

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

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 2017 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, project context and project deliverability.

Note: For combined projects the term “project” refers to both the infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.

## Index:

QUESTION #1:	Page 2
QUESTION #2:	Page 7
QUESTION #3:	Page 11
QUESTION #4:	Page 17
QUESTION #5:	Page 21
QUESTION #6:	Page 22
QUESTION #7:	Page 23

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## **QUESTION #1: DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (0-10 POINTS)**

**This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community.**

If this project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community, applicant may skip and move onto question 2.

### **Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

*If the applicant checked the box for "This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community" the evaluator will not evaluate sub-questions C, D and E. The score for Question #1 will be zero "0" if the box is checked.*

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

Provide a scaled map showing the boundaries of the proposed project/program/plan, the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community, and disadvantaged community access point(s) and destinations that the project is benefiting.

### **B. Identification of Disadvantaged Community: (0 points)**

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

### **Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- *If the applicant does not check the box "This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community" they are required to provide the required project map(s) and provide the DAC information as required in both 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.*

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## C. Direct Benefit: (0 - 4 points)

1. Explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need.
2. Explain how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project.
3. Illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.
4 Points	<p>The application <b>clearly and convincingly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need, <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Illustrates <u>and documents</u> how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents.</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p>The application <b>convincingly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need, <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents.</li> </ul>
2 Points	<p>The application <b>somewhat</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need, <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents.</li> </ul>
1 Points	<p>The application <b>minimally</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need, <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u></li> <li>• Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents.</li> </ul>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not adequately make a convincing argument that the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community.

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

When evaluating “Explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important community need,” the evaluator should consider:

- If the project will provide reasonable improvements to close missing gaps; increases needed routes or connections, or addresses the poor conditions of an existing route.
- If developing a new route/connection will the project result in a convenient and logical route that residents will want to use because it offers improved access to destinations the community commonly utilizes.
- If the project will address the lack of or need for active transportation planning, and/or community concerns about the lack of pedestrian or bicycle safety education in their community.
- If the project will address an identified “need” that was identified by the local community and is supported by backup documentation/attachments.

When evaluating “Explain how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project/program,” the evaluator should consider:

- If the improvements will be physically convenient for the community to access or use.
- If the improvements will provide a logical route that residents will use or want to use because it offers safe and convenient access.
- If the program will be conducted within the local DAC community, and the DAC residents will be specifically targeted to participate in the process.

When evaluating “Illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents,” the evaluator should consider:

- If the local DAC community actively involved in the project development;
- If the DAC community had the opportunity to provide their input into the community needs and support this project,
- If this project was presented to the DAC community in a local forum so that they could provide input or support? Or, was the project simply voted upon in a general agency meeting without really reaching out to the community to learn their needs and wants.

**D. Project Location: (0 - 2 points)**

Is your project located within a disadvantaged community?

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project is located within a DAC.
2 Points	Project location(s) are/is <u>fully</u> (100%) located within a DAC.
1 Point	Project location(s) are/is <u>partially</u> (less than 100%) within a DAC.
0 Points	None of the project location(s) are/is within a DAC.

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

Evaluators should review the project 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 project location maps that clearly define and show all of the proposed projects locations, 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.

**E. Severity: (0-4 points)**

Points	Median Household Income (MHI) Criteria – MHI = \$63,782
1 Point	75% through <80% of MHI
2 Points	70% through <75% of MHI
3 Points	65% through <70% of MHI
4 Points	< 65% of MHI
Points	CalEnviroScreen Criteria
1 Point	20% through 25% most disadvantaged
2 Points	15% through < 20% most disadvantaged
3 Points	10% through < 15% most disadvantaged
4 Points	< 10% most disadvantaged
Points	Free or Reduced Lunches
1 Point	≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches
2 Points	> 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches
3 Points	> 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches
4 Points	> 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

