

2027 Active Transportation Program
Small Infrastructure and
Small 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:

Question #	Question Title	Page #
Question #1	Disadvantaged Communities	Page 2
Question #2	Potential to Increase Users	Page 7
Question #3	Potential to Reduce Collisions	Page 13
Question #4	Public Participation & Planning	Page 20
Question #5	Scope & Plan Consistency	Page 24

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 Destinations (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. 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.

C3. 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:

- 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 C3, 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 clearly and convincingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, AND • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project, AND • Explains and provides documentation to illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, AND <p>Additionally: For combination I/NI projects, the applicant also clearly and convincingly addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community.</p>
3 Points	<p>The application somewhat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, AND • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project, AND

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains and provides documentation to illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, AND <p>Additionally: For combination I/NI projects, the applicant somewhat addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community.</p>
2 Points	<p>The application addresses two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project, Explains and provides documentation to illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <p>Additionally: For combination I/NI projects, the applicant also clearly and convincingly addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community.</p>
1 Point	<p>The application minimally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project, Explains and provides documentation to illustrate how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <p>Additionally: For combination I/NI projects, the applicant also clearly and convincingly addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be made available to and benefit the disadvantaged community.</p>
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not address how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community.

➤ **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
2 Points	Project location(s) is/are fully (100%) located within a DAC.
1 Point	Project location(s) is/are partially (less than 100%) within a DAC.
0 Points	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	
0 Points	80% or greater of the statewide MHI	\$79,297.60 or greater
1 Point	75% to <80% of the statewide MHI	\$74,341.50 to \$79,297.59
2 Points	70% to <75% of the statewide MHI	\$69,385.40 to \$74,341.49
3 Points	65% to <70% of the statewide MHI	\$64,429.30 to \$69,385.39
4 Points	Less than 65% of the statewide MHI	\$64,429.29 or less

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

Points	National School Lunch Program Free or Reduced-Price Meals Percentage	
0 points	Less than 75% of students receive 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	

Points	Healthy Places Index 3.0 Score*	
0 Points	Healthy Places Index Score above 25th Percentile	
1 Point	Healthy Places Index Score 20th through 25th Percentile	
2 Points	Healthy Places Index Score 15th through <20th Percentile	
3 Points	Healthy Places Index Score 10th through <15th Percentile	
4 Points	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
Federally Recognized Tribal Lands or projects submitted by Tribal Governments	4 points	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).
Regional Definition	0 or 1 point	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 <i>how</i> their specific community qualifies under that definition.
Other MHI or CalEnviroScreen Assessment	0 or 1 point	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

(0-52 POINTS)

A. Statement of Project Need. Describe the community and the issue(s) that this project will address. How will the proposed project benefit non-motorized users of all ages and varying abilities, including students, older adults, and persons with disabilities? What is the project's desired outcome, and how will the project best deliver that outcome? **(0-26 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
- The lack of mobility, if applicable - does the population have limited access to cars, bikes, and/or transit?
 - Does the project have an unserved or underserved demand?
- The **local** health concerns responses should focus on:
 - 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 demonstrating 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?
- **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?
- **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.
19-24 Points	<p>The application compellingly demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents all of the following in a clear narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of connectivity, • The lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • Local health concerns are identified and addressed, and a comparison to statewide and/or countywide health data is included, <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component compellingly and clearly discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.

<p>13-18 Points</p>	<p>The application duly demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents only 2 of the following clearly, and at least one other one partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of connectivity, • The lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • Local health concerns (does it include a comparison to statewide and/or countywide health data?), <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component duly discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.
<p>7-12 Points</p>	<p>The application somewhat demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents only 1 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of connectivity, • The lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • Local health concerns, <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component somewhat discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.
<p>1-6 Points</p>	<p>The application minimally demonstrates “need” in the project area, and partially documents 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of connectivity, • The lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • Local health concerns, <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For combination I/NI projects – is the NI component minimally discussed in terms of the need for the education and encouragement program.
<p>0 Points</p>	<p>The application does not demonstrate “need” in the project area in any of the three areas of need, and there is no mention of the need of the disadvantaged community, and there is no mention 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.

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

B. Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need: (0-26 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”:
 - Lack of connectivity,
 - 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.
20-25 Points	<p>The answers in Part B clearly demonstrate without a doubt that the project will best address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating or improving links or connections, AND • Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combination I/NI projects the answer clearly demonstrates that the NI program provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, AND demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.
13-19 Points	<p>The answers in Part B demonstrate that the project will address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating or improving links or connections, AND • Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combination I/NI projects the answer demonstrates that the NI program provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, AND demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.

<p>7-12 Points</p>	<p>The answers in Part B somewhat demonstrate that the project has the potential to address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by: (only 1 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating or improving links or connections, • Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combination I/NI projects the answer somewhat demonstrates that the NI program provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, AND demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.
<p>1-6 Points</p>	<p>The answers in Part B minimally demonstrate that the project may address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by partially doing 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating or improving links or connections, • Encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combination I/NI projects the answer minimally demonstrates that the non-infrastructure program provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education and encouragement activities that will address the needs identified in Part A, AND demonstrates familiarity of the community benefitting from the program.
<p>0 Points</p>	<p>The application did not demonstrate in any way that the project would address the need presented in part A.</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 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.
<p>1 Point</p>	<p>The project will increase the proportion of student trips accomplished by active transportation</p>
<p>0 Points</p>	<p>The project will not increase the proportion of student trips accomplished by active transportation.</p>

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. (0-12 points)

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	<p>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>
<p>9-12 Points</p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> clearly and convincingly demonstrates the past collision locations are within the “<i>Influence Area</i>” of the proposed safety improvements. AND the <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> clearly and convincingly 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>OR</p> <p>The applicant clearly and convincingly explains <i>why</i> they are building the project AND why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the lack of collision data and history.</p> <p>The application clearly and convincingly shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, AND • Collision types and collision details will be positively impacted and reduced by the proposed safety improvements. • There are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant considered safety threats to vulnerable and underserved populations.

