

**2027 Active Transportation Program**  
Medium Infrastructure and  
Medium Infrastructure + Non-Infrastructure  
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 to guide evaluators in scoring 2027 ATP applications. Applicants may also find this to be 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:**

<b>Question #</b>	<b>Question Title</b>	<b>Page #</b>
Question #1	Disadvantaged Communities	Page 2
Question #2	Potential to Increase Users	Page 8
Question #3	Potential to Reduce Collisions	Page 14
Question #4	Public Participation & Planning	Page 20
Question #5	Context-Sensitive/Innovation	Page 25
Question #6	Leveraging Funds	Page 27
Question #7	Scope & Plan Consistency	Page 28

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

- **Points for Part D (Project Location) and Part E (Severity) will be calculated by CTC. Evaluators will only submit scores on Part C – Direct Benefit – for a maximum of 4 points.**

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

*If this project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community, the applicant will skip this question and move on to question 2.*

**If the applicant checked the box for "This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community," the score for Question #1 will be zero "0".**

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

*Provide a scaled map showing the boundaries of the proposed project, the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community, disadvantaged community access point(s), and destinations that the project is benefiting. All census tracts (or schools if using Free or Reduced-Price School Meals) must be clearly labeled.*

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

*Select one of the following five options. The applicant 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.
- Healthy Places Index
- Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool
- USDOT Equitable Transportation Community Explorer
- Other
  - Regional Definition
  - Projects on federally recognized Tribal Land or projects submitted by Tribal Governments (federally recognized Native American tribes)
  - Other Determinant of MHI

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

- C1. Describe how the improvements meet an important need of the disadvantaged community. Explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, and/or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network.*
- C2. Explain how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project.*
- C3. Illustrate and provide documentation for how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. Address any issues of displacement that may occur as a result of this project, if applicable.*
- C4. Address any issues of displacement that may occur as a result of this project, if applicable. If displacement is not an issue, explain why it is not a concern for the community.*
- C5. For combined I/NI projects, describe how non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted toward the disadvantaged community whom the project benefits.*

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

Sub-questions A and 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 project map(s) and provide the DAC information as required in both A and B.
  - Maps should include **all** census tracts/schools that the project influences, not just the ones that are disadvantaged.

When evaluating C1, the evaluator should consider:

- Does the project provide reasonable improvements to close missing gaps; increase needed routes or connections (such as disadvantaged community residents' safe access to parks, greenways, open space, health care centers, transit stops, and other community assets) or address 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?
- Will the project address a "need" that was identified by the local community and is supported by backup documentation/attachments?

When evaluating C2, the evaluator should consider:

- Will the improvements be physically convenient and safe for the community to access or use?
- Will the improvements provide a logical route that residents will use or want to use because it offers safe and convenient access?
- If the project is not located in the DAC, will they have reasonable access points to the project?

When evaluating C3, the evaluator should consider:

- Was the local DAC community actively involved in the project development? Did they request the project?
- Did the DAC community have the opportunity to provide their input on community needs, and do they support this project?
- Was this project presented to the DAC community in a local forum so that they could provide input or support? Or was the project simply voted on in a general agency meeting without really reaching out to the community to learn their needs and wants?
- Provide documentation of how the local residents and community groups were engaged for input on community and household needs and of any support from local community-based organizations and/or residents.

When evaluating C4, the evaluator should consider:

- Did the applicant explain how anti-displacement policies and actions are being implemented in their community/city/county to discourage displacement of the community impacted by the project?
- Did the applicant discuss how displacement is being addressed, for example, through policies, workgroups, plans, city ordinances or other local laws.
- If the applicant says that displacement is not an issue in their community, did they address this? If displacement is not an issue, an applicant should not lose points if they explain **why** it is not a concern.
  - If applicable, applicants should state that displacement is not an issue **and** provide an explanation for why.

For combination I/NI projects, when evaluating C5, the evaluator should consider:

- Did the applicant explain how non-infrastructure events and programs will benefit the disadvantaged community?
- What strategies will be used to ensure that the non-infrastructure events and programs will be easily accessible to the disadvantaged community? How did the applicant ensure that the non-infrastructure events and programs are relevant to the needs of the disadvantaged community? (e.g., development of community-relevant content, choice of venue, methods used to promote the program, materials in appropriate languages, etc.)

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>• Describes how the improvements meet an important need of the disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains and provides documentation to illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> </ul> <p>The application includes <b>attachments</b> that show <b>evidence</b> of thorough engagement and outreach, resulting in input and buy-in from the disadvantaged community.</p> <p><b>Additionally:</b> For combination I/NI projects, the applicant <b>also clearly and convincingly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Describes how the disadvantaged community members will be able to easily access the events and programs.</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p>The application addresses <b>at least three</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes how the improvements meet an important need of the disadvantaged community.</li> <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.</li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project.</li> <li>• Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> </ul> <p>The application includes <b>attachments</b> that show evidence of outreach and engagement to the disadvantaged community and documents their buy-in.</p> <p><b>Additionally:</b> For combination I/NI projects, the applicant addresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community.</li> <li>• Describes how the disadvantaged community members will be able to easily access the events and programs.</li> </ul>
2 Points	<p>The application addresses <b>at least two</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes how the improvements meet an important need of the disadvantaged community.</li> <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.</li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project.</li> <li>• Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> </ul> <p>The application includes some <b>attachments</b> that show evidence of contacting the disadvantaged community.</p>

	<p><b>Additionally:</b> For combination I/NI projects, the applicant <b>somewhat</b> addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community.</li> <li>• How the disadvantaged community members will be able to easily access the events and programs.</li> </ul>
<b>1 Point</b>	<p>The application <b>minimally</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes how the project meets a need of the disadvantaged community and 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.</li> <li>• Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project.</li> <li>• Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> </ul> <p>The application <b>did not</b> include <b>attachments</b> that showed evidence of outreach to the disadvantaged community.</p> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, the application <b>minimally</b> addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will benefit and be accessible to the disadvantaged community.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe <b>all</b> of the following apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application does not address how the project closes a gap or provides connections, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Does not address how the disadvantaged community will have physical access to the project, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Does not address how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The application did not include any support attachments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects, the application <b>did not address</b> how the non-infrastructure events and programs will benefit or be accessible to the disadvantaged community.</li> </ul>

➤ **Points for Part D (Project Location) and Part E (Severity) will be calculated by CTC.**

**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
<b>2 Points</b>	Project location(s) is/are <b>fully</b> (100%) located within a DAC.
<b>1 Point</b>	Project location(s) is/are <b>partially</b> (less than 100%) within a DAC.
<b>0 Points</b>	None of the project location(s) is/are within a DAC.

