

## **2027 Active Transportation Program** Plan Scoring Rubric

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has prepared these scoring rubrics in coordination with Caltrans to provide additional guidance on the evaluation process. This document is principally intended 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, plan context, and plan deliverability.

### **Index:**

<b>Question #</b>	<b>Question Title</b>	<b>Page #</b>
Question #1:	Disadvantaged Communities	Page 2
Question #2:	Priority to Fund a Plan	Page 5
Question #3:	Public Participation	Page 8
Question #4:	Implementation	Page 11
Question #5:	Plan Development	Page 12

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

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

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

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

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

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
- 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. Plan Area: (0 - 15 points)**

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

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

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

- Applicants **must provide** the plan area map(s) **and** the DAC identification information as required in A & B.

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

**D. Severity: (0-15 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>2 Points</b>	75% to <80% of the statewide MHI	\$74,341.50 to \$79,297.59
<b>6 Points</b>	70% to <75% of the statewide MHI	\$69,385.40 to \$74,341.49
<b>10 Points</b>	65% to <70% of the statewide MHI	\$64,429.30 to \$69,385.39
<b>15 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>2 Points</b>	20% through 25% most disadvantaged	40.05 through 43.38
<b>6 Points</b>	15% through <20% most disadvantaged	43.39 through 47.54
<b>10 Points</b>	10% through <15% most disadvantaged	47.55 through 51.97
<b>15 Points</b>	<10% most disadvantaged	51.98 through 93.18

Points	National School Lunch Program   Free or Reduced-Price Meals Percentage	
<b>0 points</b>	Less than 75% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>2 Points</b>	≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>6 Points</b>	> 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>10 Points</b>	> 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
<b>15 Points</b>	> 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches	

Points	Healthy Places Index 3.0 Score*	
<b>0 points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score above 25th Percentile	
<b>2 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score 20th through 25th Percentile	
<b>6 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score 15th through <20th Percentile	
<b>10 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score 10th through <15th Percentile	
<b>15 Points</b>	Healthy Places Index Score <10th Percentile	

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

Category	Points	Other DAC Criteria
<b>Federally Recognized Tribal Lands or projects submitted by Tribal Governments</b>	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 – 2 points	If the applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community based on an adopted regional definition, the applicant must submit for consideration the regional definition, as well as <b>how</b> their specific community qualifies under that definition.
<b>Other MHI or CalEnviroScreen Assessment</b>	0 – 2 points	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: PRIORITY TO FUND THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-WIDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS (0-20 POINTS)**

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

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate Plan priority.
<b>10 Points</b>	Applicant <b>does not</b> have <b>any</b> of the following: a pedestrian plan, a bicycle plan, a safe routes to school plan, a comprehensive active transportation plan.
<b>7 Points</b>	Applicant <b>has</b> a bicycle plan, a pedestrian plan, a safe route to school plan, or a comprehensive active transportation plan, <b>but not all</b> .
<b>4 Points</b>	Applicant proposes to <b>update</b> a pedestrian plan, a bicycle plan, safe routes to school plan, or comprehensive active transportation plan <b>that is older than 5 years</b> .
<b>1 Point</b>	Applicant proposes to <b>update</b> a pedestrian plan, a bicycle plan, a safe routes to school plan, or a comprehensive active transportation plan <b>that is less than 5 years old</b> .

B. *Statement of Need. Describe the active transportation problems or deficiencies within the plan area. Include the community’s active transportation needs and why this plan is necessary to meet those needs. Consider children older adults, students, working professionals, and persons with disabilities. (0-10 points)*

**Breakdown of points:**

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

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- Analyze the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for the plan in the community.
- Review the data provided to assess if the plan area is reasonable. Consider the attached photos, other attachments, and other information included in the application to make an informed decision.
- Specific to the local public health concerns, evaluators should consider whether the applicant identified specific local public health concerns, health disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment affecting the project community that can be addressed by increasing walking and biking, including:
  - A thorough and nuanced discussion of existing health condition(s) amongst targeted users (responses should be more sophisticated than simply stating, “Walking and biking is good for health because it increases physical activity.”) AND
  - The physical or social conditions (known as the social determinants of health) in the target community that contribute to the current health conditions (beyond other elements already addressed in the application, including bike/ped. infrastructure gaps and barriers, collision rates, etc.) AND
- The applicant provides local public health data demonstrating the above public health concern or health disparity, including:

- Inclusion of health data at the smallest geography available (i.e., census tract or county level if census tract is not available) AND
- Health status of targeted users given as percentages or rates using relevant and local health indicators AND stated as ranks or comparisons to non-targeted user data (e.g., the community has a higher/lesser obesity rate compared to both the state and other rural communities of similar size)

