

2021 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 as a guide for the evaluators when scoring the 2021 ATP applications. Applicants may also find this a useful resource when developing applications. This document, however, is not intended as the definitive formula for how applications will be scored. Evaluators may take other factors into consideration when scoring applications, such as the overall application quality, program context and program deliverability.

Index:

QUESTION #1:	Disadvantaged Communities	Page #
QUESTION #2:	Potential for Increasing Biking and Walking (Statement of Need/Addressing the Need)	Page #
QUESTION #3:	Potential to Reduce Fatalities and Injuries	Page #
QUESTION #4:	Public Participation & Planning	Page #
QUESTION #5:	Evaluation and Sustainability	Page #
QUESTION #6:	Innovative Program Elements	Page #
QUESTION #7:	Program Scope and Implementation	Page #

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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, applicant will skip the question and move onto 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, and disadvantaged community access point(s) and destinations that the project is benefiting.

B. Identification of Disadvantaged Community: (0 points)

Select one of the following 4 options. Must provide information for all Census Tract/Block Group/Place # that the project affects.

- Median Household Income
- CalEnviroScreen
- Free or Reduced Priced School Meals - Applications using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.
- **Healthy Places Index**
- Other
 - Regional Definition
 - Federally Recognized Tribal Lands
 - 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 & B do not receive any points.

- If the applicant does not check the box “This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community” they are required to provide the required project map(s) and provide the DAC information as required in both A & B.
 - Maps should include **all** census tracts/schools that the project reaches, not just the ones that are disadvantaged

When evaluating the first part of sub-question C, the evaluator should consider:

- 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 the second part of sub-question C, the evaluator should consider:

- If this program was presented to the disadvantaged community in a local forum so that they could provide input and support or if the program was simply voted upon in a general agency meeting without really reaching out to the community to learn their needs and wants.
- If the disadvantaged community was actively involved in the program development and given the opportunity to provide their input.
- If the applicant provided any supporting documentation/additional attachments (Attachment K) to show how the program was requested by the residents of the disadvantaged community.

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

When evaluating the third part of sub-question C, the evaluator should consider:

- How the disadvantaged community will continue to be engaged and provide input to program development and implementation after the program begins.
- How well the program reaches the disadvantaged community residents to ensure they can participate program.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the program 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 program addresses an important need specific to the disadvantaged community, AND • Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, AND • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will be included in the program.
3 Points	<p>The application convincingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the program addresses an important need specific to the disadvantaged community, AND • Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, AND • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will be included in the program.
2 Points	<p>The application somewhat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the program addresses an important need specific to the disadvantaged community, AND • Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, AND • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will be included in the program.
1 Point	<p>The application minimally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the program addresses an important need specific to the disadvantaged community, AND • Illustrates how the program was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents, AND • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will be included in the program.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not adequately 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. Evaluators will only submit scores on Part C – Direct Benefit – for a maximum of 4 points.**

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 track/block/place data that verifies the DAC community location status, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question and

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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.
2 Points	Project location(s) is/are <u>fully</u> (100%) located within a DAC.
1 Point	Project location(s) is/are <u>partially</u> (less than 100%) within a DAC.
0 Points	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, evaluators shall give points per the table(s) below.

Points	Median Household Income (MHI) Criteria – MHI = \$56,982	
0 points	Greater than 80% of the MHI	greater than \$56,982.40
1 Point	75% through <80% of MHI	\$53,421 through \$56,982.40
2 Points	70% through <75% of MHI	\$49,859.60 through \$53,421
3 Points	65% through <70% of MHI	\$46,298.20 through \$49,859.60
4 Points	< 65% of MHI	less than \$46,298.20
Points	CalEnviroScreen Criteria	
0 points	Above 25% most disadvantaged	less than 39.34
1 Point	20% through 25% most disadvantaged	39.34 through 42.86
2 Points	15% through < 20% most disadvantaged	42.87 through 46.63
3 Points	10% through < 15% most disadvantaged	46.64 through 51.18
4 Points	< 10% most disadvantaged	51.19 through 94.09
Points	Free or Reduced Lunches	
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 Percentile	
0 Points	Healthy Places Percentile above 25%	