Points	Other DAC Criterion
Use MHI Criteria Severity Scoring Above	If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project 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.
<b>TBD</b>	Regional definitions of disadvantaged communities as adopted in a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by an MPO or RTPA per obligations with Title VI of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, such as "environmental justice communities" or "communities of concern," may be used in lieu of the options identified above.
4 Points	Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**QUESTION #2: POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING AND BICYCLING, ESPECIALLY AMONG STUDENTS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF WALKING AND BICYCLING ROUTES TO AND FROM SCHOOLS, TRANSIT FACILITIES, COMMUNITY CENTERS, EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, AND OTHER DESTINATIONS; AND INCLUDING INCREASING AND IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY OF NONMOTORIZED USERS. (0-30 POINTS)**

**A. Describe the issues that this project will address. How will the proposed project benefit the non-motorized users? What is the projects desired outcome and how will the project best deliver that outcome? (0-20 points)**

**Breakdown of points:**

- “Need” must be considered in the context of the “Potential for increased walking and bicycling”
- “Need” must be considered in the context of one or more of the following:
  - Connectivity to key destinations
  - Mobility to access everyday needs and services
  - Local public health concerns
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all of the above aspects of “need”.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate a specific active transportation need.
15-18 Points	The application <b>clearly and convincingly demonstrates “need” in the project area</b> , and documents <u>all</u> of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lack of connectivity,</li> <li>• the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,</li> <li>• local health concerns,</li> <li><b><u>AND if applicable</u></b></li> <li>• For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement</li> </ul>
10-14 Points	The application <b>convincingly demonstrates “need” in the project area</b> , and documents: (at least 2 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lack of connectivity,</li> <li>• the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,</li> <li>• local health concerns,</li> <li><b><u>AND if applicable</u></b></li> <li>• For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement</li> </ul>
5-9 Points	The application <b>somewhat demonstrates “need” in the project area</b> , and documents: (at least 1 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lack of connectivity,</li> <li>• the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,</li> <li>• local health concerns</li> <li><b><u>AND if applicable</u></b></li> <li>• For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement</li> </ul>
1-4 Points	The application <b>minimally demonstrates “need” in the project area</b> , and documents: (partially 1 or more of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lack of connectivity,</li> <li>• the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,</li> <li>• local health concerns</li> <li><b><u>AND if applicable</u></b></li> <li>• For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement</li> </ul>
0 Points	The application <b>does not demonstrate “need” in the project area</b>

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**PLUS:**

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the active transportation needs of STUDENTS.
2 Points	The application demonstrates the active transportation needs of students
0 Points	The application <b>does not</b> demonstrate the active transportation needs of students

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- *Evaluators are encouraged to review the data provided for reasonableness from the proposed project.*
  - *In doing this the evaluator should consult the attached photos, Google Maps, and any other information available to make an informed decision. A project does not need to have, or create large numbers in order to cause great change to a community’s active transportation increases, and this can be reflected in the scores given to a project.*
- *Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for improvements in the project area.*

**B. Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need:  
(0-10 points)**

**Breakdown of points:**

- **“Need”** must be considered in the context of the “Potential for increased walking and bicycling”
- **“will address”** must be considered in the context of one or more of the following “needs”:
  - the lack of connectivity,
  - the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,
  - local health concerns

To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all of the above aspects of “need”.
- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is not impacted by the number of categories documented for addressing the active transportation need.
  - Applications only documenting one category has the potential of receiving full points as long as it can fully meet the scoring criteria. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that additional categories are not appropriate for the project to better or more fully address the need.
  - Applications documenting numerous categories should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that the project scope connected to each category is relevant to the non-motorized users’ needs in the project limits.

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

Points	Applicant's ability to make a case that the project will address need for active transportation.
7-9 Points	The application <b>clearly and convincingly demonstrates</b> that the <b>project will best result in meaningful increases</b> in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the project area by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creating or improving links or connections,</li> <li>• encouraging use of routes to transportation-related and community identified destinations, where <u>an increase in active transportation modes can be realized</u></li> </ul>
5-6 Points	The application <b>convincingly demonstrates</b> that the <b>project will likely result in meaningful increases</b> in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the project area by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creating or improving links or connections,</li> <li>• encouraging use of routes to transportation-related and community identified destinations, where <u>an increase in active transportation modes can be realized</u></li> </ul>
3-4 Points	The application <b>somewhat demonstrates</b> that the <b>project will likely result in minor meaningful increases</b> in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the project area by: (at least 1 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creating or improving links or connections,</li> <li>• encouraging use of routes to transportation-related and community identified destinations, where <u>an increase in active transportation modes can be realized</u></li> </ul>
1-2 Points	The application <b>minimally demonstrates</b> that the <b>project may result in some minor increases</b> in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users by: (partially 1 or more of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creating or improving links or connections,</li> <li>• encouraging use of routes to transportation-related and community identified destinations, where <u>an increase in active transportation modes can be realized</u></li> </ul>
0 Points	The application did not demonstrate the project would address the need.

