

## **2027 Active Transportation Program** 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, program context, and program deliverability.

### **Index:**

<b>Question #</b>	<b>Question Title</b>	<b>Page #</b>
Question #1	Disadvantaged Communities	Page 2
Question #2	Potential for Increasing Biking and Walking (Statement of Need/Addressing the Need)	Page 6
Question #3	Potential to Reduce Fatalities and Injuries	Page 11
Question #4	Public Participation & Planning	Page 14
Question #5	Evaluation and Sustainability	Page 17
Question #6	Innovative Program Elements	Page 18
Question #7	Program Scope and Implementation	Page 19

## **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)**

*Explain how the program addresses an important need of the disadvantaged community, how it was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, and how the disadvantaged community residents will be included.*

### **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 the required 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 reaches, not just the ones that are disadvantaged.

When evaluating the “*how the program addresses an important need of the disadvantaged community*”, consider:

- The needs that were identified by the disadvantaged community.
- If the program will address the disadvantaged community’s specific concerns about the lack of or need for pedestrian and/or bicycle safety education and encouragement in their community.

When evaluating “*how it was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents*”, consider:

- If this program was presented to the disadvantaged community in an accessible manner.
  - Was input solicited in a local forum so that they could provide feedback and support?

- Or was the program decided on internally in a general agency meeting without giving the community a chance to voice their concerns, needs, and wishes.
- If the applicant included supporting documentation or additional attachments (Attachment K) to show how the program was requested by the residents of the disadvantaged community.

When evaluating “*how the disadvantaged community residents will be included*” consider:

- Where the program will take place and is it accessible to residents of the disadvantaged community.
  - Are clear measures taken to ensure the disadvantaged community residents can participate in the program?
- How will the disadvantaged community continue to be engaged and provide input to program development and implementation after the program begins.

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the program will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.
<b>4 Points</b>	The application <b>clearly and convincingly</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Explains how the program will address an important need(s) identified by the disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Explains <b>clear and convincing</b> measures will be taken to ensure the disadvantaged community residents can participate in the program.</li> </ul>
<b>3 Points</b>	The application <b>convincingly</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Explains how the program will address an important need identified by the disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Explains <b>convincingly</b> that measures will be taken to ensure the disadvantaged community residents can participate in the program.</li> </ul>
<b>2 Points</b>	The application <b>somewhat</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Explains how the program will address an important need specific to the disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● <b>Some</b> measures will be taken to ensure the disadvantaged community residents can participate in the program.</li> </ul>
<b>1 Point</b>	The application <b>minimally</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Explains how the program will address a need specific to the disadvantaged community, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, <b>AND</b></li> <li>● Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will be included in the program.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application <b>does not</b> make a convincing argument that the program 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?*

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

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

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project is located within a DAC.
<b>2 Points</b>	Project location(s) is/are <u>fully</u> (100%) located within a DAC.
<b>1 Point</b>	Project location(s) is/are <u>partially</u> (less than 100%) within a DAC.
<b>0 Points</b>	None of the project location(s) are/is 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
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 Criterion
<b>Federally Recognized Tribal Lands or projects submitted by Tribal Governments</b>	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).
<b>Regional Definition</b>	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.
<b>Other MHI or CalEnviroScreen Assessment</b>	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, BIKING AND ROLLING (0-40 POINTS)**

A. *Statement of Need: Explain why this program is needed. Describe the issue(s) that this program will address. Include the challenges and barriers to increasing walking and/or biking in the program area. (0-20 points)*

*Discuss:*

- *Current or proposed pedestrian and/or bicycle infrastructure in the program area*
- *Connectivity and mobility by active transportation to community-identified destinations (such as schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations.)*
- *Perceived personal safety of walking and/or biking*
- *The **local** health concern 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 program. 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 \(HPI\)](#).*
- *Other*

### **Breakdown of points:**

- **"Need"** must be considered in the context of the **"potential for increased walking, bicycling and rolling."**
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all aspects of "need" as outlined below.

