



**PRTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING**

January 30, 2020 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Jamestown S’Klallam Tribal Center

1033 Old Blyn Highway

Sequim, WA 98382

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. | 10:00 – 10:05 | Chair’s Welcome and Introductions | |
| 2. | 10:05 – 10:10 | Approval of Agenda | ACTION |
| | | Approval of Minutes from November 7, 2019 (Attachment) | Chair Clark-Getzin |
| 3. | 10:10 – 10:25 | WSDOT Public Transportation Division Olympic Region Representative Introduction | DISCUSSION
Elizabeth Safsten |
| 4. | 10:25 – 11:45 | Transportation Alternatives Grant Process (Attachment)
<i>PRTPO staff will guide the Committee through the grant criteria and selection process</i> | DISCUSSION
PRTPO Coordinators |
| 5. | 11:45 – 11:50 | Title VI Training Report Out | DISCUSSION
PRTPO Coordinators |
| 6. | 11:50– 11:55 | 2020 Meeting Schedule | DISCUSSION
PRTPO Coordinators |
| 7. | 11:55 – 12:00 | Member Updates and Adjourn | DISCUSSION
Chair Clark-Getzin |

We encourage utilization the remote meeting connection - information below:

PRTPO TAC Meeting Jan 16 2020

Thu, Jan 16, 2020 9:30 AM - 12:30 PM (PST)

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/448759733>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: [+1 \(571\) 317-3112](tel:+15713173112)

Access Code: 448-759-733

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/448759733>

Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization

TAC Meeting Summary

Meeting Location:

Kitsap Transit, Bremerton Washington

November 7, 2019

Attendees

Technical Advisory Committee Member

Bek Ashby, City of Port Orchard

Melissa Mohr, Kitsap County

Dennis Engel, WSDOT Olympic Region

TAC Vice Chair, Dave Smith, Mason County

Dick Taylor, Port of Shelton

Chris Burning, Port Angeles

Jayne Brooke, Jefferson Transit

Mike Oliver, Clallam Transit System

Sara Crouch, Jefferson Transit

TAC Chair, Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County

On the phone

Annette Nesse, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

Staff/Guests

Edward Coviello, Kitsap Transit / PRTPO Coordinator

Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator

Welcome & Introductions

TAC Chair Wendy Clark-Getzin opened the meeting and initiated self-introductions around the table.

Approval of November 7th 2019 TAC Agenda and the October 10th TAC Meeting Minutes

The TAC approved the agenda and draft minutes from the October 10th meeting. Bek Ashby abstained from voting.

Draft 2040 PRTPO Regional Transportation Plan

Thera Black presented the final draft 2040 PRTPO Regional Transportation Plan. She indicated that the public outreach was completed on the 18th of October. The Board, at its October 18th meeting, agreed

that the Plan should move forward with an appendix recording comments, insights into the comments and an updated Chapter 7 addressing how the PRTPO will address the comments going forward.

Some clean up edits were completed and the document is available in a “track changes” format for review. She asked for a recommendation to move the Plan to the Board on November 15th for approval.

Chair Clark-Getzin informed the TAC that she is appreciative of a new planning effort going forward to address comments received. There Black responded that the PRTPO will be able to respond to comments on climate change, transit connections, system resiliency and others in early 2020. A process is being developed to go forward with a strategic planning process relevant to the Region.

Thera asked the group to think about what the value is of the PRTPO for the member agencies.

Chair Clark-Getzin asked that the WSDOT intersection studies be placed into the Regional Transportation Plan to allow for information to be as easily available for reference. Member Ashby suggested that the reports be an appendix to the RTP. The studies were completed in 2017. Vice Chair Smith clarified the studies that were completed and what the value has been. Member Engel noted that the studies were used for background data for intersections but not for safety studies.

Chair Clark-Getzin explained that each County was able to choose two intersections of concern for study. The studies only focused on the operations of each intersection according to Member Engel from WSDOT Olympic Region.

The Committee had a few typographic corrections for the Draft Plan.

The Committee approved with a unanimous vote the Draft 2040 PRTPO Regional Transportation Plan for recommendation to the Executive Board.

Vice Chair Dave Smith requested that the date of TAC recommendation be placed on the staff memo to the Board to record when the action was approved.

