U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Transit Administration

Alternative Transportation in the Parks and Public Lands Program

Project Proposal for Fiscal Year 2006 Funds – Implementation Project

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION	
Project Title:	
Project Sponsor(s):	
Park or public land unit(s) involved:	City/County(ies) and State(s) involved (if applicable):
Federal Land Management Agency managing the above unit(s): ☐ Bureau of Land Management ☐ Bureau of Reclamation ☐ Fish and Wildlife Service ☐ Forest Service ☐ National Park Service	Qualified Participant(s) involved: ☐ Bureau of Land Management ☐ Bureau of Reclamation ☐ Fish and Wildlife Service ☐ Forest Service ☐ Local Government ☐ National Park Service ☐ State Government ☐ Tribal Government
General Type of Project: ☐ Implementation (including equipment) (Planning projects please use the alternate form)	☐ New project ☐ Ongoing project
Dollar amount of assistance requested:	Percent of total project cost:
Provide a basic summary of what the requested financial assistance would fund (Use no more than 1000 characters):	

Attach the budget for the proposed project, including a detailed breakdown.	
Describe the timeframe for implementing the project and funding needs per year.	
CONTACT PERSON	
Name:	Phone:
Position:	E-mail:
Address:	
REQUIREMENTS	
☐ If a State, tribal, or local government entity is proposing the project, the applicant has the consent of the Federal land management agency or agencies affected. ☐ The project is consistent with the metropolitan and statewide planning process. ☐ The project is consistent with agency plans. ☐ If this is an implementation project, all reasonable alternatives, including a non-construction option, were analyzed before proposing this project.	
EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Please attach your responses to the evaluation criteria questions (attached). Your responses should total no more than 10 pages in at least ten point font.	

Alternative Transportation in the Parks and Public Lands
<u>Implementation</u> Evaluation Criteria

Glossary of Terms

Alternative Transportation: Moving visitors by means of any mode of transportation other than that of the automobile.

Alternative Transportation System: Modes of transportation that include, buses, boats, canal boats, ferries, trains, multi-modal trails, trams, trolleys, vans and bicycles.

Carrying Capacity: The number of individuals who can be supported in a given area within natural resource limits, and without degrading the natural social, cultural and economic environment for present and future generations.

Deferred Maintenance: A backlog of infrastructure maintenance at an existing facility.

Federal Land Management Agency: An agency that manages Federal Lands and in this particular instance more specifically; the National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service.

Life-cycle: The economic life-span of transportation infrastructure (e.g. purchase, maintenance, rehabilitation, retirement).

Rolling stock: Vehicles that are used to transport people.

Site: A park, refuge, or recreational area under the jurisdiction of a Federal Land Management Agency.

Transportation infrastructure: Roads, trails, buses, vessels, bikeways, park and ride lots, transit stations, transfer facilities, tracks, guideways, bridges, signal systems, and other elements that contribute to the transportation system.

Transportation System: An interconnected system of roads, ferry services, transit facilities, boats, pedestrian facilities, bike-ways, park and ride lots, and other infrastructure designed to move people from one destination to another.

Volume to Capacity Ratio: The ratio of the number of vehicles to the capacity of the roadway.

Implementation Evaluation Factors:

<u>1. Demonstration of Need</u>

a. Describe the site's current and anticipated transportation problem or opportunity. Cite documentation in agency plans and other reports. Describe how the project is the most effective solution for meeting identified management goals and objectives for the site.

In addition to a narrative, please provide as much quantitative information as possible, such as:

- vehicles per day
- current road level of service
- air quality attainment status
- congestion levels
- parking shortages
- current transit ridership and trails usage
- volume to capacity ratio – vehicles per hour at major roads
- motorized/non-motorized facility condition

<u>Rating</u>

Purpose and Need

3 points: The transportation need and problem has been clearly and concisely identified and documented in agency management plans or other reports. Goals, objectives, and performance measures related to the project are clearly stated.

Significant improvements are needed to maintain and improve public use opportunities and visitor experiences.

2 points: Transportation need or problem has been identified in agency management plans or other reports. Goals, objectives, and performance measures related to the project are stated. Limited opportunity to maintain or improve either public use opportunities or visitor experiences.