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

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

- Check to see if the proposed program is a **new** program, or a **new component** of an existing program.
  - **The applicant cannot apply to fund an existing program or ongoing program operations.**
  - If an evaluator believes this to be the case, then it **must be** reported to CTC staff right away, as it may disqualify the application.
- Analyze the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need. Is the issue this program will address clearly stated and did the applicant provide documentation to support the narrative?
  - Applicants can provide specific examples
  - Or provide supporting data respective to the program area.
- Review the data provided to determine if the proposed program is reasonable.
  - Consult the attached photos and any other information available to make an informed decision.
  - A program does not need to have a large number of attendees to increase a community's active transportation users.
- Analyze the active transportation users' connectivity to community-identified destinations. Are the challenges and barriers to walking, biking, and rolling in the program area identified?
  - A "community identified destination" may include those that provide goods, services, and activities that the community considers particularly important. i.e., a hospital, a grocery store, a transit station, job site, the post office, or an employment center (where the community residents can reasonably expect to find employment).
  - The applicant can make a case for other important destinations, with adequate documentation.
- Specific to the local public health concerns, evaluators should consider the following:
  - Did the applicant identify **specific local** public health concerns, health disparities, or conditions in the built and social environment affecting the community that can be mitigated through increased walking, biking and rolling.
  - Check if the application includes:
    - A thorough and nuanced discussion of existing health conditions among users in the proposed program area. Responses should be more sophisticated than simply stating,

“encouraging walking and biking is good for health because it increases physical activity”.

- The physical or social conditions (i.e. social determinants of health) in the target community contributing to the current health conditions (beyond other elements already addressed in the application, including bike/ped infrastructure gaps and barriers, collision rates, etc.) AND
- Did the applicant provide **local** public health data showing the public health concern or health disparity stated in the application, including:
  - Inclusion of health data at the smallest geography available (i.e., census tract or county level if census tract is not available) AND
  - Health status of targeted users is provided in percentages or rates using relevant and local health indicators AND
  - The local data is ranked or compared to non-targeted user data. (e.g., the community has a higher or lesser obesity rate compared to the state OR compared to other communities of similar size in similar geographies).

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the need for the program.
<b>15-18 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents <b>all</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program is related to existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The program reasonably addresses safety concerns, challenges or barriers to walking, biking, and rolling, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Lack of connectivity and mobility to community identified destinations, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Perceived personal safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Local public health concerns and compares them to those in an area not targeted by the proposed program</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 program in that community.</li> </ul>
<b>10-14 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>convincingly</b> demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents (at least 3 of the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program is related to existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The program reasonably addresses safety concerns or challenges or barriers to walking, biking, and rolling, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Lack of connectivity and mobility to community identified destinations, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Perceived personal safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Local public health concerns and compares them to those in an area not targeted by the proposed program.</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 program in that community.</li> </ul>
<b>5-9 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>somewhat</b> demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents: (at least 2 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program is related to existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The program reasonably addresses safety concerns or challenges or barriers to walking, biking, and rolling, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Lack of connectivity and mobility to community identified destinations, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Perceived personal safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Local public health concerns and <b>somewhat</b> compares them to those in an area not targeted by the proposed program.</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 program in that community.</li> </ul>

<b>1-4 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b> demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents: (at least 1 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program is related to existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The program reasonably addresses safety concerns or challenges or barriers to walking, biking, and rolling, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Lack of connectivity and mobility to community identified destinations, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Perceived personal safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Local public health concerns and <b>does not really</b> compare them to those in an area not targeted by the proposed program.</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 program in that community.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	<p>Zero points can be awarded if the applicant <b>does not</b> demonstrate “need” in the program area. And the application <b>does not</b> show that the program relates to existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure. And the application <b>does not</b> discuss any health concerns.</p>

**PLUS:**

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Programs can receive points for demonstrating the transportation needs of students of all ages, including high school and college/community college
- The project **DOES NOT** have to be a safe routes to school program in order to receive these points.