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Grant Process

Thera introduced the Transportation Alternatives Grant and the available fund balances. Specifically, there was discussion of the past practices.

Edward Coviello noted that there was a meeting between PRTPO staff and the WSDOT local programs concerning the TA grant funds and how we may go forward with grant awards.

Thera handed out a summary of available funds to the TAC and explained how the funds are distributed by year and a carryover balance from past years. The PRTPO Coordinators highlighted that prior year funds are available for distribution/award and are not rolled back into the overall statewide pool of TA funds. Thera provided details of the funds by year. It was briefed that a multi-year programming effort is acceptable as is a year by year process. Thera stated that we do not need to meet an obligation target as commonly done at the County level or MPO level. However, we still need to document the award and progress of awarded projects. The PRTPO Coordinators would like to program a four-year TIP for TA funds to allow for planning and tracking of projects. The timing is suggested for Executive Board approval in June 2020 to allow coordination for the local and Regional TIPs.

It was asked if there is a benefit to tying the TA process to the State Biennium. The staff agreed that this is the best approach.

The Chair asked for reporting to the TAC of awarded projects. A discussion of project obligation and the Western Federal Lands funding followed. There was information given about the project close out dates and needing to be careful when placing the date on the agreement with WSDOT.

The WSDOT local programs staff offered training for project management to the PRTPO members.

Specific details were discussed about the TA funding eligible projects, available funds and the scheduling of the grant process with the TAC and Executive Board.

Dennis Engel, Mike Oliver and Sara Couch gave an overview of the past processes. They noted that the process worked well. Each present TAC member had a chance to vote on the presented projects. The TAC voted on any projects that fit the eligibility. The Executive Board vice Chair Ashby asked if there is a funding limit to each grant application given that there will be approximately 1.2 million of funds. Mike Oliver explained that it may not be necessary to limit the funding ask for each application. Thera explained that if the TAC wants to fund only one project that it needs to be accepted by the PRTPO members as a single project funding round rather than several awarded projects.

Chair Clark-Getzin and Mike Oliver explained the PRTPO past awards and success with TA funded projects.

Vice Chair Ashby noted that other Transportation Boards require commitment letters from the applicant stating that the project is a priority for completion. A resolution is a suggested method and that a larger project might be an approach if wanted to further regional goals.

Chair Clark-Getzin asked if the PRTPO staff can play a greater role in scoring the projects in an objective manor. Mike Oliver noted that we should follow the WSDOT guidance as much as possible. The TAC reviewed the application materials from the last funding round.

Thera asked about the presentations as the last funding round and what role they play. Discussion followed about the PRTPO staff role and it led to the understanding that the last funding round methods and processes worked well.

A short discussion about future allocation levels noted that there should not be a great difference in total annual funds given past trends.

The TAC agreed to use the last funding round process as the benchmark for the upcoming TA grant process.

Input on Draft 2020 Legislative Focus Areas

Thera presented a draft PRTPO informational folio for the TACs review. There was some reformatting from last year's folio. She explained that the timeline is tight to meet the January start of the Washington State legislature. The folio will be updated in time for a more substantial legislative session next year (2021) as the 2020 legislative session will be less focused on transportation. She asked that the TAC members feel free to pass the draft to their Board members for review.

Vice Chair Ashby introduced the notion that I-976 has passed and that we should look at requesting sustainable funding for preservation, capital, ferry system, etc. would be best. She recommended that this approach would be helpful rather than asking for specific projects. Language was offered to improve the folio by looking at specifics for each topic covered. The RTPO funding level was noted as an area of concern that the funding levels be maintained at the least. A specific list of projects and the total funds needed may be approached from a regional point of view rather than an individual project.

Mike Oliver expressed that the broader approach to the folio is a good idea. He also provided details on the upcoming electrification of the transportation system. Edward Coviello noted that Kitsap Transit is performing a study of infrastructure needs for conversion to electric vehicles.

Chair Clark-Getzin highlighted the de-federalization of rural transportation projects as progress towards better project delivery. The Hood Canal bridge impacts to the region should be explained in the folio as it has regional impacts thru travel delay during normal operations.

Vice-Chair Ashby presented to the TAC that the folio is a first version of what will be a more developed folio in the following years.

The TAC discussed the future progress of the folio and the specific connecting Washington projects that are missing from the list of projects in the draft folio. The overall message to the legislature is that we would like to work with the legislative members of developing sustainable funding.