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

1 Point	Healthy Places Percentile 20% through 25%
2 Points	Healthy Places Index Score 15% through <20%
3 Points	Healthy Places Index Score 10% through <15%
4 Points	Healthy Places Index Score <10%

Points	Other DAC Criterion
Use MHI Criteria Severity Scoring Above	If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment, to demonstrate that the community's median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income.
Regional Definition	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications utilizing the Regional Definition can receive a MAX of 1 severity point. However, applications are still able to receive all location and direct benefit points.
4 Points	Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

**QUESTION #2: POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING AND BICYCLING, ESPECIALLY AMONG STUDENTS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF WALKING AND BICYCLING ROUTES TO AND FROM SCHOOLS, TRANSIT FACILITIES, COMMUNITY CENTERS, EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, AND OTHER DESTINATIONS; AND INCLUDING INCREASING AND IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY OF NONMOTORIZED USERS.
(0-40 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 on 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 and bicycling**”
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all aspects of “need”.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- **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 the CTC right away as it may disqualify the application.
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need with specific examples and/or data in the program area.
- Evaluators are encouraged to review the data provided for reasonableness of the proposed program.
 - In doing this the evaluator should consult the attached photos, Google Maps, and any other information available to make an informed decision. A program does not need to have, or create large numbers in order to cause great change to a community’s active transportation increases, and this can be reflected in the scores given.
- A “community destination”, such as access to goods, services and activities that society considers particularly important i.e. a hospital, a grocery store, a transit station, or an employment center (where the community residents can reasonably expect to find employment). The applicant may be able to 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 disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment affecting the project community that can be addressed by increasing walking and biking, including:

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- ❖ 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.”)
- ❖ 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
- Did the applicant provide 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 need for the program.
15-18 Points	The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure • Connectivity and mobility to community destinations • Perceived personal safety • Local public health concerns
10-14 Points	The applicant demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents: (at least 3 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure • Connectivity and mobility to community destinations • Perceived personal safety • Local public health concerns
5-9 Points	The applicant somewhat demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents: (at least 2 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure • Connectivity and mobility to community destinations • Perceived personal safety • Local public health concerns
1-4 Points	The applicant minimally demonstrates “need” in the program area, and documents: (at least 1 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing or proposed active transportation infrastructure • Connectivity and mobility to community destinations • Perceived personal safety • Local public health concerns
0 Points	The applicant does not demonstrate “need” in the program area.

PLUS:

Points	Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the active transportation needs of STUDENTS.
2 Points	The application demonstrates the active transportation needs of students

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

0 Points	The application does not 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 DAC identification, 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:

- 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.
 - If evaluators feel the score should be 0, they must report this finding to the CTC as it may disqualify the application.
- When awarding points for expanded or new components to an existing program, evaluators must review the applicant's response to the question "Explain what the new or expanded components are, why they are needed, and if applicable, how they support the existing NI program. Include how the existing program is being sustained." The evaluator should take into account:
 - If the original program is sustained.
 - Why the new or expanded components are necessary.

Points	Non-Infrastructure Program Type
2 Points	Start-up program (no program currently exists)
1 Point	Expansion of an existing program
1 Point	New components to an existing program
0 Points	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 must report this finding to the CTC as it may disqualify the application.

2. Describe the program, the population it will serve, and how the program will use encouragement, education, and/or enforcement to address each of the need(s) identified above with the goal of increasing walking and/or biking to community identified destinations within the program area. (0-18 points)

Breakdown of points:

"Addressing the Need" must be considered in the context of the **"potential for increased walking and bicycling"**. To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate how the program addresses **all** aspects of the "need".