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

**B. Addressing the Need (0-20 points)**

**1. Check the box that best describes the non-infrastructure program. (0-2 points)**

- *NI projects can be start-up programs or new and/or expanded components of existing programs.*
- *The CTC intends to focus funding on start-up projects. A project is considered to be a start-up when no program currently exists.*
- *A project with new and/or expanded components to an existing program must demonstrate how the original program is continuing without ATP funding.*
- *ATP cannot fund existing or ongoing program operations.*

**Breakdown of points:**

Based on the option the applicant chooses for NI program type, evaluators shall give points per the table(s) below.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- For expanded or new components to an existing program, consider the following:
  - Is the original program sustained with non-ATP funding?
  - Why are the new or expanded components necessary?
- If the information in the application narrative and attachments do not align, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question. Evaluators should use their best judgment to choose the score that best represents the information included in the application.
  - If evaluators believe a score should be 0, they must report this finding to the CTC as it may disqualify the application.

Points	Non-Infrastructure Program Type
<b>2 Points</b>	Start-up program (no program currently exists)
<b>1 Point</b>	Expansion of an existing program
<b>1 Point</b>	New components to an existing program
<b>0 Points</b>	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the applicant is applying to fund an existing program or ongoing program operations. Evaluators <b>must report this finding to the CTC</b> as it may disqualify the application.

2. *Describe the program, the population it will serve, and how the program will use NI components (i.e., encouragement and education), to address each of the need(s) identified above with the goal of increasing walking, biking and rolling, and inducing mode shift to community identified destinations within the program area. Specific destinations must be identified.*

**Breakdown of points:**

“Addressing the Need” must be considered in the context of the “**potential for increased walking, bicycling and rolling**”.

To receive the maximum points, applicants must clearly demonstrate how the proposed program addresses **all** aspects of the "need" identified in Part A.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Evaluate if the proposed program details are the best solution to address the needs described in sub-question A.
- Determine if an increased use of active transportation modes can be realized by the program.

Points	Applicant’s ability to describe how the program meets the needs.
<b>14-17 Points</b>	The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates the program will result in a meaningful increase of walking, bicycling and rolling in the program area, <b>AND</b>,</li> <li>• Provides a <b>detailed</b> description of the program and the population it will serve, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains how the program will use education and encouragement to address the <b>all</b> the needs identified in Part 1.</li> </ul>
<b>10-13 Points</b>	The applicant <b>convincingly</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates the program will result in a meaningful increase of walking, bicycling and rolling in the program area, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Provides a <b>general</b> description of the program and the population it will serve, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains how the program will use education and encouragement to address <b>most</b> of the needs identified in Part 1.</li> </ul>
<b>5-9 Points</b>	The applicant <b>somewhat</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates the program will result in an increase of walking, bicycling and rolling in the program area, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Provides a <b>somewhat vague</b> description of the program and the population it will serve, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• <b>Vaguely</b> explains how the program will use education and encouragement to address <b>some</b> needs identified in Part 1.</li> </ul>

<b>1-4 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates the program will result in a <b>minimal</b> increase of walking, bicycling and rolling in the program area, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Provides a <b>lacking</b> description of the program and the population it will serve, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• The explanation of how the program will use education and encouragement to address <b>any</b> needs is <b>unclear</b>.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	The application <b>does not</b> describe the program and <b>does not</b> demonstrate how the program would address a need.

**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 program will increase the number of active transportation trips accomplished by students?
- Programs can receive points for demonstrating the transportation needs of students of all ages, including high school and college/community college.
- The project **DOES NOT** have to be a safe routes to school program in order to receive these points.