<p>5-8 Points</p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> demonstrate that some of the past collision locations are within the “<i>Influence Area</i>” of the proposed safety improvements. AND the <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate that some 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>OR</p> <p>The applicant convincingly explains why they are building the project AND why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the lack of collision data and history.</p> <p>The application convincingly shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, AND • Collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be somewhat impacted and reduced by the proposed safety improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are moderate safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.
<p>1-4 Points</p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> demonstrate that a few 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 few of the overall number of collisions are significant, and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details may be positively impacted and a few are reduced by the proposed safety improvements,</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The applicant was able to somewhat explain why they are building the project and why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the lack of collision data and history.</p> <p>The application somewhat shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, AND • Collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be minimally impacted by the proposed safety improvements. • There are minimal safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.
<p>0 Points</p>	<p>The <u>Project Area Collision Map/Heat Maps</u> demonstrate that a few 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>OR</p> <p>The applicant was able to minimally explain why they are building the project and why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the collision data and history.</p> <p>The application minimally shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the past crash/safety data wasn’t really analyzed by the applicant to identify specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, • There are almost no safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that are being mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.

B. Safety Countermeasures (13 points max): Referencing the information provided in Part A, demonstrate how the proposed countermeasures directly address (one or more) of the following underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence (or potential occurrence) of active transportation user injuries or fatalities (including walking, biking and rolling).

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.
11-13 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, AND • The applicant has described remedies for each need addressed in Part A, AND • The proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) are expected to fully mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant clearly demonstrates that the appropriate bicycle classification was selected. • For combined I/NI projects, the applicant clearly and convincingly 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.
7-10 Points	<p>The applicant convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, AND • The proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) are expected to significantly (but not fully) mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bicycle classification. • For combined I/NI projects, the applicant convincingly 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.
4-6 Points	<p>The applicant adequately demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed countermeasure(s) can address the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, AND • The proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should somewhat mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant somewhat evaluated and selected the appropriate bicycle classification. • For combined I/NI projects, the applicant adequately 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.
1-3 Points	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed countermeasure(s) can address the past crash/safety needs addressed in part A, AND • There are doubts as to whether the implementation of the proposed countermeasure(s) will mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, there are doubts as to whether the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bicycle classification.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For combination I/NI projects, the application minimally 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.
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not in any way prove that the proposed countermeasures have any potential to mitigate future collisions. AND For Combination I/NI projects, the NI program does not address any 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. 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)?

Include discussions of:

- *What was the process to prepare for existing and future needs of users of this project?*
- *Who was engaged in the public participation and planning process?*
- *How will stakeholders continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project?*
- *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:

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.

Stakeholders and their involvement should be clearly outlined.

- **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:

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 on the overall active transportation network.

- Projects with smaller scopes and costs should not have to demonstrate as extensive of an internal planning process, including the analysis of a wide range of alternatives, as a project with a much larger scope.
- 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.

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

- Consider whether or not the applicant appropriately used their agency's active transportation technical planning to develop and refine the project scope.
- Consider the level to which the technical planning considered both existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system.
- Consider the level to which the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.
- Consider whether or not the outreach and engagement process was ongoing and shows **continued** stakeholder support.
 - Outreach and engagement from previous Plans can be cited, but applicants should explain how it was determined that this project was still a high priority for the community.
- Give consideration to all attachments the agency provided in connection with this question, including but not limited to: any applicable public outreach process/proposal/plan, links to websites, meeting agendas, meeting sign-in sheets, meeting minutes, public service announcements, letters of support, new alternatives or major revisions that were identified, etc.
 - 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.
 - Consider the level to which the attachments show the applicant engaged with the disadvantaged community the project is supposed to benefit (when applicable).
 - 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 extent to which the public participation and planning process was utilized to identify and improve the effectiveness of the project and ensure the project is one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.
 - Additional consideration can be given to outreach that has been ongoing for a longer duration.
- 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.
- 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 demonstrate what the process to prepare for existing and future needs of users of this project was, who was engaged in the public participation and planning process, and how the stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project.
9-10 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project, AND • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system, AND • The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process and reached out to all necessary stakeholders, AND • The attached documentation supports a thorough and effective public engagement process. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
6-8 Points	<p>The applicant demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project, AND • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system, AND • The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process, AND • The attached documentation supports a thorough and effective public engagement process. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
3-5 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a technical planning process appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project, AND • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system, AND • The planning process was somewhat integrated into the public participation process, AND • The attached documentation supports a public engagement process. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.

<p>1-2 Points</p>	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a technical planning process appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project, • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system, • The planning process was minimally integrated into the public participation process, • Did not attach documentation or attached very little documentation to support a thorough public engagement process. <p><u>Additionally:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
<p>0 Points</p>	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not prove the project scope is a result of technical planning, that the applicant did not consider the existing and future needs of the project users, and the planning process was not in any way integrated into the public engagement process. 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: SCOPE AND PLAN CONSISTENCY (0-3 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
1 Point	The submitted layouts/maps are complete and clear and provide sufficient detail to determine the full scope of the proposed project.
0 Points	The submitted layouts/maps are poorly developed or vague in outlining the various elements of the proposed project.

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

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