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

Based on the option the applicant chooses for DAC identification, CTC staff shall give points per the tables below.

Points	Median Household Income (MHI)   Statewide MHI = \$99,122, 80% = \$79,297.60	
<b>0 Points</b>	80% or greater of the statewide MHI	\$79,297.60 or greater
<b>1 Point</b>	75% to <80% of the statewide MHI	\$74,341.50 to \$79,297.59
<b>2 Points</b>	70% to <75% of the statewide MHI	\$69,385.40 to \$74,341.49
<b>3 Points</b>	65% to <70% of the statewide MHI	\$64,429.30 to \$69,385.39
<b>4 Points</b>	Less than 65% of the statewide MHI	\$64,429.29 or less

Points	CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score	
<b>0 Points</b>	Above 25% most disadvantaged	less than 40.05
<b>1 Point</b>	20% through 25% most disadvantaged	40.05 through 43.38
<b>2 Points</b>	15% through <20% most disadvantaged	43.39 through 47.54
<b>3 Points</b>	10% through <15% most disadvantaged	47.55 through 51.97
<b>4 Points</b>	<10% most disadvantaged	51.98 through 93.18

Points	National School Lunch Program   Free or Reduced-Price Meals Percentage	
<b>0 points</b>	Less than 75% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>1 Point</b>	≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>2 Points</b>	> 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>3 Points</b>	> 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>4 Points</b>	> 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches	

Points	Healthy Places Index 3.0 Score*	
<b>0 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score above 25th Percentile	
<b>1 Point</b>	Healthy Places Index Score 20th through 25th Percentile	
<b>2 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score 15th through <20th Percentile	
<b>3 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score 10th through <15th Percentile	
<b>4 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score <10th Percentile	

\*Healthy Places Index Score inputted should only be the overall HPI Score. Other indicator numbers can be discussed in the narrative, but only the overall percentile can be used for Disadvantaged Communities qualification.

Category	Points	Other DAC Criteria
<b>Federally Recognized Tribal Lands or projects submitted by Tribal Governments</b>	<b>4 points</b>	Projects located within federally recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria) or projects submitted by Tribal Governments (federally recognized Native American tribes).
<b>Regional Definition</b>	<b>0 or 1 point</b>	If the applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community based on an adopted regional definition, the applicant must submit for consideration the regional definition, as well as <b>how</b> their specific community qualifies under that definition.
<b>Other MHI or CalEnviroScreen Assessment</b>	<b>0 or 1 point</b>	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.

## **QUESTION #2: POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING, BICYCLING AND ROLLING (0-40 POINTS)**

**A. Statement of Project Need.** Describe the community context and the issue(s) that this project will address to increase walking, biking and rolling and induce mode shift. How will the proposed project benefit non-motorized users of all ages and varying abilities? Consider children, older adults, students, working professionals, and persons with disabilities. What is the project's desired outcome, and how will the project best deliver that outcome? **(0-20 points)**

Discuss:

- Community characteristics and context (e.g., urban/rural/suburban, relevant history, socioeconomic characteristics, etc.)
- Destinations and key connectivity the project will achieve
- How the project will increase walking and/or biking
- Does the community have an unserved or underserved demand that the project will address?
  - The lack of mobility, if applicable - does the population have limited access to cars, bikes, and/or transit?
- The **local** health concerns responses should focus on the following:
  - Specific local public health concerns, health disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment that affect the project community and can be addressed through the proposed project. Please provide detailed and locally relevant answers instead of general descriptions of the health benefits of walking and biking (i.e., "walking and biking increase physical activity").
  - Local public health data demonstrates the above public health concern or health disparity. Data should be at the smallest geography available (state or national data is not sufficient). One potential source is the [Healthy Places Index \(HPI\)](#).
- For combined I/NI: discuss the need for an encouragement and education program.

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

Applicants are not required to submit user counts at the time of application. User counts will be collected for each successful project application after award.

- “Need” must be considered in the context of the “potential to increase active modes of transportation” such as walking, bicycling, rolling.
- “Need” must be considered in the context of all of the following:
  - Connectivity to key destinations
  - Mobility to access everyday needs and services by walking, bicycling, and rolling for persons of all ages and persons with or without disabilities.
  - Local public health concerns
- To receive the **maximum points**, applicants must thoroughly demonstrate **all** of the above aspects of “need,” and should address the needs of vulnerable and underserved populations, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), older adults, and persons with disabilities.

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

1. **Lack of connectivity.** Consider the impact of the proposed project on the community and how it will fit into the geographic context.
  - The evaluator should consult the attached photos and any other information available in the application to make an informed decision.
  - When the project application is for a segment of a larger path or corridor, does the applicant explain the benefits of not only the entire project, but also the segment? Does the application address why this particular segment is key to the larger project?
    - The applicant may claim the benefits of the larger path or corridor to illustrate the importance of completing the segment for which they are applying.