**PLUS:**

Points	Applicant's ability to make a case that the proposal that will increase the number of active transportation trips accomplished by STUDENTS.
1 Point	The project will increase the proportion of active transportation trips accomplished by students
0 Point	The project <b>will not</b> increase the proportion of active transportation trips accomplished by students

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

A “very important destination”, such as access to goods, services and activities that society considers particularly important i.e. a hospital, a grocery store, a transit station, or an employment center (where the community can reasonably expect to find employment). The applicant may be able to make a case for other very important destinations, with adequate documentation.

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

- Evaluators are to evaluate if the proposed improvements are the best solution to address the need described in sub-question A.
- Evaluators are to evaluate if the destinations shown in the application, are reasonably accessible by non-motorized users.
- Evaluators are to determine if an increase in active transportation modes can be realized by the project.

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**QUESTION #3: POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OR THE RISK OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLIST FATALITIES AND INJURIES, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF SAFETY HAZARDS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS. (0-20 POINTS)**

**A. Describe how the project location’s history of pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users, which this project will mitigate. (10 points max)**

**General Guidance on the safety “Influence Area” for a project:**

- Where “Project” is used to describe Infrastructure, and Non-Infrastructure components
- The project’s “**Influence area**” needs to be established by the applicant. The following are some general criteria to guide applicants in determining appropriate “influence-area” for each of their proposed safety improvements/countermeasures (As defined in the Caltrans Highway Safety Improvement Program application Instructions). Before applying these general criteria, it is the applicant’s responsibility to ensure that they are reasonable for their particular application.
  - a) *New Traffic Signals: All crashes within 250 feet of the new signal.*
  - b) *For intersection or mid-block crossing improvements, collisions that occurred within 250 feet of the intersection/mid-block crossing in all directions affected by the improvement may be used. If the distance to the nearest intersection is less than 500 feet, only those collisions that occurred from mid-point may be used.*
  - c) *Longitudinal Improvements (bike lanes, sidewalks, road diets, etc): All crashes potentially effected by and within the limits of the improvement.*
  - d) *If the improvements represent a new route and there is no past crash and safety data available within the limits of the proposed improvements, the applicant should consider the potential for the project to eliminate or reduce existing conflict points on parallel routes. A portion of the crash data from parallel routes can be included where the new facility/route can be reasonably expected to reduce the likelihood of past crashes from reoccurring. The overall applicant data provided in the Narrative Questions and various attachments must support the use of parallel crash data.*
  - e) *The influence-area may be extended beyond the physical improvements and/or the limits above if standard traffic engineering principles, as documented in Caltrans, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) or FHWA publications, suggest it would be appropriate to do so. When the influence-area of the project is not obvious and judgment has been used in identifying the influence-area, it is the applicant’s responsibility to provide additional documentation showing the reasonableness of the judgment.*

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**6 points:** Based on the actual history of “reported” Crash Data and how this crash data demonstrates the proposed safety improvements represent one of the communities highest safety needs.