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

### **QUESTION #3: POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION USER FATALITIES AND INJURIES (0-10 POINTS)**

- A. Describe the program area's history of pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users, which this program will mitigate. (0-10 points)

*Referencing the heat-maps, collision map and collision summaries provided in above, discuss why your agency chose this program area as a priority for addressing ongoing safety and discuss how the program corresponds to the types and locations of the past collisions. Consider threats to vulnerable and underserved communities, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), children, students, older adults and persons with disabilities in your response.*

#### **Breakdown of points:**

Evaluators should evaluate all attachments, including:

- The “County/City Heat Map” and the “Community Heat Map” of the area surrounding the limits of the program: Points are based on the maps demonstrating that the relative collision history within the program limits is **high** when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community's collision history, suggesting that the program limits represents one of the community's highest safety needs.
- **Or** the applicant thoroughly explains why the program area was chosen despite the lack of collision history.
  - Note: If an applicant clearly and convincingly explains **why** they are proposing the program despite the lack of collision data, they can still receive all, or a majority of the points.
  - Examples of reasons why an applicant may propose a program in an area with no collisions are:
    - The infrastructure tied to the proposed program is a new facility.
    - It is so unsafe to walk, bike, or roll that there is no active transportation activity, or it has been banned (e.g., school campus rules).
    - Some communities have residents that do not report collisions.
- If the program is not located 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 program area. Evaluators should consider the influence the program is expected to have overall AND the specific location of the proposed program.
- 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 program.
  - Note: Applicants are allowed to provide safety data in a different format if they prefer OR if they do not have the collision data.
    - These include surveys collected from the communities near-miss data, information from crowdsourcing applications (such as Street Story), 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 as described in the narrative section.

#### **Influence Area Guidance**

A project's expected safety “Influence Area” (i.e., where a project has the potential to mitigate) 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 an appropriate "Influence Area" and overall project area for their proposed safety improvements/countermeasures. Prior to scoring the Safety Question, the evaluator should assess and try to confirm that the applicant's "project area" (or Influence Area) shown in their maps is reasonable with respect to the following criteria:

- New Traffic Signals: crashes within 250 feet of the new signal.
- For intersection or mid-block crossing improvements, collisions that occurred within 250 feet of the intersection/mid-block crossing in all directions affected by the improvement may be used.

- 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 where the new facility/route can be reasonably expected to reduce the likelihood of past crashes from reoccurring. The overall applicant data provided in the Narrative Questions and various attachments must support the use of parallel crash data.

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

Applicants are **required** to include documentation under **sub-question 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 determines the information is **incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated**, they should note this in their evaluation comments and score sub-question 4 accordingly.

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

- Applicants must provide the output files from the TIMS ATP tool (or, if the agency prefers, 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.
    - Evaluators should consider additional point reductions for this question if the applicant included crash data that does not reasonably tie to the influence area of the proposed “safety” program elements.
  - 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. All crashes that do not include a non-motorized user as one of the primary victims must be excluded.
    - The number of crashes entered into the table is directly supported by both the map and the listing.
    - Attachments **must** be included to support alternative data (surveys, school policy, or letter from school explaining 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:

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

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate how the program addresses and mitigates the influence area's history of collisions
8-10 Points	<p>The application <b>clearly and convincingly</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed program, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Why this program area is a high priority for addressing the identified safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify how the program will mitigate future crash-type trends.</li> </ul>
5-7 Points	<p>The application <b>somewhat</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed program, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Why this program area is a high priority for addressing the identified safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify how the program will mitigate future crash-type trends.</li> </ul>
1-4 Points	<p>The application <b>minimally</b> shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed program, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Why this program area is a high priority for addressing the identified safety concerns, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify how the program will mitigate future crash-type trends.</li> </ul>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application <b>does not</b> at all show that the proposed program will address or mitigate safety needs.</p>

## **QUESTION #4: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND PLANNING (0-15 POINTS)**

*Describe the community-based public participation process that culminated in the program proposal.*

- A. *Describe who was engaged in the identification and development of this program. How were they engaged? Describe the type, extent, and duration of outreach and engagement conducted to relevant stakeholders. What was their feedback, and how was it incorporated into the program proposal? If applicable, describe any unique engagement challenges that the community faced and how they were addressed. (0-5 points)*