2020 Meeting Schedule

The TAC agreed to continue to hold the meetings on Thursday at either Kitsap Transit in Bremerton or the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe in Clallam County. Executive Board Vice-Chair Ashby explained that the future meeting dates may not be the same as the past due to fiscal constraints and she ask that the members be flexible until we know the fiscal impacts of the current every other month schedule.

The topic of what an RTPO must do compared to the additional tasks requested and how that impacts the meeting schedules going forward. Thera provided specifics about a JTC request and how these types of requests require flexibility in the regional work program.

The TAC agreed that the third Thursday of every other month will work rather than the second.

Member Updates and Adjourn

Chair Clark-Getzin announced the Executive Board meeting on the 15th and that we should help our staff prepare.

The next meeting is Thursday January 16th at the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribal Center, Sequim Washington.



ACTION ITEM

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Thera Black and Edward Coviello
Date: January 16, 2020
Subject: **2020 TAP Funding Process Overview**

REQUESTED ACTION:

The TAC is asked to forward a recommendation to the Executive Board regarding a process for conducting the 2020 TAP Call for Projects.

Overview

In late February PRTPO will issue a Call for Projects for Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding. PRTPO will award \$1,299,179 in funding. These are TAP funds available through federal fiscal year 2024.

In November the TAC kicked off the 2020 TAP priority programming process with an assessment of the 2014-15 process and framework. The general assessment was that the overall approach worked well and is suitable for the 2020 process with a few minor adjustments. The Board considered the TAC's findings at its November meeting and concurred, with a few suggestions. The 2020 TAP process will use the 2014-15 process as a starting point.

The rest of this memo walks through details of the process. A few points in the 2020 process outline are highlighted to call attention to these for further discussion by the TAC in addition to anything else that needs to be addressed.

Key Milestones

- 16 Jan** TAC process recommendation to the Board
- 21 Feb** Board considers TAC recommendation and approves initiating the 2020 TAP Call for Projects
- 28 Feb** Launch Call for Projects. Distribute/post application packets [**1. Clarify funding notification protocol**]
- 10 Apr** Deadline – application period closes (6 weeks) and screening begins
- 17 Apr** Board receives report on number of applications received, funds requested
- 22 Apr** TAC receives application package and begins its review process
- 21 May** TAC makes a recommendation to the Board on TAP awards
- 19 Jun** Board considers TAP applications, TAC recommendation, and awards \$1.3 million to priority TAP projects

Process Fundamentals

Available Funds

PRTPO will program \$1,299,179 for the four-year period. There are no specific annual funding targets. Sponsors should indicate the optimal, realistic year that the requested TAP funds will be obligated. This process does not commit post-2024 funds.

Eligible Project Types

All project types eligible for TAP funding may be considered in this process. See Attachment A for the current list of eligible project types, as well as eligible applicants and a TAP FAQ prepared by FHWA.

Eligible Project Sponsors

All entities eligible to receive TAP funds are eligible to apply. Project sponsors must be CA agencies or demonstrate that they have obtained a commitment from WSDOT or a CA agency to administer their project if awarded federal funds. Attachment A lists those entities eligible under federal law to use TAP funds.

Minimum Match

13.5%

Funding Cap

There is no cap on the amount of funds that can be requested for a project. *Sponsors should understand that it is the intent of the Board to generate as much regional benefit as possible with this investment.* The larger the funding request, the more value and regional benefit the project sponsor should expect to demonstrate in the proposal. It is the Board's prerogative to award all TAP funds to a single project if, in its determination, that project is worthy of such an award.

Limit on Number of Proposals

There is no limit on the number of proposals that a single sponsor may submit, however, any sponsor submitting more than one project must indicate its application priority array for consideration in the evaluation process.

Rural-Urban Balancing

As a final element in the project evaluation process, PRTPO may adjust priorities if needed to achieve the minimum levels of rural and urban funding distributions. Of the four-year allocation amount of \$1.3 million, a minimum of \$363,375 must be awarded to projects in rural areas and a minimum of \$271,410 must be awarded to projects in urban areas. The following table summarizes total funding availability and the minimum required rural and urban distributions.

