

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has prepared these Scoring Rubrics in coordination with Caltrans to provide additional guidance on the evaluation process. This document is principally intended as a guide for the evaluators when scoring the 2019 ATP applications. Applicants may also find this a useful resource when developing applications. This document, however, is not intended as the definitive formula for how applications will be scored. Evaluators may take other factors into consideration when scoring applications, such as the overall application quality, plan context and plan deliverability.

Index:

QUESTION #1:	Disadvantaged Communities	Page 2
QUESTION #2:	Priority to Fund a Plan	Page 5
QUESTION #3:	Public Participation	Page 8
QUESTION #4:	Implementation and Plan Development	Page 11

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #1: DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (0-30 POINTS)

ATP funds the development of community-wide active transportation plans within, or for area-wide plans, encompassing disadvantaged communities. All Plan applications must demonstrate how the plan area qualifies within or encompassing disadvantaged communities.

A. Map of Project Boundaries, Access and Destination (0 points): Required

Provide a scaled map showing the boundaries of the proposed plan area, the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community, and disadvantaged community access point(s) and destinations that fall within the plan area.

B. Identification of Disadvantaged Community (0 points): Required

Select one of the following 4 options. Must provide information for all Census Tract/Block Group/Place # that the project affects.

- Median Household Income
- CalEnviroScreen
- Free or Reduced Priced School Meals - Applications using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.
- Other

C. Plan Area: (0 - 15 points)

Based on the percentage of census tracts within the plan area that qualify as a disadvantaged community, evaluators shall give points per the table below.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

Sub-questions A & B do not receive any points.

- Applicants must provide the plan area map(s) and the DAC identification information as required in A & B.
- The evaluator should verify that the required information in both A & B is provided and complete. If the evaluator determines the information is incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated to maximize the DAC criteria they should note this in their evaluation comments and score Question 1 accordingly.

Evaluators should review the plan area location maps that are required with the application to determine the accuracy of the applicant's response to the project location question.

- If the applicant failed to provide plan area location maps that clearly define and show all of the plan area, and the corresponding census track/block/place data that verifies the DAC community location status, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question and should use their best judgment to choose the least score they feel best represents the information given.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the Plan is located within a DAC.
15 Points	Plan area is <u>75-100%</u> in a DAC.
12 Points	Plan area is <u>50-74%</u> in a DAC.
9 Points	Plan area is <u>25-49%</u> in a DAC.
6 Points	Plan area is <u>10-24%</u> in a DAC.
2 Points	Plan area is <u>≤10%</u> in a DAC.

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

D. Severity: (0-15 points)

Based on the option the applicant chooses for DAC identification, evaluators shall give points per the table(s) below.

Points	Median Household Income (MHI) Criteria – MHI = \$51,026
2 Points	75% through <80% of MHI \$47,836.50 through \$51,025.59
6 Points	70% through <75% of MHI \$44,646.49 through \$47,835.99
10 Points	65% through <70% of MHI \$41,458.30 through \$44,646.48
15 Points	< 65% of MHI less than \$41,458.30
Points	CalEnviroScreen Criteria
2 Points	20% through 25% most disadvantaged
6 Points	15% through < 20% most disadvantaged
10 Points	10% through < 15% most disadvantaged
15 Points	< 10% most disadvantaged
Points	Free or Reduced Lunches
2 Points	≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches
6 Points	> 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches
10 Points	> 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches
15 Points	> 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

Points	Other DAC Criterion
Use MHI Criteria Severity Scoring Above	If an applicant believes the plan benefits a disadvantaged community but the plan area does not meet the aforementioned criteria due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment, to demonstrate that the community's median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income.
TBD	To use a regional definition of disadvantaged communities, the definition must be adopted as part of a regular 4-year cycle adoption of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) by an MPO or RTPA per obligations with Title VI of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964. Any regional definition, such as "environmental justice communities" or "communities of concern," must document a robust public outreach process that includes the input of community stakeholders, and be stratified based on severity. Justification for a regional definition, including RTP/SCS adopting actions, public outreach documentation, and severity stratification, must be submitted to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) no later than June 1, 2018. CTC staff will make the final determination of the eligibility of regional definitions by June 29, 2018.
15 Points	Plan areas located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #2: PRIORITY TO FUND THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-WIDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS WITHIN OR, FOR AREA-WIDE PLANS, ENCOMPASSING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES, INCLUDING PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS, OR COMPREHENSIVE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS. (0-20 POINTS)