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

Points	Applicant's ability to describe how the program meets the needs.
14-17 Points	The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that the program will best result in meaningful increases in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the program area by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a detailed description of the program and the population it will serve AND • Thoroughly explaining how the program will use education, encouragement, and/or enforcement to address the identified needs
10-13 Points	The applicant demonstrates that the program will best result in meaningful increases in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the program area by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a general description of the program and the population it will serve AND • Explaining how the program will use education, encouragement, and/or enforcement to address the identified needs
5-9 Points	The applicant somewhat demonstrates that the program will best result in meaningful increases in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the program area by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a vague description of the program and the population it will serve AND • Vaguely explaining how the program will use education, encouragement, and/or enforcement to address the identified needs
1-4 Points	The applicant minimally demonstrates that the program will best result in meaningful increases in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the program area by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a lacking description of the program and the population it will serve AND • Unclear explanation of how the program will use education, encouragement, and/or enforcement to address the identified needs
0 Points	The application did not describe the program and did not demonstrate how the program would address the 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 project will increase the number of active transportation trips accomplished by students?
- Projects can receive points for demonstrating the transportation needs of students of all ages, including high school and college/community college
- An applicant **DOES NOT** have to be a safe routes to school project 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.
1 Point	The program will increase the proportion of active transportation trips accomplished by students
0 Point	The program will not increase the proportion of active transportation trips accomplished by students

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #3: POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OR THE RISK OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLIST FATALITIES AND INJURIES, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF SAFETY HAZARDS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS. (0-10 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)

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 their highest safety needs or the applicant is able to thoroughly explain why they are building the project despite the lack of collision history.
 - 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 (i.e. school campus rules).
 - Some communities have residents that 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.
 - ❖ These different data formats applicants can use to show the safety need include: surveys from communities asking how they feel about the safety of the area, near miss data, information from crowd sourcing 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.

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 appropriate “Influence Area” and/or overall project area for their proposed safety improvements/countermeasures (These criteria are defined in the Caltrans Highway Safety Improvement Program Application Instructions). 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 effected by and within the limits of the improvement.

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- 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 respond to 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:

- Applicant must provide the output files from the new 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 abiding to 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.

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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? (0-5 points)

General Guidance on stakeholders and their involvement in a project:

There is a difference between outreach and engagement. Applicants that engage constituents 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, 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, and community leaders, elected officials, advocacy organizations, local businesses, and members of vulnerable or underserved populations (i.e. elderly, youth, physically and/or mentally disabled, members from disadvantaged communities).
- **Governmental** stakeholders can include other departments, agencies, jurisdictions, etc. impacted by the proposed project that are NOT the applicant (these can include, but are not limited to law enforcement, transportation, local health department, schools/school districts, emergency services, metropolitan planning organization, etc.)
- **Meetings and/or events** and how many were held to engage stakeholders is key to Public Participation. These can include, but are not limited to:
 - **The type of meetings or events:** open houses, community charrettes, city council meetings, planning commission meetings, tables or booths at farmer's markets, door-to-door solicitation, etc.
 - **How the meetings or events were noticed:** local newspaper, county website, on the radio, Facebook, Twitter, at school parents group meetings, at church, local publications in other languages, flyers, etc.
 - **How the meetings or events were documented:** Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes, letters of support, photos, etc.
 - **Where the meetings or events took place:** school, community center, city council hall, etc.
 - **The accessibility of the meetings or events:** accessible by public transportation, translation services provided, child care provided, time of day the meetings or events were held that best meet the needs of the community, food provided, etc.
 - **The stakeholders' involvement in the decision-making body:** technical advisory committee, citizens' advisory committee, etc.

Breakdown of points:

- The level of expected planning for a program is **directly connected** to the **magnitude and complexity** of the proposed activities and to the impacts to the overall transportation network.
 - 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 outreach and meeting/event accessibility

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- Evaluators are to give consideration to any attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: any applicable meeting minutes, meeting sign-in sheet, links to websites, letters of support, public service announcements, new alternatives or major revisions that were identified, etc.
- Evaluators are to consider the extent that the relevant stakeholders were engaged in the development of the program and the level of community outreach and meeting/event accessibility in relation to the magnitude and complexity of the proposed program and the community characteristics being served and/or impacted by the program.
- Evaluators are to consider the level to which the letters of support emphasize that the program represents the top or one of the top active transportation priorities for the community, targeted end users, or public stakeholders.
- Evaluators are to consider the level to which the applicant demonstrated the engagement was used to refining the program scope.
- Evaluators are to consider the level to which the program considered both existing and future needs of the program users and the transportation system.