	TAP Funds Allocated to PRTPO			
	Total	Rural	Urban	Anywhere
Opening Balance*	\$ 224,459			\$ 224,459
FFY 2020	\$ 214,944	\$ 72,675	\$ 54,282	\$ 87,987
FFY 2021	\$ 214,944	\$ 72,675	\$ 54,282	\$ 87,987
FFY 2022	\$ 214,944	\$ 72,675	\$ 54,282	\$ 87,987
FFY 2023	\$ 214,944	\$ 72,675	\$ 54,282	\$ 87,987
FFY 2024	\$ 214,944	\$ 72,675	\$ 54,282	\$ 87,987
Unprogrammed \$\$	\$ 1,299,179	\$ 363,375	\$ 271,410	\$ 664,394

* Includes pending reimbursement of \$24,299 from Port Townsend.

Next Call for Projects

It is PRTPO's intent to conduct another call for projects in 2022 with funding attributed to FFY 2025 and 2026. In 2021 PRTPO will review the status of its federally funded projects, establishing a biennial program with annual check-ins for all federally funded projects.

Minimum Qualifying Requirements

Evidence of Project Validity

Project is identified in a locally adopted TIP, TDP, or CFP, or is explicitly identified in some other public plan that has gone through a public input or review process.

Consistency with 2040 RTP

Applicants are expected to describe how their projects support RTP goals and policies.

CA Status or Sponsor

Applicants must have Certification Acceptance (CA) status or provide evidence that WSDOT or another CA entity will oversee the project.

Public Access

Project applicants certify that the proposed project will be open for general public access and use.

Project Screening Process

All applications submitted by the close of the application period will undergo an initial internal screening to ensure completeness of the project package and identify any potentially ineligible proposals with the sponsors before the formal review and prioritization process begins. An application package will be developed and sent to TAC members for review and prioritization.

TAC Project Review and Prioritization Process

Projects will undergo a multipart review before the TAC makes its funding recommendation to the Board.

1. Initial Review

By April 22 TAC members will each receive an application package for initial review. Each member will be asked to review the applications based on materials presented, and note any questions or follow-up information needed to understand the project. This would occur before the TAC first meets.

2. Presentations and Discussion

Each applicant will make a brief presentation on their project proposal(s) to TAC members, recognizing that TAC members have reviewed the applications ahead of time. It is understood that this will often mean a TAC member is pitching his or her own proposal to the other TAC members. That is fine and should generate in-depth questions and evaluation as a result of the collective expertise in the room.

It is also an opportunity for TAC members to talk with project sponsors about any questions that came up during their individual reviews. *If minor changes to project descriptions are needed to improve either the clarity or correctness of the proposed project, that should be clearly noted as a change on the original application for inclusion in the Board's packet.* The objective at the end of the presentations is for every member of the TAC to be clear on what each proposal entails, the likely benefits it will generate, the cost and funding ask, and the overall project feasibility and suitability as described. **[2. This could be lengthy. Consider a meeting to hear and discuss presentations and then a second meeting for prioritization and recommendation?]**

3. Prioritization and Funding Recommendation

TAC members will individually complete a priority ranking of all the project proposals to provide an initial assessment of preliminary priorities. Members will then discuss the projects, their merits, and any challenges or issues influencing prioritization decisions. This process will result in a funding recommendation from the TAC to the Board to inform its review and decisions. [\[3. Confirm feasibility of rank order with 10-20 applications\]](#)

Board Review and Funding Action

The Board will conduct its own review of the applications though in a much more abbreviated way, relying heavily on the TAC vetting and prioritization process to inform its discussion. The Board will receive a package that includes all proposals with any relevant mark-ups as well as a summary of the TAC evaluation process, any key findings or considerations, and the TAC's funding recommendation to the Board.

The Board will consider the TAC's recommendation in its discussion as well as any other policy considerations that may be warranted in its determination of funding awards. The Board will take action to award \$1.3 million to priority TAP projects.

Regional Priorities

Eligible TAP projects account for a wide range of infrastructure and services. Some of these are of higher value to PRTPO than others in terms of regional benefit. In an era of funding scarcity such as this, some TAP-eligible activities align better with regional objectives than others.