**Breakdown of points:**

- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is based on the evaluators review of the following output files from the new UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS tool (*or if the agency prefers, they may use their own collision database data/software to produce equivalent documents*).
  - Collision Heat-map of the area surrounding the project limits: Points are based on the map demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history, suggesting that the project limits represents one of their highest safety needs.
  - Project Area Collision Map: Points are based on the map demonstrating that the past collision locations are within the “***Influence area***” of the proposed safety improvements.
  - Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports: Points are based on summaries, lists and reports demonstrating that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.
- ❖ *Note: For applications that do not have the collision data OR that prefer to provide safety data in a different format are allowed to do so. If an application chooses not to provide the above output documents, then the evaluator must scrutinize why they did not provide these documents/data and then do their best to make an approximation/comparison of the data provided to the generally-expected output data. **Evaluators need to stay mindful that these points are intended to be awarded based on a data-driven process.***

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the location’s history of Crash/Safety data directly supports/demonstrates the “need” for “safety” improvements.
5-6 Points	The application <b>clearly and convincingly shows:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Collision Heat-map</u> demonstrates that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history,</li> <li>○ <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrates that the past collision locations are within the “<b><i>Influence area</i></b>” of the proposed safety improvements.</li> <li>○ <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.</li> </ul>
3-4 Points	The application <b>somewhat shows:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Collision Heat-map</u> demonstrates that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history,</li> <li>○ <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrates that the past collision locations are within the “<b><i>Influence area</i></b>” of the proposed safety improvements.</li> <li>○ <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.</li> </ul>
1-2 Points	The application <b>minimally shows:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Collision Heat-map</u> demonstrates that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history,</li> <li>○ <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrates that the past collision locations are within the “<b><i>Influence area</i></b>” of the proposed safety improvements.</li> </ul>

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.</li> </ul>
0 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not provide verifiable data and does not provide data-driven documentation to demonstrate that the propose project represents one of the jurisdiction/community’s highest safety needs AND does not demonstrate that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.</li> </ul>

### **Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

The following “Minimum Requirements” must be met for the application to receive any of these points:

- Applicant must provide the output files from the **new UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS tool** (or if the agency prefers, they may use their own collision database data/software to produce equivalent documents):
  - Collision Heat-map of the area surrounding the project limits- demonstrating the relative collision history of the project limits in relation to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history
  - Project Area Collision Map- identifying the past crash locations within the project limits
  - Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports – demonstrating collision trends, collision types, and collision details
- The output files provided by the Applicant must meet the following parameters:
  - The project’s “**Influence area**”, as defined by the applicant and shown in the output documents, must be consistent with the project maps/plans attached to the application AND must be reasonable per the above “**Influence area**” guidance.
    - Evaluators should consider additional point reductions for this question if the applicant included crash data that does not reasonably tie to the influence area of the proposed “safety” improvements.
  - The collisions represent the most recent 5 years of available crash data. (Note: SWITRS and TIMS crash data is typically 1.5 to 2.5 years old before it is loaded into the crash database). Old data, and more than 5 years of data must be excluded.
  - If the applicant does not use the new UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS tool and instead uses their own collision database data/software, then the following additional checks and analysis must be done by the evaluators prior to awarding points:
    - Crashes are from official crash reports. The full crash reports do not have to be included, but their report number and agency must be identifiable.
    - Only pedestrian and bicycle crashes are included. All crashes that do not include a non-motorized user as one of the primary victims must be excluded.
    - The number of crashes entered into the table is directly supported by both the map and the listing.

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

**4 points: Based on applicant’s ability to make a compelling case that the location’s history of Crash Data (Or Safety Data for projects without documented crash data) directly supports/demonstrates the “need” for “safety” improvements within the project limits.**

**Breakdown of points:**

- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is based on the evaluators review of the applicant’s response to the following question:  
*“Referencing project’s heat-maps, collision map and collision summaries provided in above, discuss the extent to which the proposed project limits represents one of the agency’s top priorities for addressing ongoing safety and discuss how the proposed safety improvements correspond to the types and locations of the past collisions. (e.g. sidewalks, bike lanes, lighting, bulb-outs, signals/beacons, etc.)”*

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the location’s history of Crash/Safety data directly supports/demonstrates the “need” for “safety” improvements.
4 Points	<p>The application <b>clearly and convincingly shows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</li> <li>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p>The application <b>convincingly shows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</li> <li>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</li> </ul>
2 Points	<p>The application <b>somewhat shows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</li> <li>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</li> </ul>
1 Points	<p>The application <b>minimally shows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</li> <li>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</li> </ul>

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the safety need of the proposed project.
----------	--

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Evaluators are to verify that the applicant demonstrated that the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project.
- Evaluators are to verify that the applicant demonstrated that they analyzed the past crash/safety data to identify the specific crash-type trends which will likely occur in the future if no action is taken.
- Evaluators are to verify that the applicant demonstrated there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles which can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.