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

There is a difference between outreach and engagement. Applicants that engage program stakeholders should receive a higher score than those that 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 to a targeted audience.
- **Public** stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end-users, community leaders, elected officials, community-based organizations, advocacy organizations, local businesses, and members of vulnerable or underserved populations (e.g., older adults, youth, persons with disabilities, members of disadvantaged communities).
- **Governmental** stakeholders can include other departments, agencies, jurisdictions, etc. impacted by the proposed project that are NOT the applicant (these can include, but are not limited to transportation agencies, local health departments, schools/school districts, emergency services, metropolitan planning organizations, law enforcement, etc.)
- **In-person, virtual, and hybrid meetings and/or events** and how many were held to engage stakeholders is key to Public Participation. These can include, but are not limited to:
  - **The type of meetings or events:** open houses, community charrettes, city council meetings, planning commission meetings, tables or booths at farmer's markets or other community events, door-to-door solicitation, walk or bike audits, etc.
  - **How the meetings or events were noticed:** local newspapers, agency websites, radio announcements, social media posts on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc., school parent group meetings, places of worship, local publications in other languages, flyers, etc.
  - **How the meetings or events were documented:** Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes, virtual participant lists, virtual chat logs, letters of support, photos, etc.
  - **Where the meetings or events took place:** Virtual meeting platforms, schools, community centers, city hall, parks or other outdoor locations to accommodate safe in-person gathering and social distancing, etc.
  - **The accessibility of the meetings or events:** accessible by public transportation, translation services provided, childcare provided, time of day the meetings or events were held that best meet the needs of the community, virtual accessibility features such as captioning and interpretation, 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 and surveys.

### **Breakdown of points:**

- The level of expected planning for a program is **directly connected** to the **magnitude and complexity** of the proposed activities and the impacts on the overall transportation network as well as the long-term impacts of the program on its participants.
  - Programs with larger scopes and costs should demonstrate a more extensive planning process.

- Points will be awarded based on the extent that the relevant stakeholders were engaged in the development of the program and the level of community engagement and meeting/event accessibility.
- Evaluators should consider strategies that applicants used to overcome unique community challenges (e.g., recent natural disasters, continued impacts from COVID-19, etc.) when evaluating this question. However, the level of community engagement should still be appropriate for the magnitude and complexity of the project.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Check any attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: any applicable meeting minutes, meeting sign-in sheet, links to websites, letters of support, public service announcements, new alternatives, or major revisions that were identified, etc.
- Analyze the extent to which the relevant stakeholders were engaged in the development of the program; the level of community engagement; and the accessibility of the meeting/events. Consider this in relation to the magnitude and complexity of the proposed program and the needs of the community characteristics being served and/or impacted by the program.
- Check the level to which the letters of support emphasize the need for the program and that it addresses the highest active transportation priorities for the community, targeted end-users, or public stakeholders.
- Analyze whether the applicant demonstrates the engagement was used to refine the program scope.
- Analyze the level to which the program considers both existing and future needs of the program recipients and the transportation network.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate public participation
5 Points	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that the program scope was developed through a <b>comprehensive</b> public participation process which included <b>all</b> the appropriate stakeholders, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Demonstrates the meetings and events were <b>fully</b> accessible and effectively engaged <b>all</b> program stakeholders. <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Gives examples of stakeholder input and how that stakeholder input was incorporated in the program proposal.</li> </ul>
3-4 Points	<p>The applicant <b>somewhat</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that the program scope was developed through a public participation process which included the appropriate stakeholders, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Demonstrates the meetings and events were <b>somewhat</b> accessible and engaged <b>some</b> program stakeholders, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains stakeholder input and <b>somewhat</b> describes how the input was incorporated into the program proposal.</li> </ul>
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that the program scope was developed through a public participation process which included <b>some</b> stakeholders, <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• The meetings and events were <b>minimally</b> accessible and engaged some program stakeholders, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Explains stakeholder input <b>without examples</b> and <b>minimally</b> describes how the input was incorporated into the program proposal.</li> </ul>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application <b>does not</b> demonstrate that the program was developed through a public participation process, <b>AND</b> no input was incorporated into the program proposal.</p>

*B. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the program. Include which agencies and stakeholder groups (e.g., public health, community-based organizations, public schools, law enforcement, and non-traditional partners) will be involved in implementing the program. (0-10 points)*

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Review all attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: applicable public outreach process/proposal/plan, meeting minutes, meeting sign-in sheet, links to websites, letters of support, public service announcements, etc.