A. Priority: Select One. (0-10 points)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to provide accurate information, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question and should use their best judgment to choose the score they feel best represents the information given. Based on the applicant’s existing plans, evaluators shall give points per the table below.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate Plan priority.
10 Points	Applicant has neither a pedestrian plan, a bicycle plan, a safe routes to schools plan, nor a comprehensive active transportation plan.
7 Points	Applicant has a bicycle, pedestrian, or safe route to schools plan but not all.
4 Points	Applicant is seeking to update a pedestrian, bicycle, safe routes to school, or comprehensive active transportation plan that is older than 5 years.
1 Point	Applicant is seeking to update a pedestrian, bicycle, safe routes to school, or comprehensive active transportation plan that is less than 5 years old.

B. Statement of Need. Describe the active transportation problems or deficiencies within the plan area. Include the community’s active transportation needs and why this plan is necessary to meet those needs. (0-10 points)

Breakdown of points:

- “Need” must be considered in the context of the “**potential for increased walking and bicycling**”
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all of the aspects of “need” as well as how the development of a plan is necessary to meet the needs.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for the plan in the community.
- Evaluators are encouraged to review the data provided for reasonableness in the plan area including the attached photos, Google Maps, and any other information available to make an informed decision.
- Specific to the local public health concerns, evaluators should consider whether or not the applicant identified specific local public health concerns, health disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment affecting the project community that can be addressed by increasing walking and biking, including:
 - Thorough and nuanced discussion of existing health condition(s) amongst targeted users AND

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

- Responses should be more sophisticated than simply stating, “Walking and biking is good for health because it increases physical activity.” AND
- The physical or social conditions (known as the social determinants of health) in the target community that contribute to the current health conditions (beyond other elements already addressed in the application including bike/ped. infrastructure gaps and barriers, collision rates, etc.) AND
- Description and supporting data of the social determinants of health including, but not limited to, access to safe places to recreate, access to essential destinations (like childcare and work), tree canopy, and social cohesion AND
- Did the applicant provide local public health data demonstrating the above public health concern or health disparity, including:
 - Inclusion of health data at the smallest geography available (i.e., census track or possibly county level if census track is not available) AND
 - Health status of targeted users given as percentages or rates using relevant and local health indicators AND stated as ranks or comparisons to non-targeted user data (e.g., the community has a higher/lesser obesity rate compared to both the state and other rural communities of similar size) AND
 - Citation of sources used for all health status information given.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate need for a plan.
7-8 Points	<p>The applicant <u>clearly and convincingly</u> demonstrates “need” in the plan area, and documents <u>all</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of active transportation infrastructure ● Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users ● Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations ● Local public health concerns ● Other <p><u>AND</u></p> <p>The applicant <u>clearly and convincingly</u> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet <u>each</u> of the identified needs.</p>
5-6 Points	<p>The applicant <u>demonstrates</u> “need” in the plan area, and documents: (at least 3 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of active transportation infrastructure ● Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users ● Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations ● Local public health concerns ● Other <p><u>AND</u></p> <p>The applicant <u>convincingly</u> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet <u>at least 3</u> of the identified needs.</p>

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

3-4 Points	<p>The applicant <u>somewhat</u> demonstrates “need” in the plan area, and documents: (at least 2 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of active transportation infrastructure • Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users • Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations • Local public health concerns • Other <p><u>AND</u> The applicant <u>somewhat</u> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet <u>at least 2</u> of the identified needs.</p>
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant <u>minimally</u> demonstrates “need” in the plan area, and documents: (at least 1 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of active transportation infrastructure • Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users • Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations • Local public health concerns • Other <p><u>AND</u> The applicant <u>minimally</u> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet <u>at least 1</u> of the identified needs.</p>
0 Points	<p>The applicant <u>does not</u> demonstrate “need” in the plan area AND does not demonstrate how the plan will meet the needs.</p>

PLUS:

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the active transportation needs of STUDENTS.
2 Points	The applicant demonstrates the active transportation needs of students
0 Points	The applicant does not demonstrate the active transportation needs of students

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #3: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (0-25 POINTS)

Describe the community based public participation process that will be conducted as part of the development of the plan.