- Evaluators should expect the application to focus on the benefits of the segment in this application. Does the applicant provide more information on the project benefits than just generally claiming the benefits of the entire path or corridor?
- 2. **Lack of mobility for non-motorized users.** Evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for improvements in the project area.
  - When citing key destinations, does the applicant also explain *why* those destinations are important for the community being impacted by the project?
  - Are *specific* destinations cited or are general terms used, e.g. “schools”, “stores”, or “amenities”?
  - Does the applicant discuss how the community currently accesses the specified destinations? (i.e., driving, transit, walking, biking, rolling)
  - What are the mobility challenges impacting the community?
- 3. **Local Health Concerns.** Are specific local public health concerns identified?
  - Does the application identify a health disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment affecting the project community that can be addressed by increasing walking, biking, and rolling, including:
    - A thorough and nuanced discussion of existing health conditions affecting the targeted community.
      - Evaluators can expect responses to 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) that contribute to the current health conditions in the target community.
      - This check point looks beyond elements already addressed in the application such as scope elements (closing gaps and barriers), and safety concerns (collision rates), etc.
  - Does the application provide local public health data demonstrating the public health concern or health disparity discussed in the application. Also consider:
    - Is the health data provided for the smallest geographic area available (i.e., census tract or city or county level if a specific census tract is not available) AND
    - The health status of targeted users is provided in percentages or rates using relevant and local health indicators, AND
    - The local data is compared 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).

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate a specific active transportation need.
16-18 Points	<p>The application <b>compellingly demonstrates “need” in the project area</b>, and documents <b>all</b> of the following in a <b>clear</b> narrative:</p> <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 are identified and addressed, and a comparison to statewide and/or countywide health data is included,</li> </ul> <p><b>AND if applicable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community,</li> <li>• For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component compellingly and clearly discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.</li> </ul>

<b>11-15 Points</b>	<p>The application <b>duly demonstrates “need” in the project area</b>, and documents only 2 of the following clearly, and at least one other one partially:</p> <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 (does it include a comparison to statewide and/or countywide health data?),</li> </ul> <p><b>AND if applicable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community,</li> <li>• For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component <b>duly</b> discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.</li> </ul>
<b>5-10 Points</b>	<p>The application <b>somewhat demonstrates “need” in the project area</b>, and documents only 1 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <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> </ul> <p><b>AND if applicable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community,</li> <li>• For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component <b>somewhat</b> discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.</li> </ul>
<b>1-4 Points</b>	<p>The application <b>minimally demonstrates “need” in the project area</b>, and <b>partially</b> documents 1 of the following:</p> <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> </ul> <p><b>AND if applicable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community,</li> <li>• For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component <b>minimally</b> discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	<p>The application <b>does not demonstrate “need” in the project area in any of the three areas of need</b>, and there is <b>no mention</b> of the need of the disadvantaged community, and there is <b>no mention</b> of the NI program (if applicable).</p>

**PLUS:**

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Does the applicant address how students will use and have access to the project?
- Projects can receive points for demonstrating the transportation needs of students of all ages, including high school and college/community college.
- If the applicant simply states "schools" as a destination the project will connect to, that does not warrant the two points.
- The project **DOES NOT** have to be a safe routes to school project in order to receive these points.

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

**B. Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need: (0-20 points)**

- Close a gap?
- Creation of new routes?
- Removal of barrier to mobility?
- Other improvements to existing routes?

*Considering the category(s) selected, describe how the project links, connects to, or encourages the use of existing routes to important or community-identified destinations where an increase in active transportation modes can be realized, including but not limited to: schools, school facilities, transit facilities, community, social service or medical centers, employment centers, high density or affordable housing, regional, state, or national trail systems, recreational and visitor destinations or other community-identified destinations. Specific destinations must be identified.*

*For combined I/NI projects, describe the non-infrastructure program, the population it will serve, and how the program will use education and encouragement to address the needs identified in Part A.*

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

- **“Need”** must be considered in the context of the “potential for increased walking and bicycling” for all ages and varying abilities.
- **“The proposed project will address”** must be considered in **all** 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” for each improvement category.
  - Since each category addresses a different need, the answers provided should be specific to the improvement category.
- For combined I/NI projects, evaluators should evaluate how the non-infrastructure programming will address the needs identified in Part A. Applicants should discuss how the non-infrastructure program will:
  - provide new skills and familiarity to the community
  - induce mode shift
  - enhance connectivity, mobility, and health
  - introduce the community to existing and new improvements
- The applicant should discuss how the project meets the needs of vulnerable and underserved populations, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), older adults, and persons with disabilities.
- The amount of points a project application receives on this sub-question is **not impacted by the number of categories** documented for addressing the active transportation need.
  - An application only documenting **one category** has the potential to receive 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.
  - An application 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.

A “very important destination” includes those that offer access to goods, services, and activities that society considers particularly important, e.g., job sites, hospital or other health care facility, a grocery store, a transit station, a community center, a retail center, or an employment center (where the community can reasonably expect to find employment). The applicant should make the case for other destinations that are very important to the community benefiting from the proposed project.

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

- Evaluate if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed improvements are the best solution to address the needs described in Part A. For combination I/NI projects, the applicant should address both infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.
- Evaluate if the destinations identified in Part A are reasonably accessible by non-motorized users.
- Consider narrative answers and attachments to determine if an increase in active transportation modes can be realized by the project.
- Check the local public health data and information provided and the source (e.g. public health department, local community-based organization that provides support for health equity or addresses health disparities, Healthy Places Index):
  - Was the local public health department or community-based organization involved in aspects of the application such as supporting public engagement, developing project scope, supporting data and statistics to highlight the public health need, etc.; and
  - Will the local public health department or community-based organization continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program?