While all TAP activities eligible under federal law are also eligible for consideration in the PRTPO process, applicants should be advised that certain types of projects are likely to be considered higher priority than others during review. This may be useful to potential applicants in considering whether to apply for project funding [\[4. Attachment B – Review with TAC\]](#)

Each project will be evaluated on its own merits and in consideration of the wide range of benefits associated with different project types.

Additional Factors in Determining Priorities *(Application fields address info below)*

Additional considerations go into project review and prioritization based on information from applicants. This includes:

- **Feasibility of Proposed Project and Schedule**

Successful project delivery requires sufficient staff resources in light of other project delivery commitments an agency has already made and will have underway in the same delivery window. Applicants juggling multiple projects in the same time frame as the proposed project – especially if they are federally funded – should be prepared to explain how the proposed project can proceed without disrupting existing commitments.

- **Availability of Matching Funds**

Proposed local matches that require the applicant to obtain a state grant are a riskier proposition than those proposals that have secured local or state funds for match already.

- **Partnerships**

Proposals with financial partners demonstrate buy-in from other entities and help to stretch limited funds.

- **Over-Match**

The minimum required match for a TAP grant is 13.5 percent. Because this is a reimbursement-style grant program it means that agencies are reimbursed for 87.5 percent of their expenses up to the grant total. An applicant that commits more than the minimum 13.5 percent is demonstrating local commitment to that project and is helping to stretch limited resources further.

- **Shovel-Readiness**

Many types of projects have more than one phase, culminating in a construction phase. Infrastructure proposals for which all pre-construction work has been completed and environmental permits secured are considered “shovel-ready” projects. There are multiple benefits to a shovel-ready infrastructure project over one that still has pre-construction work to do: public benefit sooner rather than later, vastly lower risk of project delays or cost overruns including environmental surprises that can create setbacks, and demonstrated progress on project delivery often with non-federal funds.

Secured Right-of-Way Proposals that entail right-of-way (ROW) acquisition or are dependent upon its completion before the project can proceed to construction have inherently more risks to project schedule and cost than those that do not. Proposals that require right-of-way acquisition should demonstrate that the proposed schedule is realistic.

- **Partial Funding**

Partial funding for a project requires either additional resources or a change in scope. To the extent possible, PRTPO will try to avoid offering applicants reduced funding, however, it is likely that it will be necessary at some point. Applicants should consider whether they would accept partial funding and what the implications of it would be on project delivery. That is, will additional funds be secured to deliver the proposed project, or will the project be scaled back to align with the reduced funding. In either case, applicants should be prepared to respond to inquiries regarding a possible award less than what is requested.

Completion of 2020 Funding Process

The Board will make its funding decision in June, allowing time for local agencies awarded funding to include the secured projects in their 2021-2026 TIPs. Those funding secured projects will then be naturally included in the 2021-2026 RTIP and in the STIP ready for obligation as scheduled.

TAC Follow-up on Process Details

This concludes the process overview based on our understanding going into the TAC meeting. There are a few specific points we know of that need to be discussed and probably several from you. For ease of reference we highlighted a few points in blue text, above, and present below in the order they appear.

1. Clarify funding notification protocol

Funding notices will be sent out through the PRTPO distribution channel, but this means numerous potential project sponsors – school districts, in particular – won’t know of the funding program availability. We can post information on-line and make the application packet available for download but until we have a good community distribution list going our ability to get the word out is limited.

2. The presentations and discussion process for the TAC could be lengthy. Suggest a meeting to hear and discuss presentations and then a second meeting for prioritization and recommendation.

With \$1.3 million on the table PRTPO is likely to receive more applications than it did in 2014 when PRTPO reviewed ~19 proposals before awarding \$663,000 to 12 projects. It seems like two meetings might make this a more reasonable process with presentations and discussion at the first meeting. This would be followed perhaps later that week or the next week with a meeting of TAC members to develop a priority array and funding recommendation to forward on to the Board.

If the TAC is reviewing 20 or more proposals and each review lasts about 10 minutes with presentation and discussion and transition between projects, it will be a long day. Planning ahead now will make it possible to nail down a second date in the first couple of weeks of May to accommodate this approach. This would also enable us to indicate in the application packet that project sponsors are expected to make a presentation on a specific date, which could help them in their preparation.

Does this sound like a reasonable approach or does the TAC prefer to do the whole process in one half day meeting?