Points	The applicant’s ability to demonstrate that stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the program
<b>8-10 Points</b>	The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a process on how stakeholders will continue to be engaged <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Gives <b>specific examples</b> of how partnering agencies or stakeholder groups (if any) will be involved in implementing the program.</li> </ul>
<b>5-7 Points</b>	The applicant <b>somewhat</b> demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A process on how stakeholders will continue to be engaged <b>AND</b></li> <li>• How partnering agencies or stakeholder groups (if any) will be involved in implementing the program.</li> </ul>
<b>1-4 Points</b>	The applicant <b>minimally</b> demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A process on how stakeholders will continue to be engaged <b>AND</b></li> <li>• How partnering agencies or stakeholder groups (if any) will be involved in implementing the program.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application <b>does not</b> demonstrate that stakeholders will continue to be engaged <b>AND no</b> partnering agencies or stakeholder groups will be involved in the implementation of the program.

**QUESTION #5: EVALUATION AND SUSTAINABILITY (0-10 POINTS)**

A. *How will the effectiveness of the program be measured? Describe the effectiveness measures that will be evaluated (public support, mode shift, knowledge increase, safety, etc.) and the tools that will be used (such as surveys, counts, observations, etc.) to quantify the success. (0-5 points)*

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

The following must be checked and analyzed by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- The number of times the program is evaluated (before, during, after).
- Can the evaluation tools and methods be replicated.
- The tools/methods described are realistic and doable.

Points	The applicant’s ability to demonstrate how program effectiveness will be measured
<b>5 Points</b>	The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates how the program will be measured <b>with details</b> on the specific and realistic tools and methods that will be used.
<b>3-4 Points</b>	The applicant <b>somewhat</b> demonstrates how the program will be measured <b>with a general</b> overview of the realistic tools and methods that will be used.
<b>1-2 Points</b>	The applicant <b>minimally</b> demonstrates how the program will be measured <b>with a vague</b> description of tools and methods that will be used.
<b>0 Points</b>	Evaluators can award a zero if the applicant <b>does not</b> demonstrate how the program effectiveness will be measured <b>and</b> the tools and methods are <b>not appropriate</b> to quantify the success of the program.

B. *How will the program be sustained after completion? As you address this question, consider the following:*

- *Train the Trainer*
- *“How-to” toolkits and guides to transfer program materials and equipment to another party (e.g., teachers, school district, parent volunteers, PTA, an after-school program, community volunteers, community organization, etc.)*
- *Other sources of funding*

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Analyze whether the program will bring added and lasting value to the community.
- Determine whether the described sustainability plan is realistic and doable.
- Consider whether any letters of support or intent from another agency, organization, or volunteers confirms a commitment to sustain the program.

Points	The applicant’s ability to demonstrate how the program will be sustained
<b>5 Points</b>	The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> identifies how the program will be sustained.
<b>3-4 Points</b>	The applicant <b>somewhat</b> identifies how the program will be sustained.
<b>1-2 Points</b>	The applicant <b>vaguely</b> identifies how the program will be sustained.
<b>0 Points</b>	Evaluators can award a zero if they believe the applicant <b>did not</b> identify how the program will be sustained.