Points	Applicant’s ability to make a case that the project will address the need for active transportation.
<p><b>16-19 Points</b></p>	<p>The answers in Part B <b>clearly demonstrate</b> without a doubt that the <b>project will best</b> address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating or improving links or connections, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects the answer <b>clearly</b> demonstrates that the NI program provides:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, <b>AND</b> demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>11-15 Points</b></p>	<p>The answers in Part B <b>demonstrate</b> that the <b>project will</b> address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating or improving links or connections, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects the answer <b>demonstrates</b> that the NI program provides:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, <b>AND</b> demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6-10 Points</b></p>	<p>The answers in Part B <b>somewhat demonstrate</b> that the <b>project has the potential</b> to address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by: (only 1 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating or improving links or connections,</li> <li>• Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects the answer <b>somewhat</b> demonstrates that the NI program provides:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, <b>AND</b> demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>1-5 Points</b>	<p>The answers in Part B <b>minimally demonstrate</b> that the <b>project may</b> address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by partially doing 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating or improving links or connections,</li> <li>• Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects the answer <b>minimally</b> demonstrates that the non-infrastructure program provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, <b>AND</b> demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	The application <b>did not demonstrate in any way</b> that the project would address the need presented in part A.

**PLUS:**

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Does the applicant address how the improvements will help students access the project?
- Projects can receive points for demonstrating the transportation needs of students of all ages, including high school and college/community college.
- If the applicant simply states “schools” as a destination that does not warrant the one point
- The project **DOES NOT** have to be a safe routes to school project in order to receive this point.

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

### **QUESTION #3: POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION USER FATALITIES AND INJURIES.**

**(0-25 POINTS)**

A. Describe the project location's history of pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users, which this project will mitigate. (12 points max)

*Referencing the project-area collision summaries and data provided in sub-questions 1 and 2, provide an analysis of the past collision data to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken. 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. Consider the safety threats to vulnerable and underserved communities, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), children, students, older adults, and persons with disabilities in your response.*

#### **Expectations for Evaluators:**

Before assigning a score, evaluators should evaluate all attachments, including:

- The "County/City Heat Map" and the "Community Heat Map" of the area surrounding the project limits: Points are based on the maps demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is significant when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community's collision history, suggesting that the project limits will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.
  - Note: If an applicant can explain **why** they are building the project despite the lack of collision data, they can still receive the majority or all of the points. Examples of reasons why an applicant may choose to build a project in an area with no collisions are:
    - It is a new facility.
    - It is so unsafe that there is no bike/ped activity, or it has been banned (e.g., school campus rules).
    - Some communities have residents who do not report collisions.
  - If the project is not in one of the highest-density crash locations, does the applicant **thoroughly** explain *why* this location was chosen?
- 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. Evaluators should consider the overall project limits AND the limits of the specific improvements/scope of the project.
- Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports: Points are based on summaries, lists, and reports demonstrating the overall number of collisions and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.
  - Note: Applicants are allowed to provide safety data in a different format if they prefer **OR** if they do not have the collision data.
  - The alternate data formats should also show the safety need and could include surveys from communities asking about the safety of the project area, near-miss data, information from crowdsourcing applications (such as Street Story), a systemic safety analysis identifying high-risk features or typologies, etc.
    - If an applicant uses an alternate format for safety data, they **must** still attach the appropriate documentation to prove the safety concerns of the project area.

#### **Influence Area Guidance**

A project's expected safety "Influence Area" is where a project has the potential to mitigate unsafe conditions. An applicant's defined influence area must be reasonable. The project's "Influence Area" is established by the applicant, and in the TIMS ATP Tool is depicted by the "Project Area Collision Map."

The following are some general criteria to guide applicants and evaluators in determining the appropriate "Influence Area" and overall project area for their proposed safety improvements and countermeasures.

Evaluators must analyze the applicant's explanation of Prior to scoring the Safety Question, evaluators must analyze the applicant's explanation of the project's "Influence Area" (or project area) shown in the maps to see if it is reasonable. The following criteria should be considered:

- New Traffic Signals: crashes within 250 feet of the new signal are reasonable.
- For intersection or mid-block crossing improvements, collisions within 250 feet of the intersection/mid-block crossing in all directions affected by the improvement may be used.
- Longitudinal Improvements (bike lanes, sidewalks, road diets, etc.): crashes potentially affected by and within the limits of the improvement.
- 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.
- The crash data from parallel routes can be included if it is reasonably expected that the new facility/route will reduce the crash trends that have been taking place.
- The overall applicant data provided in the Narrative Questions and various attachments must support the use of parallel crash data.

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

Applicants are **required** to respond to sub-questions **1 or 2** and have the **option** to respond to **both**.

Sub-questions 1 and/or 2 and 3 do not receive any points. The evaluator should verify that the required information in 1 and/or 2 and 3 is provided and complete. If the evaluator team determines the information is **incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated**, they should note this in their evaluation comments, and the application should **not** receive full points for Part A.

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

- Applicants must provide the output files from the TIMS ATP tool (or they may use their own collision database data/software to produce equivalent documents).
- Only pedestrian and bicycle collisions are included.
- 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 "Influence Area" guidance below.
    - Evaluators should consider point reductions for this question if the applicant included crash data that is not **reasonably** tied to the influence area of the proposed "safety" improvements and the applicant does not provide a reasonable explanation for choosing the project location.
  - The collisions represent the most recent 5-11 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).
  - If the applicant does not use the TIMS ATP 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.
    - The number of crashes entered into the table is directly supported by both the map and the listing.
    - Attachments **must** be included to support alternative data (surveys, school policy, or a letter from the school explaining the policy to discourage walking and biking due to safety, etc.)
- The data entered in the application table is accurate and reflects the documentation the applicant provides in alignment with the above requirements.