3. Confirm feasibility of rank order with 20+ applications

In November we discussed the rank order prioritization process. It seems like a preferred way of pursuing the 2020 prioritization process. The question arises when considering the potential effects on project scores with such a wide point range. The 2014 process had no more than 6 projects in any one year of funding so ranking ranged from 1 to 6. Ranking from 1 to 20+ may introduce some unexpected effects to the scoring.

One option around this might be to focus on each TAC member's "Top 10" projects, awarding 10 points to the highest priority proposal, nine to the next, and so on down to one with all remaining proposals receiving no points.

Another option, somewhat more tedious to implement but fruitful, transparent and allowing for lots of discussion, would be a pairwise ranking where every project is directly compared against every other project to create a single composite priority array.

What process does the TAC recommend for project ranking / prioritization?

4. Review Attachment B with TAC

TAP funding can be spent on a wide array of project types, from the control and removal of outdoor advertising to restoration of historic transportation facilities to trails to Safe Routes to School, and many things in between. For a variety of reasons, it may be worth clarifying up front which of the eligible project types are most likely to be considered high priority project types for the region. The point is not to say that "control and removal of outdoor advertising" (for example) isn't eligible to compete but the project sponsor at least knows it will have to work extra hard to make a compelling case for these projects because the proposed project type doesn't align well with regional need. Or, they may decide this isn't a good funding option and save time and effort if it's not a compelling project.

Appendix B lists all eligible project types and offers a preliminary indication of which project types are most in alignment with regional need. TAC discussion and revisions will help ensure we are clear with all potential sponsors which project types are not likely to compete well in this PRTPO process.

For More Information:

Thera Black | 360.878.0353 | TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org

Edward Coviello | 360.824.4919 | EdwardC@KitsapTransit.com

ATTACHMENT A – PRIORITY TAP PROJECT TYPES FOR THE PENINSULA REGION

The following table lists all eligible TAP project types. It also includes a preliminary indication as to which projects may not be very competitive in this process because they don't align well with Peninsula region needs. The TAC is asked to review and help refine this list to provide clarity for all potential project sponsors so they can better understand if this is a good funding source for their proposal.

Project Types Eligible for TAP Funding Under Federal Law	PRPTO Alignment?
Planning, and design and construction projects related to on-road and off-road facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized transport. Includes infrastructure, signals (bike/ped), traffic calming measures, lighting, and safety-related infrastructure. Includes projects that satisfy ADA requirements.	Y
Planning, and design and construction of infrastructure-related projects and systems that provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.	Y
Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails, bicyclists, or other nonmotorized transport users.	Y
Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.	N
Community improvement activities which include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising ii. Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities iii. Vegetation management practices in transportation ROW to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control iv. Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under Title 23 v. Streetscaping and corridor landscaping vi. Junkyard screening and removal 	?
Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in section 23 USC 133(b)(3) [<i>relates to Clean Air Act</i>], 23 USC 328(a) [<i>stormwater management treatment facilities related to transportation runoff</i>] and chapter 329 Title 23 [<i>control of invasive species</i>] 	N
The Recreational Trails Program under 23 USC 206.	Y
Safe Routes to School program activities and projects described in Section 1404(f) of SAFETEA-LU. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Planning, design, and construction of infrastructure-related projects that will substantially improve the ability of student to walk and bike to school. These include sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, on-street bike facilities, off-street bike and pedestrian facilities, secure bike parking, and traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools (~ 2 miles). Projects may be carried out on any public road or any bike or pedestrian pathway or trail in the vicinity of schools. ii. Non-infrastructure related activities that encourage walking and biking to school. These include public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of 	Y

<p>schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment. Also training of volunteers. Traffic education and enforcement activities for K-8 grade must be within two miles of the school. No other proximity constraints are associated with non-infrastructure related activities.</p> <p>iii. Safe Routes to School coordinator.</p>	
<p>Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the ROW of former interstate system routes or other divided highways.</p>	N
<p>Bike-sharing programs including bike sharing docks, equipment, and other capital costs as well as the bicycles that are integral to a bike sharing system. (STP eligible, too). Federal funds cannot be used for operations costs.</p>	Y
<p>Climate change-adaptation activities including planning, preventive maintenance, infrastructure preservation. <i>[Tracking down more specifics re: eligible activities]</i></p>	Y
<p>Road diet activities</p>	Y