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the need for a plan.
<b>7-8 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> describes the “need” in the plan area <b>AND</b> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet each of the identified needs, <b>AND</b> The applicant documents <b>all</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of active transportation infrastructure</li> <li>• Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users</li> <li>• Lack of connectivity and mobility options for users to get to key destinations</li> <li>• Local public health concerns</li> <li>• Attachments and other documentation show the need is reasonable.</li> </ul>
<b>5-6 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>convincingly</b> demonstrates “need” in the plan area <b>AND</b> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet each of the identified needs, <b>AND</b> Documents at least 3 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of active transportation infrastructure</li> <li>• Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users</li> <li>• Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations</li> <li>• Local public health concerns</li> <li>• Attachments and other documentation show the need is reasonable.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>somewhat</b> demonstrates “need” in the plan area <b>AND</b> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet each of the identified needs, <b>AND</b> Documents at least 2 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of active transportation infrastructure</li> <li>• Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users</li> <li>• Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations</li> <li>• Local public health concerns</li> <li>• Attachments and other documentation show the need is reasonable.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b> demonstrates “need” in the plan area <b>AND</b> demonstrates how the plan will serve to meet each of the identified needs, <b>AND</b> Documents only 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of active transportation infrastructure</li> <li>• Injuries or fatalities to non-motorized users</li> <li>• Connectivity and mobility for users to get to key destinations</li> <li>• Local public health concerns</li> <li>• Attachments and other documentation show the need is reasonable.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>does not</b> demonstrate “need” in the plan area <b>AND</b> does not demonstrate how the plan will meet the needs, <b>AND does not</b> provide any documentation.</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 the needs of students in their community and how their needs will be addressed?
- If the applicant simply states “schools” as a destination within the community, that does not warrant the two points.
- A Plan **DOES NOT** have to be a safe routes to school plan in order to receive these points.

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

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

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

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

#### Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- Community stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end-users, 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.)

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

B. Describe how stakeholders will be engaged in the development of the plan. Describe your intended outreach methods during the plan’s development (e.g., charrettes, community workshops, pop-up events, social media, etc.), including the number of outreach activities and estimated number of people reached. How will you maximize the accessibility of the community engagement process? (e.g., providing translation, interpretation, and child care services; selecting times/locations convenient to the general public; ensuring culturally/linguistically appropriate materials). If applicable, describe strategies you will use to address any unique engagement challenges you expect to arise (e.g., challenges related to ongoing natural disaster or COVID-19 impacts). (0-15 points)

#### Breakdown of points:

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

- The level of expected engagement for a plan is **directly connected to the magnitude and complexity** of the proposed plan and to the impacts on the overall transportation network.

- Plans with larger plan areas, scopes, and costs should demonstrate a more extensive planning process.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

- The number of accessible meetings/events that will be held to engage stakeholders is key to Public Participation. Evaluators should also consider:
  - **Types of meetings or events:** open houses, community charrettes/workshops, city council meetings, planning commission meetings, walk/bike audits, etc.
    - Evaluators should pay special attention to meetings where stakeholders will **only be informed** of the plan **vs.** being involved in **providing input throughout** the planning process.
  - **How the meetings/ events will be noticed:** local newspapers, agency website, radio announcements, social media posts on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc., school parent group meetings, places of worship, local publications in other languages, flyers, etc.
  - **Location of meetings/ events:** Virtual meeting platforms, schools, community centers, city hall, parks, and other outdoor locations to accommodate safe in-person gatherings and social distancing, etc.
  - **Accessibility of the meetings/ events:** Accessible by public transportation, translation services provided, culturally/linguistically appropriate meeting materials, child care services provided, food provided, and time of day the meetings or events were held, etc.
  - **Stakeholder involvement in a decision-making body:** technical advisory committee, citizens’ advisory committee, etc.
  - **Documentation of meetings/ events to address the community input received:** Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes, letters of support, etc.
- Other methods used to engage and obtain input from the community, such as crowdsourcing maps and surveys.

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

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

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

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

Points	The applicant's ability to maintain ongoing outreach with stakeholders
<b>5 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>clearly and convincingly</b> demonstrates an outreach/communication process with <u>specific details</u> that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep stakeholders informed of changes to the draft plan as a direct result of their input, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Keep stakeholders updated on project implementation after the plan is adopted.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>somewhat</b> demonstrates an outreach/communication process with <u>general details</u> that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep stakeholders informed of changes to the draft plan as a direct result of their input, <b>AND</b></li> <li>• Keep stakeholders updated on project implementation after the plan is adopted.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2 Points</b>	<p>The applicant <b>minimally</b> demonstrates an outreach/communication process with <u>vague details</u> <b>AND minimally</b> addresses how stakeholders will be updated on project implementation after the plan is adopted.</p>
<b>0 Points</b>	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application <b>does not</b> demonstrate that stakeholder input will be incorporated and there is <b>no evidence</b> stakeholders will continue to be informed after plan adoption.</p>

**QUESTION #4: IMPLEMENTATION (0-10 POINTS)**

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

Discuss:

- How the final plan will result in specific projects that can lead to future active transportation projects.
- How you will prepare to implement projects identified in the plan (e.g., adopting supportive policies, programming projects into the Regional Transportation Plan, etc.).
- How you will quickly translate the projects and programs identified in the plan into tangible programs and infrastructure.
- Identify any specific funding sources (aside from the ATP) that would be available to fund the implementation of infrastructure projects and non-infrastructure programs identified in the plan.