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

- The applicant included the relevant attachments.
- The applicant demonstrated that they **analyzed** the past crash/safety data to identify the **specific crash-type trends** that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken.
- The applicant demonstrated there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements. The applicant should discuss safety threats to vulnerable and underserved communities, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), students, older adults, and persons with disabilities.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project location represents one of the agency’s top priorities for addressing ongoing safety. And applicant’s ability to demonstrate that they have analyzed their past Crash/Safety Data and the proposed safety improvements correspond to the types and locations of the past collisions.
<p><b>9-12 Points</b></p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates the past collision locations are within the “<i>Influence Area</i>” of the proposed safety improvements. <b>AND</b> the <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrate the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements,</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> explains <b>why</b> they are building the project <b>AND</b> why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the lack of collision data and history.</p> <p>The application <b>clearly and convincingly</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Collision types and collision details will be <b>positively impacted and reduced</b> by the proposed safety improvements.</li> <li>• There are <b>significant</b> safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.</li> <li>• The applicant considered safety threats to vulnerable and underserved populations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5-8 Points</b></p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> demonstrate that <b>some</b> of the past collision locations are within the “<i>Influence Area</i>” of the proposed safety improvements. <b>AND</b> the <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate that <b>some</b> of the overall number of collisions is significant, and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements,</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>The applicant <b>convincingly</b> explains <b>why</b> they are building the project <b>AND</b> why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the lack of collision data and history.</p> <p>The application <b>convincingly</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be <b>somewhat impacted and reduced</b> by the proposed safety improvements.</li> <li>• There are <b>moderate</b> safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.</li> </ul>

<p><b>1-4 Points</b></p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> demonstrate that a <b>few</b> of the past collision locations are within the “<i>Influence Area</i>” of the proposed safety improvements. The <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate that a <b>few</b> of the overall number of collisions are significant, and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details <b>may</b> be positively impacted and a <b>few</b> are reduced by the proposed safety improvements,</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>The applicant was able to <b>somewhat</b> explain <b>why</b> they are building the project <b>and</b> why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the lack of collision data and history.</p> <p>The application <b>somewhat</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be <b>minimally</b> impacted by the proposed safety improvements.</li> <li>• There are <b>minimal safety</b> threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>0 Points</b></p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> demonstrate that a <b>few</b> of the past collision locations are within the Influence Area of the proposed safety improvements. <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements,</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>The applicant was able to <b>minimally</b> explain <b>why</b> they are building the project <b>and</b> why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the collision data and history.</p> <p>The application <b>minimally</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the past crash/safety data <b>wasn’t really</b> analyzed by the applicant to identify specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken,</li> <li>• There are <b>almost no</b> safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.</li> </ul>

**B. Safety Countermeasures (13 points max):**

*Describe how the project improvements will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to active transportation user injuries or fatalities. Referencing the information provided in Part A, demonstrate how the proposed countermeasures directly address the underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence of active transportation user collisions.*

*For combined I/NI projects, describe how the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programs address the safety issues identified in Part A.*

**Breakdown of points:**

The number of points an applicant/project receives on Part B is not impacted by the number of "potential safety hazards" and "countermeasures" documented in the application.

- Applications only documenting one "potential safety hazard" / "countermeasure" have the potential to receive full points as long as they can fully meet the scoring criteria and demonstrate that implementing only one countermeasure is appropriate to fully mitigate existing hazards.
- Applications documenting numerous "potential safety hazards" and "countermeasures" should not automatically receive additional or full points. The applicant must demonstrate that each safety hazard is relevant to the non-motorized users in the project limits and that **each** countermeasure proposed in the project is **necessary** to mitigate the potential for future crashes.

- Projects that appear to include elements/costs with few or no safety benefits should **not** receive as many points as projects with highly effective and efficient use of limited funding.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- 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.
  - Safety countermeasures can include both on-road improvements, as well as separated paths and trails.
- Evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that each proposed safety countermeasure(s) is appropriate to mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area.
- For projects proposing new or improved bikeways, evaluators should evaluate the extent to which the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types given the context of the project and any constraints the applicant faced. This can include but is not limited to:
  - Community input
  - Geography (e.g., rural, suburban, urban)
  - Posted speed limits
  - Proposed operating speed
  - Roadway cross section
  - Traffic volume
  - Safety concerns outlined in Part A
  - Traffic calming measures
  - Surrounding land use types
  - Roadway classifications
  - Right-of-way, utility, and environmental constraints
  - Other considerations
- For combination I/NI projects, evaluate the extent to which the non-infrastructure program will address the safety concerns outlined in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, and educate users about safety hazards. The NI program should complement the infrastructure improvements.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards within the project limits.
<p><b>11-13 Points</b></p>	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed countermeasure(s) have a <b>proven track record</b> for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The applicant has described remedies for <b>each</b> need addressed in Part A, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) are expected to <b>fully mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant <b>clearly</b> demonstrates that the appropriate bicycle classification was selected.</li> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, the applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates that the NI program will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7-10 Points</b></p>	<p>The applicant <b>convincingly</b> demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed countermeasure(s) have a <b>proven track record</b> for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) are expected to <b>significantly (but not fully) mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bicycle classification.</li> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, the applicant <b>convincingly</b> demonstrates that the NI program will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul>

<p><b>4-6 Points</b></p>	<p>The applicant <b>adequately</b> demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed countermeasure(s) can address the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should <b>somewhat mitigate</b> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant <b>somewhat</b> evaluated and selected the appropriate bicycle classification.</li> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, the applicant <b>adequately</b> demonstrates that the NI program will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1-3 Points</b></p>	<p>The applicant <b>minimally demonstrates</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposed countermeasure(s) can address the past crash/safety needs addressed in part A, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• <b>There are doubts</b> as to whether the implementation of the proposed countermeasure(s) will mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, <b>there are doubts</b> as to whether the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bicycle classification.</li> <li>• For combination I/NI projects, the application <b>minimally</b> demonstrates that the NI program will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>0 Points</b></p>	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application <b>does not in any way</b> prove that the proposed countermeasures have <b>any</b> potential to mitigate future collisions. <b>AND</b> For Combination I/NI projects, the NI program <b>does not</b> address <b>any</b> safety needs or encourage safe behaviors.</p>

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

*Describe the community-based public participation process that culminated in the project. Combined I/NI projects should address both infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.*

- A. *What is/was the process of defining designs to prepare for the future needs of users of this project? How did the applicant analyze the alternatives and impacts on the transportation system to influence beneficial outcomes? Did the alternatives take the wide range of active transportation users into consideration (i.e., children, older adults, wheelchair users, and people with visual impairments)?*

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

There is a difference between outreach and engagement. Applicants who engage constituents should receive a higher score than those who conduct only outreach.