A. Describe who will be engaged in the creation of the plan. Identify key community stakeholders, key government stakeholders, and any other stakeholders. (0-5 points)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The following should be considered by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- Community stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end users, and community leaders, elected officials, advocacy organizations, local businesses, and members of vulnerable or underserved populations (i.e. elderly, youth, physically and/or mentally disabled, members from disadvantaged communities).
- Governmental stakeholders can include other departments, agencies, jurisdictions, etc. impacted by the proposed project that are NOT the applicant (these can include, but are not limited to law enforcement, transportation, local health department, schools/school districts, emergency services, metropolitan planning organization, etc.)

Points	Applicant’s ability to identify who will be engaged in the creation of the plan.
4-5 Points	The applicant provides a thorough and inclusive description of <u>a wide variety</u> of relevant stakeholders that will be engaged in the development of the plan. <u>AND</u> provides a clear explanation as to why soliciting input from these particular stakeholders is key.
3 Points	The applicant provides a general description of stakeholders that will be engaged in the development of the plan. <u>AND/OR</u> provides some explanation as to why soliciting input these particular stakeholders is key.
1-2 Points	The applicant provides a vague description of <u>some</u> stakeholders that will be engaged in the development of the plan. <u>AND/OR</u> provides some explanation as to why soliciting input these particular stakeholders is key.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately identify stakeholders that will be engaged in the plan.

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

B. Describe how stakeholders will be engaged in the development of the plan. Describe your intended outreach methods during the plan’s development, including the number of outreach activities and estimated number of people reached. How will you maximize the accessibility of the community engagement process? (0-15 points)

Breakdown of points:

Points will be awarded based on the extent that the relevant stakeholders will be engaged in the development of the plan and the level of community outreach and meeting/event accessibility.

- The level of expected engagement for a plan is **directly connected to the magnitude and complexity** of the proposed plan to the impacts on the overall transportation network.
- Plans with larger plan areas, scopes, and costs should demonstrate a more extensive planning process, including the analysis of a wide range of alternatives.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The following should be considered by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- The number of meetings/events that will be held to engage stakeholders is key to Public Participation. Evaluators should also consider:
 - Types of meetings or events: open houses, community charrettes/workshops, city council meetings, planning commission meetings, etc.
 - Evaluators should pay special attention to meetings where stakeholders will only be informed of the plan vs. actually being involved in providing input to the planning process.
 - How the meetings/ events will be noticed: local newspaper, county website, on the radio, at school parents group meetings, etc.
 - Location of meetings/ events: school, community center, city council hall, etc.
 - Accessibility of the meetings/ events: near public transportation, translation services provided, culturally/linguistically appropriate meeting materials, child care services provided, and time of day the meetings or events were held, etc.
 - Stakeholder involvement in a decision-making body: technical advisory committee, citizens’ advisory committee, etc.
 - Documentation of meetings/ events to address the community input received: Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes, letters of support, etc.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate how stakeholders will be engaged in the development of the plan
11-15 Points	The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive public engagement process with a variety of meetings and events that are fully accessible to meaningfully engage <u>all</u> stakeholders.
6-10 Points	The applicant generally demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public engagement process with meetings and events that are accessible to meaningfully engage stakeholders.
1-5 Points	The applicant somewhat demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public engagement process with meetings and events that are somewhat accessible to engage <u>most</u> stakeholders.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately demonstrate how stakeholders will be engaged.

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

C. *Describe how you intend to maintain ongoing outreach with stakeholders to communicate changes to the draft plan and how the stakeholders' input was addressed. In addition, how do you intend to keep the community and stakeholders updated following plan adoption? (0-5 points)*

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- Evaluators are to consider the level to which the public participation process will effectively inform the public of how stakeholder input/needs will be addresses in the plan.