**B. Safety Countermeasures (10 points max)**

**Describe how the project will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities (only); Countermeasures must directly address the underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence of pedestrian and/or bicyclist collisions.**

**Breakdown of points:**

- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is not impacted by the number of “Potential safety hazards” and “Countermeasures” documented in the application.
  - Applications only documenting one “Potential safety hazard” / “Countermeasure” has the potential of receiving full points as long as it can fully meet the scoring criteria and demonstrate that implementing only one countermeasure is appropriate to address the existing hazards.
  - Applications documenting numerous “Potential safety hazards” / “Countermeasures” should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that each safety hazard is relevant to the non-motorized users in the project limits and that each countermeasure being funded by the project is necessary to mitigate the potential for future crashes.
  - Projects that appear to include elements/costs with little safe benefits should not receive as many points as projects with highly effective & efficient use of limited funding.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards.
9-10 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is an <b>urgent need</b> for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</li> <li>• the proposed countermeasure(s) have a <b>proven track record</b> for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <b>fully mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</li> </ul>
6-8 Points	<p><b>The applicant convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is a <b>significant need</b> for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</li> <li>• the proposed countermeasure(s) have a <b>proven track record</b> for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <b>AND</b></li> </ul>

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <b>significantly (but not fully) mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</li> </ul>
3-5 Points	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is a <b>moderate need</b> for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</li> <li>the proposed countermeasure(s) have a <b>track record</b> for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <b>AND</b></li> <li>the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <b>somewhat mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</li> </ul>

1-2 Points	<p><b>The applicant minimally demonstrates</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there <b>could be a need</b> for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</li> <li>the proposed countermeasure(s) have a <b>track record</b> for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <b>AND</b></li> <li>the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <b>somewhat mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</li> </ul>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the safety need of the proposed project.

### **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 safety improvements being proposed in the project.*
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that they analyzed the past crash/safety data trends and appropriately selected safety countermeasure(s) with proven track record(s) for addressing the past trends.*
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated each proposed safety countermeasure(s) is appropriately included in the project to mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.*

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## **QUESTION #4: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION and PLANNING (0-10 POINTS)**

Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project.

- A. What was the process of defining future policies, goals, investments and designs to prepare for future needs of users of this project? How did the applicant analyze the wide range of alternatives and impacts on the transportation system to influence beneficial outcomes? (3 points max)**

**Breakdown of points:**

- The level of expected planning for a project is directly connected to the magnitude and complexity of the proposed changes/designs and to the impacts to the overall transportation network.
  - Projects with larger scopes and costs should demonstrate a more extensive internal planning process, including the analysis of a wide range of alternatives.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the public participation process will be utilized as part of the development of a plan.
3 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) <b>and</b> the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system <b>and</b> the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.</li> </ul>
2 Points	<p><b>The applicant demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) <b>and</b> the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system <b>and</b> the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.</li> </ul>
1 Points	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) <b>and/or</b> the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system <b>and/or</b> the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.</li> </ul>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the project scope is a result of technical planning.

**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 applicant demonstrated the agency’s active transportation technical planning conducted as part of developing and refining the project scope.
- Evaluators are to consider the level to which the technical planning considered both existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system.
- Evaluators are to consider the level to which the process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

- B. Who:** Describe who was engaged in the identification and development of this project and how they were engaged. Describe and provide documentation of the type, extent, and duration of outreach and engagement conducted to relevant stakeholders. (3 points max)

**General Guidance on stakeholders and their involvement in a project:**

- *Public stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end users, 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.)*
- *Meetings and/or events and how many were held to engage stakeholders is key to Public Participation. These can include, but are not limited to:*
  - *The type of meetings or events: open houses, community charrettes, city council meetings, planning commission meetings, etc.*
  - *How the meetings or events were noticed: local newspaper, county website, on the radio, at school parents group meetings, etc.*
  - *How the meetings or events were documented: Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes, letters of support, etc.*
  - *Where the meetings or events took place: school, community center, city council hall, etc.*
  - *The accessibility of the meetings or events: accessible by public transportation, translational services provided, and time of day the meetings or events were held, etc.*
  - *The stakeholders' involvement in the decision-making body: technical advisory committee, citizens' advisory committee, etc.*