**QUESTION #6: INNOVATIVE PROGRAM ELEMENTS (0-5 Points)**

A. *Does this program propose any elements that are new to the region? AND/OR does this program utilize any recognized best practices that have been proven successful in a similar local community context? Explain why the program chose to include these elements.*  
(5 points)

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- The program elements meet the needs of a wide range of stakeholders.
- The program proposes elements new to the region or community, or it proposes best practices that are innovative in the local community context.
- The program is in harmony with the community values.
- The project exceeds the expectations of stakeholders and achieves a level of excellence in people's minds.
- The project involves efficient and effective use of the resources (time, budget, community).

Points	The applicant’s ability to demonstrate innovative elements or recognized best practices
5 Points	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that innovative elements were considered and incorporated into the program to best meet the needs of the population the program is serving <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• Considered recognized best practices and included them in the program <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Includes a <b>clear</b> explanation for why the innovative elements or recognized best practices are effective.</li> </ul>
3-4 Points	<p>The applicant <b>somewhat</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that innovative elements were considered and incorporated into the program to meet the needs of the population the program is <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• Considered recognized best practices and included them in the program <b>AND</b></li> <li>• <b>May have</b> included an explanation for why the innovative elements or recognized best practices are effective.</li> </ul>
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates that innovative elements were considered and incorporated into the program to meet the needs of the population the program is serving <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• Considered recognized best practices and included them in the program <b>AND</b></li> <li>• <b>Did not</b> include an explanation as to why the innovative elements or recognized best practices are effective.</li> </ul>
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a zero if the innovative elements or recognized best practices are <b>not appropriate</b> to the population the program is serving.</p>

## QUESTION #7: PROGRAM SCOPE AND IMPLEMENTATION (0-10 POINTS)

### A. Complete the 25-R. (0-10 points)

Applicants are required to complete a 25-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan) as part of the NI application.

#### Breakdown of points:

Evaluators will consider the following:

- **Completeness** of Exhibit 25-R.
  - Is the scope clearly split into multiple tasks with multiple activities?
  - Are tasks/activities detailed and specific?
    - Clearly written descriptions
    - Includes a quantified number of activities
    - Specifies a tangible deliverable
  - Do safe routes to school programs coordinate with school schedules?
- **Consistency** of 25-R with the applicant’s responses throughout the narrative of application.
  - Are the activities described in the narrative reflected and easily found in the 25-R?
  - Are established partnership commitments reflected in the 25-R, if any (i.e., public health, community-based organization, law enforcement, etc.)?
- **Compliance** of 25-R with the ATP Non-Infrastructure Guidance.
  - Are staff costs and “other costs” included per NI Guidance?
  - Are ATP costs and in-kind costs (if any) clearly identified?

#### Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to follow all directions in filling out the 25-R, the evaluator should **not** give full points for this sub-question.

Points	Evaluating the 25-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan): Completeness
4 Points	The applicant submits a <b>strong</b> 25-R that includes a <b>complete, clear, and organized</b> work plan with in-depth detail that outlines the various tasks and costs of the program.
2-3 Points	The applicant submits an <b>average</b> 25-R that includes a work plan with <b>enough detail and organization</b> to outline the various tasks and costs of the program but may be unclear in some areas.
1 Point	The applicant submits a <b>weak</b> 25-R that includes a work plan that is <b>poorly developed and vague</b> and the various tasks of the program are <b>unclearly</b> outlined.
0 Points	The applicant failed to provide and fill out the 25-R.

Points	Evaluating the 25-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan): Consistency
3 Points	The applicant submits a <b>strong</b> 25-R that is <b>fully</b> consistent with and reflects the applicant's responses throughout the application.
1-2 Points	The applicant submits an <b>average</b> 25-R that is <b>mostly</b> consistent with and reflects the applicant's responses throughout the application.
0 Points	The applicant submits a <b>weak</b> 25-R that is <b>inconsistent</b> with the applicant's responses throughout the application.

Points	Evaluating the 25-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan): Compliance
<b>3 Points</b>	The applicant <b>fully</b> complies with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance.
<b>1-2 points</b>	The applicant <b>partially</b> complies with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance.
<b>0 Points</b>	The applicant <b>does not</b> comply with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance.