact Name and Email:
- 3. Implementing Agency Type: Caltrans District MPO/RTPA Tribal Nation Tolling Authority

II. Project Information

All projects are required to answer all questions.

- 4. Project Name:
- 5. Project Description:
- 6. Caltrans District:
 - □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □ 11 □ 12
- 7. County:
- 8. Route:
- 9. Postmile Begin and End:
- 10. Location Description:
- 11. Current Phase:

Planning/Pre-PID PID/PSR PAED PS&E ROW/CON

12. Manage Lane Type:

☐ High Occupancy Toll Lane ☐ Express Toll Lane ☐ Other, specify:

13. Has the project received AB 194 approval?

Yes No If No, when will the project seek AB 194 approval:

14. Is the project SHOPP eligible?

Yes, fully Yes, partially No

- 15. Is there a signed cooperative agreement with Caltrans for this project?

 Yes
 No

 If No, when will the co-op be signed:
- 16. Will the project invest net toll revenues in low-carbon transportation options (select all that apply)?

No Yes, Bike/Ped Yes, Transit Yes, Demand Management Yes, Other

III. Estimated Cost and Schedule

Projects without an approved environmental document may provide ranges for questions 19-23 based on alternatives under consideration that include priced managed lane conversions. Estimates should be in 1,000's. Years should be in federal fiscal years. Projects seeking funds to use as leverage for other discretionary funds should attach a detailed funding plan describing programming timelines for uncommitted fund sources. Projects that include non-SHOPP eligible components should attach a detailed cost estimate that breaks out costs for each project element and indicates SHOPP eligibility.

Phases	Total Cost Estimate	Committed Funds	Committed Fund Source(s)	Unfunded Need	CRP SHOPP Funding Request
18. Planning/PID/PSR	\$	\$		\$	\$
19. PAED	\$	\$		\$	\$
20. PS&E	\$	\$		\$	\$
21. ROW	\$	\$		\$	\$
22. CON	\$	\$		\$	\$
23. Project Total	\$	\$		\$	\$

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FINAL CRP SHOPP Managed Lane Proposal Form DIRECTOR'S OFFICE OF EQUITY, SUSTAINABILITY, & TRIBAL AFFAIRS Rev 8/2023

24. Begin PID/PSR Year:25. Begin PAED Year:26. RTL Year:27. OTT Year:

IV. Scoring Criteria: Deliverability

The scoring committee will evaluate the response to questions 5-27 to evaluate any potential delivery risks including meeting IIJA deadlines, SHOPP eligibility, and ability to cover cost increases.

Projects will be scored as follows: 1 point: Project has significant and un-mitigatable delivery risks 2 points: Project has significant but manageable delivery risks 3 points: Project has limited delivery risks or delivery risks have been mitigated

V. Scoring Criteria: Carbon Dioxide Equivalent Emissions

Projects without an approved environmental document may provide a range for question 29 if multiple managed lane conversion alternatives are under consideration. Emissions should be reported in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent; should be given for the horizon year of analysis (generally about 20 years in the future); and should be for the full project, including any elements in addition to the managed lane conversion, such as new transit service that will be provided concurrently with the conversion. Emissions estimates should show the change between build and no-build alternatives in the horizon year (not horizon-year build vs. current conditions).

Absent specific evidence, lane-management conversions are considered neutral for induced traffic, with additional features such as improved transit providing any reductions. Lane management itself can provide improvements, e.g. when pricing or vehicle occupancy requirements are sufficient to incentivize lower traffic flow and VMT, but these benefits are not automatic and should be documented.

For such documentation, induced travel assessments (in terms of vehicle-miles traveled, or VMT) should be undertaken per guidance in Caltrans Transportation Analysis Framework, Transportation Analysis under CEQA, and Bulletin 21-02, all available here. (More general guidance on managed lanes and VMT can be found in HOT Lanes and VMT.) Induced travel must be included in any emissions analysis.

Resources for estimating greenhouse gas emissions reductions – or VMT reductions that result in GHG reductions – from transit additions and other measures can be found in the CAPCOA GHG Handbook and the draft Caltrans VMT Mitigation Playbook, both available here.