**Breakdown of points:**

- Points will be awarded based on the extent that the relevant stakeholders were engaged in the development of the project and the level of community outreach and meeting/event accessibility
- The level of expected public outreach and participation for a project is directly connected to the magnitude and complexity of the proposed project and the community characteristics being served and/or impacted by the project.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the public participation process took place in development of the proposed project, or how and who will be engaged in the development of a plan.
3 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included appropriate levels of public and governmental stakeholders, <b>and</b> the meetings and events were <b>fully</b> accessible and effectively engaged <b>all</b> project stakeholders.</li> </ul>
2 Points	<p><b>The applicant demonstrates</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included appropriate levels of public and governmental stakeholders, <b>and</b> the meetings and events were accessible and effectively engaged project stakeholders.</li> </ul>
1 Point	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates</b> that: The project scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included some public and/or governmental stakeholders, <b>and/or</b> the meetings and events were accessible and engaged project stakeholders.</p>

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the project scope was developed through an adequate public participation process.
----------	---

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- *Evaluators are to give consideration to any attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: any applicable public outreach process/proposal/plan, links to websites, meeting agenda, meeting sign-in sheet, meeting minutes, public service announcements, letters of support, etc.*
- *Evaluators are to consider the extent that the relevant stakeholders were engaged in the development of the project and the level of community outreach and meeting/event accessibility in relation to the magnitude and complexity of the proposed project and the community characteristics being served and/or impacted by the project.*

**C. What: Describe the feedback received during the stakeholder engagement process and describe how the public participation and planning process has improved the project’s overall effectiveness at meeting the purpose and goals of the ATP. (2 points max)**

**Breakdown of points:**

- Points will be awarded based on the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to identify the highest community/regional active transportation priorities and to ensure the effectiveness of the project at meeting the purpose for the ATP through the use of stakeholder feedback.
  - The magnitude of the proposed project is directly connected to the expected degree to which the project represents a high local-community vs. regional priority.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate that feedback was received and how it will improve the project’s overall effectiveness.
2 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope is supported by the feedback received during the public participation and planning process, <b>and</b> this process has improved the project’s overall effectiveness, <b>and</b> the project is one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.</li> </ul>
1 Point	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope is supported by the feedback received during the public participation and planning process, <b>or</b> this process has improved the project’s overall effectiveness, <b>although</b> the project may not be one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.</li> </ul>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove project scope is supported by the feedback received during the public participation and planning process, <b>or</b> the project is not a high community/regional active transportation priority.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- *Evaluators are to give consideration to any attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: any applicable meeting minutes, letters of support, new alternatives or major revisions that were identified, etc.*

## 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

- *Evaluators are to consider the level to which the letters of support emphasize that the project represents the top or one of the top active transportation priorities for the community, targeted end users, or public stakeholders.*
- *Evaluators are to consider the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to identify improve the effectiveness of the project*
- *Evaluators are to consider the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to ensure the project is one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.*
- *Evaluators are to consider the magnitude of the proposed project when considering the extent to which the project represents one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.*

**D. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan. (1 point max)**

Points	The applicant's ability to demonstrate that stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan.
1 Point	<b>The applicant demonstrates</b> that project stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately demonstrates that project stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program/plan.

**E. This project is specifically listed in an approved Transportation Plan. (1 point max)**

Points	This project is specifically listed in an approved Transportation Plan
1 Point	This project is specifically listed in an approved Transportation Plan.
0 Points	This project is <b>NOT</b> specifically listed in an approved Transportation Plan.

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## **QUESTION #5: PROJECT SCOPE and IMPLEMENTATION (0-10 POINTS)**

### **A. Development and documentation of the Project Scope: (10 points max)**

Evaluators will consider the following:

[link to the policy](#)

The documents and application sections considered key to defining the project's Scope, Cost and Schedule are:

- Project layout-plans and cross-sections
- Detailed Engineer's Estimate
- Project Schedule and Requested programming years for the ATP funding
- Supporting photos, maps, etc.