Points	The applicant's ability to maintain ongoing outreach with stakeholders
4-5 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates an outreach/communication process with <u>specific details</u> that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep stakeholders informed of changes to the draft plan as a direct result from their input <u>AND</u> • Keep stakeholders updated on project implementation after the plan is adopted.
3 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates an outreach/communication process with <u>general details</u> that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep stakeholders informed of changes to the draft plan as a direct result from their input <u>AND</u> • Keep stakeholders updated on project implementation after the plan is adopted.
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates an outreach/communication process with <u>vague details</u>.</p>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately demonstrate that stakeholder input will be addressed and how they will continue to be informed after plan adoption.</p>

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #4: IMPLEMENTATION AND PLAN DEVELOPMENT (0-25 POINTS)

A. Describe how the plan will lead to implementation of the identified projects. (0-10 points)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The following should be considered by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- Consider whether or not the implementation plan for projects is realistic.
- Consider the process and how quickly the applicant plans to deliver projects.
- Does the applicant consider possible funding sources including ATP, AHSC, Urban Greening, CMAQ, local or regional funds, etc.?

Points	The applicant's ability to implement the identified projects in the Plan
8-10 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates with <u>specific and realistic details</u> how they expect to implement the projects listed in the plan. The applicant addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the final plan will result in future ATP projects. • How the agency will prepare to implement projects identified in the plan. • How quickly the projects will become tangible infrastructure. • Specific funding sources that would fund the projects, other than ATP, are identified.
5-7 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates with <u>general details</u> how they expect to implement the projects listed in the plan. The applicant addresses (at least two):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the final plan will result in future ATP projects. • How the agency will prepare to implement projects identified in the plan. • How quickly the projects will become tangible infrastructure. • Specific funding sources that would fund the projects, other than ATP, are identified.
1-4 Points	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates with <u>vague details</u> how they expect to implement the projects listed in the plan.</p>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not demonstrate how they expect to implement the projects listed in the plan.</p>

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

B. Complete the 22-Plan: (0-15 points)

Applicants are required to complete a 22-PLAN on the “new” template for ATP Cycle 4 as part of the Plan application.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to follow all directions for filling out the 22-PLAN, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question and should use their best judgment to choose the score they feel best represents the information given.

Breakdown of points:

Evaluators will consider the following:

- Completing the 22-Plan (Completeness)
- How well it reflects the applicant’s responses throughout this application (Consistency)
- How the plan meets the required components outlined in the CTC Guidelines (Components)

Points	Evaluating the 22-PLAN: Completeness
5 Points	The applicant submits an excellent 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a <u>complete, clear, and organized</u> scope of work with in-depth detail that outlines the various tasks of plan development and the planning process
4 Points	The applicant submits a strong 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a scope of work with <u>enough detail</u> that outlines the various tasks of plan development and the planning process
3 Points	The applicant submits an average 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a scope of work that lacks detail or organization in outlining the various tasks of plan development and the planning process
2 Points	The applicant submits a below average 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a scope of work that is vague and unclear in outlining the various tasks of plan development and the planning process
1 Point	The applicant submits a weak 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a scope of work that is poorly developed and unclear in outlining the various tasks of plan development and the planning process
0 Points	The applicant failed to provide the 22-PLAN.

Points	Evaluating the 22-PLAN: Consistency
5 Points	The applicant submits an excellent 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is fully consistent with and reflects the public participation and implementation activities described in the application
4 Points	The applicant submits a strong 22-PLAN that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is consistent with and reflects the public participation and implementation activities described in the application

2019 Active Transportation Program Plan Scoring Rubric

3 Points	<p>The applicant submits an average 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is mostly consistent with and reflects the public participation and implementation activities described in the application
2 Points	<p>The applicant submits a below average 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is inconsistent with the public participation and implementation activities described in the application
1 Point	<p>The applicant submits a weak 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is inconsistent with the public participation and implementation activities described in the application
0 Points	The applicant failed to provide the 22-PLAN.

Points	Evaluating the 22-PLAN: Components
5 Points	<p>The applicant submits an excellent 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes <u>all</u> the required plan components, and if not, provides a clear and convincing explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.
4 Points	<p>The applicant submits a strong 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes <u>all</u> the required plan components, and if not, provides a good explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.
3 Points	<p>The applicant submits an average 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes <u>all</u> the required plan components, and if not, provides an average explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.
2 Points	<p>The applicant submits a below average 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not specify the required plan components, or provides a mediocre explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.
1 Point	<p>The applicant submits a weak 22-PLAN that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not specify the required plan components, or provides a mediocre explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.
0 Points	The applicant failed to address the components TAB on the 22-PLAN.