- **Engagement:** is a two-way process involving inclusive interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit and agreement on a project. Engagement allows stakeholders to initiate input and provide input that may change the design or the scope of the project.
- **Outreach:** is a way to connect, inform, and get feedback from stakeholders. Outreach does not always allow for changes to the design or scope of a project; it is akin to an in-depth and well-informed marketing campaign for a targeted audience.

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

The level of expected planning for a project is **directly connected** to the **magnitude and complexity** of the proposed project scope, designs, regional impacts, as well as impacts on the overall active 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.

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

- Consider the level to which the applicant demonstrated the agency's active transportation technical planning that was conducted to develop and refine the project scope. Was it appropriate to the size of the project?
- How well does the technical planning consider both existing and future needs of the active transportation users and the larger transportation system.
- Consider whether the outreach and engagement process was ongoing and shows **continued** stakeholder support.
  - Outreach and engagement from previous plans that includes the proposed project can be cited, but applicants should explain how it was determined that this project is still a high priority for the community, especially for larger projects and if the outreach and engagement for the plan is several years old.
- Does the applicant discuss how the outreach and engagement process for the plan was effectively integrated into the public participation process for this project specifically? Did the community discuss the proposed project specifically?

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate that a public participation process was utilized to develop this project, and that they analyzed the range of alternatives and impacts on the transportation system through a thorough public engagement process.
5-6 Points	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates:</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></li> <li>• The public participation process allowed for public input to shape the project, and considered the existing and future needs of a wide range of project users, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The outreach and engagement process utilized has been ongoing and shows <b>continued</b> stakeholder support, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process. Alternatives were analyzed and they take the varied range of active transportation users into consideration.</li> </ul>
3-4 Points	<p>The applicant <b>sufficiently</b> demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a <b>sufficient</b> technical planning process, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The public participation process allowed for public input to shape the project, and considered the existing and future needs of a wide range of project users, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The outreach and engagement process utilized has been ongoing and shows <b>continued</b> stakeholder support, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process. Alternatives were analyzed and they take the varied range of active transportation users into consideration.</li> </ul>
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project scope was developed through a <b>poor</b> technical planning process (<b>not appropriate</b> for the complexity and magnitude of the project)</li> <li>• The public participation process <b>marginally</b> considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system.</li> <li>• The outreach and engagement process <b>does not</b> show <b>continued</b> stakeholder support,</li> <li>• The planning process was <b>not effectively</b> integrated into the public participation process. Alternatives were <b>not effectively</b> analyzed to take a wide range of active transportation users into consideration.</li> </ul>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application <b>does not</b> in any way prove the project scope is a result of a public participation process and technical planning <b>AND does not</b> in any way consider the existing and future needs of the project's users <b>AND does not</b> in any way analyze alternatives.</p>

*B. Describe who was/will be engaged in the identification and development of this project. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project. Describe the feedback received during the stakeholder engagement process. If applicable, describe any unique engagement challenges that the community faced and how they were addressed. For combined I/NI projects, describe any public input on the development of the encouragement and education programming.*

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

- Public stakeholders can include anyone who may be impacted by the project, or takes an interest, or cares about the project area or community. Examples include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end-users, community leaders, elected officials, community-based organizations, advocacy organizations, local businesses, transit agencies, and members of vulnerable or underserved populations (e.g., older adults, youth, persons with disabilities, members of disadvantaged communities, etc.)

- Consider the level to which the attachments show the applicant engaged with the disadvantaged community the project is supposed to benefit (when applicable).
- Were the stakeholders allowed to give input that changed the project?
- Were all the stakeholders who will be impacted by the project engaged?
- 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, transportation agencies, local health departments, schools and school districts, emergency service providers (fire trucks, ambulances), metropolitan planning organizations, law enforcement, etc.)
- In-person, virtual, and hybrid meetings and/or events. How many were held to engage stakeholders is key to successful public participation. These can include, but are not limited to:
  - **The type of meetings or events:** open houses, community charrettes, city council or board of supervisors meetings, commission meetings, tables or booths at farmer’s markets and other community events, door-to-door solicitation, walk or bike audits, etc.
  - **How the meetings or events were noticed:** local newspaper ads or articles, agency or project websites, radio announcements, social media posts, school meetings (e.g. PTA meetings, school assemblies), places of worship, local publications, flyers, etc. Was the information provided in other languages?
  - **How the meetings or events were documented:** Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes or minutes, registration lists, virtual chat logs, letters of support, photos, etc.
  - **Where the meetings or events took place:** Virtual meeting platforms, schools, community centers, city council hall, parks or other outdoor locations to accommodate safe in-person gatherings and social distancing, etc.
  - **Accessibility of meetings or events:** near public transportation, translation services provided, childcare provided, what time of day best meet the needs of the community, virtual accessibility features such as captioning and interpretation, American Sign Language or other language translation services, food provided, etc.
  - **The stakeholders’ involvement in the decision-making body:** technical advisory committee, citizens’ advisory committee, etc.
- Other methods used to engage and obtain input from the community, such as crowdsourcing maps, project websites, and surveys.