1 point: Only anecdotal or informal evidence available. Goals and objectives are not articulated. Possible opportunity to maintain either public use opportunities or visitor experience.

0 points: No information presented on the purpose and need for the project. No apparent impacts identified related to public use visitor experience.

Severity of the Problem

3 points: Very poor level of service (applicable to roads, parking, trails, transportation facilities, transit facilities), high volume to capacity ratio, parking shortage, high current transit ridership, air quality non-attainment area. The current trails/pedestrian infrastructure lacks connectivity, the high levels of road traffic negatively impact pedestrian and bicycle users.

2 points: Poor level of service (applicable to roads, parking, trails, transportation facilities, and transit facilities), parking shortages, air quality non-attainment area, peak period congestion, no existing transit riders. The poor quality of the trails/pedestrian infrastructure limits or discourages public use.

1 point: Periodic congestion. Limited quantitative information on travel conditions, parking demand, or other measures of transportation capacity problems. People have difficulty finding the trails/pedestrian infrastructure.

0 points: No information presented on the severity of the problem.

b. What natural, cultural, historic, or scenic resources are impacted by the current transportation situation?

Rating

3 points: Significant impact on natural, cultural, historical, and scenic resources.

2 points: Moderate impact on natural, cultural, historical, or scenic, resources.

1 point: Limited impact on natural, cultural, historical, or scenic, resources.

0 points: No impact on natural, cultural, historical, or scenic, resources.

c. Indicate how many people visit this public land unit each year. Please include information on seasonal or cyclical visitation that is relevant to the proposed project.

Rating

3 points: High visitation level

2 points: Moderate visitation level

1 point: Low visitation level

0 points: No information provided

2. Protection of Resources

a. Describe how this project will protect and/or improve natural, cultural, historic, and/or scenic resources.

In addition to a narrative, please provide as much quantitative information as possible, such as:

- acres of wetlands
- acres wildlife habitat, etc with reduced impact
- number of species
- acres of ecosystem restoration

- acres disturbed land restoration and re-vegetation
- preservation of an archeological or historical resource
- viewshed and watershed preservation

Rating
3 points: The project would protect and/or improve natural, cultural, historic, and/or scenic resources to a high degree.
2 points: The project would protect and/or improve natural, cultural, historic, and/or scenic resources to a medium degree.
1 point: The project would protect and/or improve natural, cultural, historic, and/or scenic resources to a low degree.
0 points: The project would not protect and/or improve natural, cultural, historic, and/or scenic resources.

b. Describe how this project will mitigate the impact of traffic congestion, and what environmental benefits will result (improved habitat connectivity, reduced pollution - including noise pollution, air pollution, and visual pollution).
In addition to a narrative, please provide as much quantitative information as possible, such as:

- Number of vehicles reduced. Percent increase in transit, bicycle, pedestrian use.
- Reduction in or mitigation of need for impervious surfaces (parking lots and roads). Increase in square feet of porous surface (over the no-build alternative)
- Reduction in auto-animal collision rates. Increase in wildlife habitat connectivity and acres connected by the project.
- Reduction in pollutant emissions (ozone, CO2, PM10, etc). This can be estimated from reduction in vehicle miles traveled. Increase in air clarity measures for wilderness areas, refuges, parks, etc.
- Reduction of visual impact of parking and roads. Increase in scenic value of areas near transportation facilities.
- Reduction of in noise from autos. Increase in the acres of FLMA with very low noise levels (over the no-build alternative).

Rating
3 points: High benefit.
2 points: Medium benefit.
1 point: Low benefit.
0 points: No Information provided

c. Describe how this project will ensure that visitation does not exceed an area's ability to handle increased levels of visitation or "carrying capacity".
In addition to a narrative, please provide as much quantitative information as possible, such as:

- How many visitors can the site currently accommodate with existing transportation system? What percent of that capacity is the site operating at during peak periods?
- How many visitors will the site be able to accommodate with the proposed alternative transportation system? At what percent of capacity will the site operate at during peak periods with the proposed alternative transportation system?