These documents, along with the other elements of the ATP Engineer's Checklist (Attachment B), will be evaluated for:

- How well they match the applicant's responses throughout this application
- How well they meet the PSR-Equivalent expectations defined in the Engineer's Checklist
- How well the overall project scope meets the Purpose and Goals for the ATP, as defined CTC Guidelines.

**For projects with Non-Infrastructure elements (Combined I/NI projects), applicants must complete the 22-R:**

The 22-R will be evaluated for:

- How well it matches the applicant's responses throughout this application
- How well the overall scope meets the Purpose and Goals for the ATP, as defined CTC Guidelines
- Compliance with the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance

**The scoring for this question is outlined in the 3 tables below.**

Points	The application's narrative are consistent with the scope of the project as defined by the plans, estimate and workplan (if applicable).
3-4 Points	The project documents <b>fully match</b> the applicant's responses throughout this application
1-2 Points	The project documents <b>somewhat match</b> the applicant's responses throughout this application
0 Points	The project documents <b>does not match</b> the applicant's responses throughout this application

Points	The project documents meet the PSR-Equivalent expectation as defined in the CTC resolution ... and the Engineer's Checklist
4 Points	The scope, cost and schedule are clearly defined.
2 Points	One or more elements of the scope, cost and/or schedule are not clearly defined
0 Points	The scope, cost and/or schedule are not defined.

Points	The project elements meet the purpose and goals of the ATP
2 Points	All of the project elements meet the purpose and goals of the ATP
1 Points	Most of the project elements meet the purpose and goals of the ATP
0 Points	Most of the project elements <b>do not meet</b> the purpose and goals of the ATP

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## QUESTION #6: CONTEXT SENSITIVE BIKEWAYS/WALKWAYS and INNOVATIVE PROJECT ELEMENTS (0-5 POINTS)

**A. How are the “recognized best” solutions employed in this project appropriate to maximize user comfort and for the local community context?**

As you address this question consider the following:

- The posted speed limits and actual speed,
- The existing and future motorized and non-motorized traffic volume,
- The widths for each facility,
- The adjacent land use, and
- How the project is advancing a low(er) stress environment on each facility or a low stress network
  - What is the current stress level? (low, medium or high)
  - If the stress level is medium or high, is the project going beyond minimum design standards to maximize potential users of all ages and abilities?

**B. INNOVATIVE PROJECT ELEMENTS**

Does this project propose any solutions that are new to their region? Were any Innovative elements considered but not selected? Explain why they were not selected.

Points	<b>The applicant’s ability to demonstrate that the “recognized best” solutions employed in this project appropriate to maximize user comfort and for the local community context and the project is proposing solutions that are new to their region?</b>
5 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project recognized best solutions were employed and/or</li> <li>• The project is proposing innovative solutions</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p><b>The applicant demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project recognized best solutions were employed and/or</li> <li>• The project is proposing innovative solutions and/or</li> <li>• Innovative elements were considered but not selected</li> </ul>
1 Points	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project recognized best solutions were employed and/or</li> <li>• The project is proposing innovative solutions and/or</li> <li>• Innovative elements were considered but not selected</li> </ul>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a zero if the solutions are not appropriate to maximize user comfort, and/or Innovative solutions were not proposed, or the reason for not selecting the innovation was not compelling.</p>

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## QUESTION #7: TRANSFORMATIVE PROJECTS (0-5 POINTS)

A. Describe how your project will transform the non-motorized environment?

B. Describe how other new or proposed funded projects or policies in the vicinity of this project will attribute to the transformative nature of this project?

As you address this question consider the following:

- Transit
- Land use

For projects please attach one of the following:

- the meeting minutes voting to fund the project, or
- the environmental approved environmental document
- other?

For policy(ies) attach?