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

- Points should 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 and 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.
- Consider **all** 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, photos, surveys, letters of support, etc.
  - If an applicant **did not attach ANY** documentation to show a thorough and effective public engagement process, the application should **not** receive full points.
  - Consider the level to which the attachments show the applicant engaged with the **disadvantaged community** the project is supposed to benefit (when applicable).
- Consider if the letters of support help to emphasize that the project is the top, or one of the top, active transportation priorities for the community, targeted end-users, or other public stakeholders.
- Consider the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to:
  - Improve the effectiveness of the project.
    - Were changes made to the original design or the preferred alternative based on public participation feedback?
    - Were community priorities identified, and how were they implemented into the design?

- If applicable, were the disadvantaged community priorities identified, and how were they implemented into the design?
  - Ensure the project is one of the highest community and regional active transportation priorities.
- Consider strategies that applicants used to **overcome unique community challenges** (e.g., recent natural disasters, minimal to no attendance due to ICE presence in community, etc.) when evaluating this question. However, the level of community engagement should still be appropriate for the magnitude and complexity of the project.
- For combined I/NI projects, evaluators should ensure that the applicant discusses the public participation and planning process for the infrastructure AND non-infrastructure elements of the project.

Points	Applicant's ability to illustrate who was/will be engaged in the development of the project and describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project.
4 Points	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes <b>who</b> was engaged in the identification and development of the project scope,</li> <li>• Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged,</li> <li>• <b>Documented</b> the outreach and engagement, <b>AND</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Attachments</b> show that the applicant <b>fully</b> engaged the relevant stakeholders, including the disadvantaged community (when applicable).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The project scope is <b>fully</b> supported by the feedback received during the public participation and planning process,</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.</li> </ul>
3 Points	<p>The applicant <b>sufficiently</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes <b>who</b> was engaged in the identification and development of the project scope,</li> <li>• Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged,</li> <li>• <b>Documented</b> the outreach and engagement, <b>AND</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Attachments</b> show that the applicant <b>sufficiently</b> engaged the relevant stakeholders, including the disadvantaged community (when applicable).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The project scope is supported by the feedback received during the public participation and planning process,</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.</li> </ul>
2 Points	<p>The applicant <b>somewhat</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes <b>who</b> was engaged in the identification and development of the project scope,</li> <li>• Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged,</li> <li>• <b>Documented</b> the outreach and engagement, <b>AND</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Attachments</b> show that the applicant engaged with <b>some</b> relevant stakeholders, including the disadvantaged community (when applicable).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The project scope is <b>somewhat</b> supported by the feedback received during the public participation and planning process,</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.</li> </ul>

<p><b>1 Point</b></p>	<p>The applicant <b>minimally addresses between 1-2 items:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes <b>who</b> was engaged in the identification and development of the project scope,</li> <li>• Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged,</li> <li>• <b>Documented</b> the outreach and engagement, <b>AND</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Attachments</b> show that the applicant engaged with relevant stakeholders, including the disadvantaged community (when applicable).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The project scope is supported by feedback received during the public participation and planning process,</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.</li> </ul>
<p><b>0 Points</b></p>	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application <b>does not in any way</b> document the outreach and engagement, prove the project scope was developed through an adequate public participation process, or specify who was or will be engaged. For combined I/NI projects, the application does not show that public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.</p>

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

### **A. Context-sensitive bikeways/walkways**

*How are the “recognized best” solutions employed in this project appropriate to maximize user comfort and for the local community context? Describe how the recognized best solutions included consideration of children, older adults and persons with disabilities to walk, bike and roll safely to key destinations.*

*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 amount of physical separation from vehicular traffic;*
- *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 comfort and potential users of all ages and abilities?*
  - *What features are included to promote low-stress, comfortable, and safe walking and/or biking conditions?*
  - *Does the project expand on or create a low-stress network?*

### **B. Innovative 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. Combined I/NI projects should address both infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements. Are any elements of the non-infrastructure program innovative or new to the region?*

### **C. For Combination I/NI Projects Only: Evaluation and Sustainability**

*For projects with non-infrastructure elements, describe how the effectiveness of the program will be measured and how the program will be sustained after completion.*

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

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

- The project satisfies the purpose and needs of a full range of stakeholders, including users of all ages and abilities.
- The project is a safe facility for both the user and the community.
- The project expands on, creates, or fits within the community’s vision for a low-stress active transportation network.
- The project is in harmony with the community, and it preserves the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historical, and natural resource values of the area.
- The project exceeds the expectations of both designers and stakeholders and achieves a level of excellence in people's minds.
- The project involves the efficient and effective use of the resources (time, budget, community) of all involved parties.
- The project is designed and built with minimal disruption to the community.
- The project is seen as having added lasting value to the community.
- For combination I/NI projects, on Part C, the evaluator should consider:
  - The number of times the program is evaluated (before, during, after).
  - Whether the evaluation tools/method can be replicated.
  - Whether the evaluation tools/methods described are realistic and doable.

- Whether the program is expected to have added lasting value to the community.
- Whether the described sustainability plan is realistic and doable.

Points	The applicant’s ability to demonstrate that the “recognized best” solutions employed in this project are appropriate to maximize user comfort and appropriate to the local community context. AND the applicant’s ability to explain what innovative elements are being utilized, or <i>why</i> innovative elements were <i>not</i> selected.
5 Points	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized best solutions were employed in this project, and</li> <li>• The project is proposing innovative solutions to best address the project’s issues/needs, <b>or</b></li> <li>• Recognized best solutions were employed, and innovative elements were considered; and the reason for not selecting the innovative elements is <b>very clear and compelling</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects, the applicant <b>clearly</b> included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.</li> </ul>
3-4 Points	<p>The applicant <b>convincingly</b> demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized best solutions were employed in this project, and/or</li> <li>• The project is proposing innovative solutions, <b>or</b></li> <li>• Viable innovative elements were considered, and the explanation for not selecting the innovations is <b>convincingly noted</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects, the applicant included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.</li> </ul>
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b> demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized best solutions were employed, <b>and/or</b></li> <li>• Innovative elements were considered but not selected, and <b>no explanation</b> was given.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For combination I/NI projects, the applicant included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming, but <b>minimal</b> explanation was given.</li> </ul>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a zero if the solutions <b>are not appropriate</b> to maximize user comfort, and innovative solutions <b>were not proposed, or</b> the reason for not selecting the innovations was <b>not explained</b>. The applicant <b>did not</b> include or consider innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.</p>

## **QUESTION #6: LEVERAGING FUNDS (0-5 POINTS)**

### **Breakdown of points:**

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

The Commission will only consider cash funds for leveraging. Pre-construction (PA&ED, PS&E, and R/W) phases funded by the local agency will be considered for leveraging even if the funds were expended before the application deadline.