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**

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

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

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

## QUESTION #5: PLAN DEVELOPMENT (0-15 POINTS)

Complete the 25-Plan: (0-15 points)

Applicants are required to complete a 25-Plan.

### Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to follow all directions for filling out the 25-Plan, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question and should use their best judgment to choose the score they feel best represents the information given.

### Breakdown of points:

Evaluators will consider the following:

- Completeness of the 25-Plan.
  - Is the scope clearly split into multiple tasks and sub-tasks, unique to the proposed Plan?
  - Are tasks/sub-tasks detailed and specific?
    - Clearly written descriptions
    - Have a quantified number of activities/deliverables
  - Are task/sub-task costs reasonable?
  - Is the timeframe given for the development of the Plan reasonable?
- Consistency of 25-Plan with the applicant’s responses throughout the **narrative** of application.
  - Are the processes and activities described in the narrative reflected and easily found in the 25-Plan?
    - Specifically, consider the public participation outreach and engagement methods that were described in Question 3.
- Compliance with the required components outlined in the CTC Guidelines, Appendix B.
  - Did the applicant include the components checklist?
    - If any components were not checked, did the applicant provide a complete justification?
    - Are the components identified with the appropriate tasks on the 25-Plan?

Points	Evaluating the 25-Plan: Completeness
<b>5 Points</b>	The applicant submits an <b>excellent and complete</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes a <b>complete, clear, and organized</b> scope of work with <b>in-depth detail</b> that outlines the various tasks of plan development and the planning process</li> </ul>
<b>4 Points</b>	The applicant submits a <b>strong</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes a <b>complete and organized</b> scope of work with <b>enough detail</b> to outline the various tasks of plan development and the planning process</li> </ul>
<b>3 Points</b>	The applicant submits an <b>average</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes an <b>organized</b> scope of work that <b>lacks some</b> detail or organization in outlining the various tasks of plan development and the planning process</li> </ul>
<b>2 Points</b>	The applicant submits a <b>below-average</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes a scope of work that is <b>vague and unclear</b> in outlining the various tasks of plan development and the planning process</li> </ul>
<b>1 Point</b>	The applicant submits a <b>weak</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes a scope of work that is <b>poorly developed and unclear</b> in outlining the various tasks of plan development and the planning process</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	The applicant failed to provide the 25-Plan.

Points	Evaluating the 25-Plan: Consistency
<b>5 Points</b>	The applicant submits an <b>excellent</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is <b>fully</b> consistent with and reflects the public participation and implementation activities described in the application</li> </ul>
<b>4 Points</b>	The applicant submits a <b>strong</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is consistent with and reflects the public participation and implementation activities described in the application</li> </ul>
<b>3 Points</b>	The applicant submits an <b>average</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is <b>mostly</b> consistent with and reflects the public participation and implementation activities described in the application</li> </ul>
<b>2 Points</b>	The applicant submits a <b>below-average</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is <b>inconsistent</b> with the public participation and implementation activities described in the application</li> </ul>
<b>1 Point</b>	The applicant submits a <b>weak</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is <b>mostly inconsistent</b> with the public participation and implementation activities described in the application</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	The applicant failed to provide the 25-Plan.

Points	Evaluating the 25-Plan: Compliance
<b>5 Points</b>	The applicant submits an <b>excellent</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes <b>all</b> the required plan components, and if not, provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.</li> </ul>
<b>4 Points</b>	The applicant submits a <b>strong</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes <b>all</b> the required plan components, and if not, provides a <b>good</b> explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.</li> </ul>
<b>3 Points</b>	The applicant submits an <b>average</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes <b>most of</b> the required plan components, and if not, provides an <b>average</b> explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.</li> </ul>
<b>2 Points</b>	The applicant submits a <b>below-average</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Does not</b> specify all the required plan components or provides a <b>mediocre</b> explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.</li> </ul>
<b>1 Point</b>	The applicant submits a <b>weak</b> 25-Plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Does not</b> specify the required plan components or provides a <b>very weak</b> explanation as to why that component(s) is not included.</li> </ul>
<b>0 Points</b>	The applicant failed to address the components TAB on the 25-Plan.