Points	Transforming the non-motorized environment and how other new or proposed funded projects or policies in the vicinity of this project will attribute to the transformative nature of this project
5 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is transforming the non-motorized environment and/or</li> <li>• This project is being combined with other projects or policy(ies) to make a transformative change</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p><b>The applicant demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is transforming the non-motorized environment and/or</li> <li>• This project is being combined with other projects or policy(ies) to make a transformative change</li> </ul>
1 Points	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is transforming the non-motorized environment and/or</li> <li>• This project is being combined with other projects or policy(ies) to make a transformative change</li> </ul>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a zero if the solutions was not compelling.

### Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## QUESTION #8 COST EFFECTIVENESS (0-5 POINTS)

**A project’s cost effectiveness is considered to be the relative costs of the project in comparison to the project’s benefits as defined by the purpose and goals of the ATP. This includes the consideration of the safety and mobility benefit in relation to both the total project cost and the funds provided.**

Explain why the project is considered to have a high Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose and goals of “increased use of active modes of transportation”. [Explain why this project is the best use of State Resources?](#)

### General Guidance:

- “Project” is used to describe Plan, Infrastructure, and/or Non-Infrastructure projects.
- “Project Benefits as defined by the purpose and goals of the ATP”
  - State Law defines the Purpose of the ATP as “encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking or walking”.
  - Section 2 of the CTC Guidelines restate the Goals of the program as defined by State Law.
  - The “project benefits” are evaluated with respect to:
    - The extent to which the project addresses the “Needs” and “Benefits” is addressed in Question #2 and #3, and
    - “Total Project Cost” and “ATP funds”

### Breakdown of points:

- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this question is not impacted by only the magnitude and/or number of different types of improvements benefiting active transportation users. **The magnitude and types of improvements MUST be considered with respect to the Cost of the project and the amount of ATP funding being requested:**
  - Applications proposing only one type of improvement with a relative small scope and cost have the potential of receiving full points as long as they can justify the benefits per costs are very high.
  - Applications proposing numerous types of improvements with a large scope and cost should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that the overall the benefits per costs are very high.

Points	<b>The applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project is considered to have a high B/C with respect to the ATP purpose and goals.</b>
5 Points	<p><b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project <b>only</b> includes scope and costs that effectively and efficiently address significant safety, mobility <b>and</b> other project needs which is expected to directly result in “encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation” <b>and</b> one or more ATP goals, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The project includes <b>no</b> scope/costs that do not directly address significant active transportation needs.</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p><b>The applicant demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project includes scope and costs that effectively and efficiently address significant safety, mobility <b>and</b> other project needs which are expected to directly result in “encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation” <b>and</b> one or more ATP goals.</li> </ul>
1 Points	<p><b>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project includes scope and costs that effectively and efficiently address significant safety, mobility <b>and/or</b> other project needs which are expected to directly result in “encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation” <b>and/or</b> one or more ATP goals.</li> </ul>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the project’s use of ATP funding is being done in an efficient and/or effective manner.

# 2019 Large Infrastructure Active Transportation Program Scoring Rubrics

## QUESTION #9 LEVERAGING FUNDS (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 evaluate the magnitude of the Total Project Cost and the ATP funding being requested. Therefore, the Evaluator must review the applicant's cost estimate before scoring this question.
  - Per the main question, the project's cost effectiveness must be evaluated in relation to both the total project cost and the funds provided.
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that the project will result in "encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation" and/or one or more ATP goals.

**Describe the Leveraging funding the applicant is committing to invest in the project if it is awarded ATP funding (total value in dollars).**

**Only direct funding and the direct expenses for completing project delivery milestones can be used. Provide detailed information on actual costs for past milestones and estimated costs for future milestones.**

### Breakdown of points:

- Points will be awarded based on the amount of the non-ATP funding pledged to the project.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate that non-ATP funding is pledged to the project.
1 Point	<b>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates</b> commitment of leveraging funds to a phase(s) of the project where the applicant is requesting new ATP funding. (For example, not for the completion of a prior phase). The commitment funding must be at least 1% of the total ATP funding requested for the project.

### **PLUS:**

1 Point	1% to 11.4% of total project cost
2 Points	11.5% to 14.9% of total project cost
3 Points	15% to 19.9% of total project cost
4 Points	20% or more of total project cost