Except for State Transportation Improvement Program funding, the Commission will only consider funds that are not allocated by the Commission on a project-specific basis as eligible funds for leveraging points. The Commission will not consider in-kind or non-infrastructure funds as eligible for leveraging.

<b>Points</b>	<b>Amount Leveraged</b>
<b>1 Point</b>	At least 1% to 5% of total project cost
<b>2 Points</b>	More than 5% to 10% of total project cost
<b>3 Points</b>	More than 10% to 15% of total project cost
<b>4 Points</b>	More than 15% to 20% of total project cost
<b>5 Points</b>	<b>More than 20%</b> of total project cost

- **Applications submitted by Tribal Governments (federally recognized Native American Tribes) and projects that are on Tribal Lands will be awarded five leveraging points.**
- **Applicants must attach a signed letter of commitment indicating the amounts and sources of leveraged funds. Applicants without a signed letter of commitment will not receive leveraging points. Applicants may also include other documentation to substantiate leveraging, including meeting minutes from a governing body, a budget sheet, a board or council resolution, etc.**

## **QUESTION #7: SCOPE AND PLAN CONSISTENCY (0-5 POINTS)**

### **A. Consider the following elements for the infrastructure components of the project:**

- Consistency between the layouts/maps, Engineer's Estimate, and proposed scope
- Compliance with the Engineer's Checklist
- Complete project schedule

### **B. Evaluate the non-infrastructure elements of the project using Exhibit 25-R. Evaluate for:**

- How well it reflects the applicant's responses throughout this application
- How well the overall scope meets the purpose and goals of the ATP
- Compliance with the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance

### **Breakdown of Points:**

Applicants are required to complete Attachment B as part of all Infrastructure and 25-R for combination (Infrastructure & Non-Infrastructure) applications.

Evaluators will consider the following:

- Consistency between the Layouts/Maps, Engineer's Estimate, and proposed scope
  - The layouts should clearly show all of the proposed scope (the scale should be appropriate)
    - The evaluator should easily be able to determine if improvements are on one or both sides of the roadway or at all corners of an intersection, e.g., bulb-outs.
    - Are the right-of-way lines shown? Especially if the improvements are outside of the existing facilities. Are existing power poles and other utilities shown?
    - Was a cross-section included showing the existing facilities and how the improvements will meet the existing facility?
    - Does the supplied cross-section resemble the location? Or if existing facility widths differ, are there cross-sections for them?
    - For combination I/NI projects, evaluators will evaluate the Exhibit 25-R for:
      - A complete, clear, and detailed scope;
      - How well it reflects the applicant's responses throughout the application; and
      - How well the overall scope meets the purpose and goals of the ATP.
- Compliance with the Engineer's Checklist
  - Were items checked as completed that are not shown in the documents?
  - New traffic signals require a traffic warrant showing that the signal is needed. Is/are the warrants attached?
  - For Combo Projects, evaluators will also consider the Exhibit 25-R for compliance with Non-Infrastructure Guidance.
- Complete Project Schedule
  - Does the schedule allow adequate time to complete each phase, including:
    - Environmental studies, if needed?
    - Acquisitions and Utility relocations, if needed?
  - For Combo Projects, evaluators will also consider how the NI phase coordinates with IF phases and, if it is a school program, coordination with school schedules.

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

If the applicant failed to follow any directions in filling out the Engineer's checklist and associated attachments, the evaluator should **not give full points** for this sub-question.

**Note** – 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 benefits in relation to both the total project cost and the funds provided. The application should show that consideration was given to the project's cost-effectiveness. Did the applicant:

- Show that the project will meet the non-motorized needs of users of a wide range of ages and abilities?
- Exhibit a balance between utility and aesthetics?
- Take a systematic approach to analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of various alternatives and select the alternative that will provide the highest benefits for the lowest cost?

Points	Evaluating Layouts/Maps
<b>3 Points</b>	The submitted layouts/maps are <b>complete and clear</b> and provide sufficient detail to determine the full scope of the proposed project.
<b>2 Points</b>	The submitted layouts/maps contain enough detail <b>and/or</b> organized in a way that outlines the various scope elements of the proposed project; but may be unclear in some areas.
<b>1 Point</b>	The submitted layouts/maps are <b>unclear or vague</b> , making it hard to determine the various scope elements of the proposed project.
<b>0 Points</b>	The applicant <b>failed to provide</b> layouts/maps.

Points	Evaluating Engineer's Estimate
<b>1 Point</b>	The submitted estimate is <b>thorough and consistent</b> with the proposed scope elements and phases of the project; and the cost-effectiveness is apparent.
<b>0 Points</b>	The applicant <b>failed to provide</b> an estimate that matches the proposed elements, and it is clear the project is not cost-effective.

Points	Evaluating the Project Schedule
<b>1 Point</b>	The submitted schedule <b>fully incorporates</b> all project phases and provides adequate time to complete them (PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, CON, and CON-NI).
<b>0 Points</b>	The submitted schedule <b>failed to incorporate</b> project phases and/or does not provide adequate time to complete them (PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, CON, and CON-NI).