Projects will be scored as follows: 1 point: Project increases carbon 2 points: Project is carbon neutral 3 points: Project decreases carbon

28. No Build Emissions:

29. Build Emissions:

- 30. Describe how carbon emissions reductions were calculated:
- 31. Describe how the project aligns with the California Air Resources Board Scoping Plan:

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE OF EQUITY, SUSTAINABILITY, & TRIBAL AFFAIRS Rev 8/2023

VI. Scoring Criteria: Vehicle Miles Traveled

Projects without an approved environmental document may provide a range for question 33 based on alternatives under consideration that include a priced managed lane conversion. Answers for questions 32 and 33 are required even if the project completed environmental without conducting VMT analysis, should be given for the end year of analysis, and should be for the full project, including any elements in addition to the managed lane conversion. Projects that include VMT mitigation that is not a project feature should attach a VMT mitigation plan.

Projects will be scored as follows:

1 point: Project increases VMT and does not demonstrate ability to mitigate impacts 2 points: Project increases VMT but demonstrates ability to mitigate impacts 3 points: Project decreases VMT

- 32. No Build VMT:
- 33. Build VMT:
- 34. Describe how VMT was calculated:

VII. Scoring Criteria: Travel Reliability

Projects without an approved environmental document may provide a range for questions 36 and 39 based on alternatives under consideration that include priced managed lanes conversions. Annual hours of delay may be person hours or vehicle hours, should be given for the end year of analysis, and should be for the full project, including any elements in addition to the managed lane conversion

Projects will be scored as follows: 1 point: Project does not reduce delay nor improve reliability 2 points: Project reduces delay or improves reliability 3 points: Project reduces delay and improves reliability

- 35. No Build Annual Hours of Delay:
- 36. Build Annual Hours of Delay:
- 37. Describe how annual hours of delay was calculated:
- 38. No Build Travel Time Reliability:
- 39. Build Travel Time Reliability:
- 40. Describe how travel time reliability was calculated:

VIII. Scoring Criteria: Low Carbon Transportation Options

All projects must answer question 41. All projects must answer the corresponding question for each low-carbon transportation option checked in question 16.

Projects will be scored as follows:

1 point: Project does not substantially improve low-carbon travel options 2 points: Project substantially improves low-carbon travel options but lacks specific information

3 points: Project substantially improves low-carbon travel options with specific, quantitative information

41. Describe how the project's net toll revenues are (or will be) prioritized and invested. Approved expenditure plan, project list, competitive funding process, etc.:

Rev 8/2023

- **42. Describe how the project's toll revenues will be invested to improve bicycle and pedestrian travel.** Use specific information and quantitative data to the extent possible:
- **43. Describe how the project's toll revenues will be invested to improve transit service.** Use specific information and quantitative data to the extent possible
- **44.** Describe how the project's toll revenues will be invested in transportation demand management programs. Use specific information and quantitative data to the extent possible:
- **45. Describe how the project's toll revenues will be invested to a low-carbon transportation option not described above.** Use specific information and quantitative data to the extent possible:

IX. Transportation Equity

All projects are required to answer all questions. Maps showing boundaries of the disadvantaged community areas must be attached to this proposal form

Projects will be scored as follows:

1 point: Projects is not located in a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) and does not directly serve a DAC

2 points: Projects is located in a DAC but does not directly serve a DAC or is not located in a DAC but directly serves a DAC

3 points: Project is located in a DAC and directly serves a DAC

45. Is the project located in a DAC?

Yes, fully Yes, partially No

46. What metric was used to define DAC?

Justice40 Caltrans Equity Index CalEnviroscreen

AB 1550 Low-Income Communities Healthy Places Index

- Other, specify:
- 47. Describe how the project meets needs identified by members of disadvantaged communities:
- 48. Describe any project elements that ensure the priced managed lane is accessibility to equity priority communities (Income-based discounts or vouchers, payment options for unbanked users, etc.):

X. Outreach and Partnership

All projects are required to answer all questions.

Projects will be scored as follows:

1 point: Project conducted minimum required outreach and does not demonstrate substantial inter-agency partnership

2 points: Project demonstrates meaningful outreach or substantial inter-agency partnership, but not both.

3 points: Project demonstrates both meaningful outreach and substantial inter-agency partnership.

49. Describe the public outreach conducted specific to the project:

50. Describe how the project's scope reflects input received from the public:

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE OF EQUITY, SUSTAINABILITY, & TRIBAL AFFAIR: Rev 8/2023

51. Describe how other agencies were involved in the development of the project (Transit operators, cities, counties, Caltrans, regional agencie, etc.):

XI. Signatures

- 52. District Signature:
- 53. MPO/RTPA/Tolling Authority Signature:
- 54. District Project Rank: of projects