Rating
3 points Project increases carrying capacity or decreases number of days site operates at over carrying capacity.
2 points: Project has a moderate improvement in carrying capacity
1 point: Carrying capacity situation remains the same.
0 points: Carrying capacity situation worsens.

3. Financial Sustainability and Operational Efficiency

a. Describe how the project is the most cost-effective method to address the transportation problem identified at the site, compared to other alternatives, including the no-build alternative. The annual cost per passenger trip (annualized capital cost (capital cost *.07) of the project divided by annual riders) of the project is a suitable measure of cost-effectiveness. Other measures such as farebox recovery (the percent of operating costs recovered by passenger fares) may also be used to consider cost-effectiveness.

Rating

3 points: The project is the most cost-effective solution to the problem and is supported by cost-effectiveness data.

2 points: The project may not be the most cost-effective solution, but is supported by the cost-effectiveness data.

1 point: The project has questionable cost-effectiveness, or the supporting data for the cost-effectiveness analysis can not be substantiated.

0 points: No attempt has been made to consider cost-effectiveness.

b. Describe the sources of funding for the proposed project, including the capital cost of the project (in FY06 dollars) the level of funding requested from the ATPPL program, and any other funding sources dedicated for the project. Provide documentation that describes innovative financing or joint development support of this proposal.

Rating

3 points: The financial plan includes fully-developed innovative financing or joint development support of this project. The ATPPL share of funding is less than 80%.

2 points: There is some innovative financing or joint development support of this proposal. The ATPPL share of funding is less than 90%.

1 point: No attempt has been made to include alternative funding measures. The ATPPL share of funding is 100%.

0 points: The projects capital cost or the financial plan is based upon inaccurate or dated information or assumptions

c. Describe the financial plan for this project and include sources of funding for both capital and operating funds, over a three to five year period. The plan should identify long term funding sources, staffing needs, contractor costs, lease terms, funding of replacement equipment, and operating revenues sufficient to pay for the costs.

Rating

3 points: A realistic and complete financial plan has been developed for this project that identifies and commits capital and operating funding for a three to five year period.

2 points: A financial plan has been developed, but not all sources of funding have been identified, or it is limited in scope or timeframe.

1 point: The financial plan has not been developed to a sufficient degree.

0 points: The projects capital cost or the financial plan is based upon inaccurate or dated information or assumptions.

d. Describe how the project will reduce or increase annual operations and maintenance costs, and how it will affect future cyclical maintenance program costs. Will a transportation fee be implemented? If so, will it cover the total costs of operation and

maintaining the service including replacing the fleet at the end of their service life? Describe to what extent will this project affect the ability of the unit to maintain other assets and how the proposed project will impact the site's deferred maintenance backlog.

Rating

3 points: The project financial plan comprehensively addresses issues such as economic analysis, operational funding, and maintenance funding, funding of replacement equipment and operating revenues such as transportation fees. The plan describes innovative financing or joint development support and will describe impact on site's deferred maintenance backlog.

2 points: The project financial plan is less comprehensive in addressing financial planning (economic analysis, operational funding, and maintenance funding, funding of replacement equipment and operating revenues such as transportation fees). The plan has limited detail regarding innovative financing or joint development support and will describe impact on site's deferred maintenance backlog.

1 point: The project financial plan is vague in addressing financial planning (economic analysis, operational funding, and maintenance funding, funding of replacement equipment and operating revenues such as transportation fees). The financial plan does not describe innovative financing or joint development support and does not describe impact on site's deferred maintenance backlog.

0 points: No information is provided regarding the financial plan.

4. Public Benefits

a. What number and percentage of visitors to this facility will benefit from this project? Please include information on seasonal or cyclical visitation that is relevant to the proposed project.

Rating

3 points: A significant proportion of visitors will use the project (30 percent or more)

2 points: A moderate proportion of visitors will use the project (10 to 30 percent)

1 point: A limited proportion of visitors will use the project (0-10 percent)

0 points: No information is provided regarding the proportion of visitors who will use the project.

b. Describe how the project will enhance visitor experience related to educational benefits, recreational benefits, public health benefits, and social benefits.

Rating

3 points: The project will provide significant benefits in all four areas.

2 points: The project will provide significant benefits in three areas.

1 point: The project will provide significant benefits in one to two areas.

0 points: No information is provided to indicate the level of benefits for the visitor experience.

c. Describe the transportation benefits of the project for improving the visitor experience by addressing any current transportation mobility issues (reduces congestion, interposal connectivity, improves public access, including access for those with disabilities).

In addition to a narrative, please provide as much quantitative information as possible, such as:

- Number of new alternative transportation system users because of the project

- Number of disabled persons who would gain greater access because of the project
- Travel time savings for travel to/from major site destinations for visitors using the project.

Rating

Number of New Alternative Transportation System Users.

3 points: A significant proportion of visitors will use the project instead of driving (30 percent or more)
2 points: A moderate proportion of visitors will use the project instead of driving (10 to 30 percent)
1 point: A limited proportion of visitors will use the project instead of driving (0-10 percent)
0 points: No information is provided regarding the proportion of visitors who will use the project.

Access for Persons with Disabilities

3 points: Increased number of persons with disabilities that can access site.
2 points: Improved access to persons with disabilities
1 point: Limited benefits to persons with disabilities,
0 points: No information provided regarding benefits to persons with disabilities.

Travel Time Savings

3 points: Improved travel times for persons using the proposed project.
2 points: Minor improvement in travel times for persons using the proposed project.
1 point: No Improvement in travel times.
0 points: No information provided regarding improvements in travel times.

d. Describe how the project would improve safety. Include quantitative analysis on accident rates, property loss, and other measures, if available.

Rating

3 points: Documented anticipate reduction in accident rates resulting from the project.
2 points: Moderate level of anticipated safety benefits from the project.
1 point: Limited documentation of safety benefits of the project.
0 points: No documentation of safety benefits of the project.

e. Describe how the project will reduce fuel consumption for site patrons and improve energy efficiency aspects of transportation including non-motorized transportation. This will be assessed by the number of riders switching from auto to transit or bike/pedestrian as a result of the project

Rating

3 points: A significant proportion of visitors will use the project instead of driving (30 percent or more)
2 points: A moderate proportion of visitors will use the project instead of driving (10 to 30 percent)
1 point: A limited proportion of visitors will use the project instead of driving (1-10 percent)
0 points: 0 points: No information is provided regarding the proportion of visitors who will use the project.

f. Cite agreements or documentation that show a high level of coordination and partnering activities with federal, state, tribal and local government agencies, and

gateway communities. If applicable, describe any economic, mobility, or other benefits to the gateway community.

Rating

3 points: A signed memorandum of agreement, council resolution, or other mutual agreement between the site and adjacent communities/entities.
2 points: Documentation showing consensus and support for the project.
1 point: Limited documentation showing support for the project by other entities.
0 points: No documentation is provided showing support for the project.

g. Describe how planning efforts include partnership moneys or will leverage funding for planning, design development, or implementation of the project.

Rating

3 Points: Documentation of project funding commitments from non-governmental sources.
2 Points: Documentation of local funding from other agencies planned or programmed for planning, design, development, etc.
1 Point: Limited documentation of funding availability.
0 points: No documentation is provided showing funding availability.

Alternative Transportation Planning in the Parks and Public Lands
Implementation Evaluation Criteria

Measure	Points	Weight
Demonstration of Need		
Purpose and Need	(0-3)	25%
Severity of the Problem	(0-3)	
Natural Resources Impacted	(0-3)	
Visitation Level	(0-3)	
Protection of Resources		
Natural Resources Protected	(0-3)	25%
Environmental Benefits	(0-3)	
Carrying Capacity	(0-3)	
Financial Sustainability and Operational Efficiency		
Cost Effectiveness	(0-3)	25%
ATPPL Funding Share	(0-3)	
Financial Plan	(0-3)	
Operating Efficiency	(0-3)	
Public Benefits		
Number of Visitors Benefiting	(0-3)	25%
Visitor Experience	(0-3)	
New ATS Project Users	(0-3)	
ADA Access Improvements	(0-3)	
Travel Time Savings	(0-3)	
Safety Improvements	(0-3)	
Energy Efficiency	(0-3)	
Coordination/Partnering	(0-3)	
Funding Leverage	(0-3)	