Points	Applicants ability to demonstrate public participation
4-5 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the program scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included appropriate levels of public and governmental stakeholders, and the meetings and events were fully accessible and effectively engaged all program stakeholders. <i>AND</i> • Gives examples of stakeholder input and how that stakeholder input was incorporated in the program proposal.
3 Points	<p>The applicant generally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the program scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included appropriate levels of public and governmental stakeholders, and the meetings and events were accessible and effectively engaged program stakeholders. <i>AND</i> • Explains that stakeholder input was given and how it was incorporated in the program proposal.
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the program scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included some levels of public and governmental stakeholders, and/or the meetings and events were accessible and engaged program stakeholders. <i>AND</i> • Explains that stakeholder input was given and how it was incorporated in the program proposal.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the program was developed through an adequate public participation process.

B. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the program. Include which agencies and stakeholder groups (public health, law enforcement, non-governmental organizations (NGO) and non-traditional partners like faith groups, elder/senior intergenerational groups) will be involved in implementing the program? (0-10 points)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

- Evaluators are to give consideration to any attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: any applicable public outreach process/proposal/plan, 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
8-10 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process on how stakeholder will continue to be engaged AND • Gives specific examples on how partnering agencies or stakeholder groups (if any) will be involved in implementing the program.
5-7 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process on how stakeholders will continue to be engaged AND • How partnering agencies or stakeholder groups (if any) will be involved in implementing the program.
1-4 Points	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process on how stakeholders will continue to be engaged AND • How partnering agencies or stakeholder groups (if any) will be involved in implementing the program.
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not demonstrate that stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the program.</p>

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

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

Points	The applicant's ability to demonstrate how program effectiveness will be measured
4-5 Points	The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates the means by which the program will be measured with details on the specific tools and methods that will be used.
3 Points	The applicant demonstrates the means by which the program will be measured with an overview of the tools and methods that will be used.
1-2 Points	The applicant somewhat demonstrates the means by which the program will be measured with a vague description of the tools and methods that will be used.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a zero if the effectiveness measures are not appropriate to quantify the success of the program.

B. How will the program be sustained after completion? (0-5 points)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- The program is seen as having added lasting value to the community.
- The described sustainability plan is realistic and doable.
- Evaluators are to give consideration to any letters of support or intent from another agency, organization or volunteers that confirm commitment to sustain the program.

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

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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 full range of stakeholders.
- 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 clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative elements were considered and incorporated into the program to best address the population the program is serving <u>AND/OR</u> • Recognized best practices were considered and included in the program <u>AND</u> • Includes an explanation as to why the innovative elements or recognized best practices are effective.
3-4 Points	<p>The applicant adequately demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative elements were considered and incorporated into the program to address the population the program is serving <u>AND/OR</u> • Recognized best practices were considered and included in the program <u>AND</u> • May have included an explanation as to why the innovative elements or recognized best practices are effective.
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative elements were considered and incorporated into the program to address the population the program is serving <u>AND/OR</u> • Recognized best practices were considered and included in the program <u>AND</u> • Did not include an explanation as to why the innovative elements or recognized best practices are effective.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a zero if the innovative elements or recognized best practices are not appropriate to the population the program is serving.

2021 Active Transportation Program Non-Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

A. Complete the 22-R. (0-10 points)

Applicants are required to complete a 22-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan) as part of the NI application.

Breakdown of points:

Evaluators will consider the following:

- How well it reflects the applicant's responses throughout the application.
- How well the overall scope meets the Purpose and Goals of the ATP program, as defined in CTC Guidelines.
- Compliance with the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to follow all directions in filling out the 22-R, 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.

Points	Evaluating the 22-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan): Completeness
4 Points	The applicant submits a strong 22-R that includes a complete, clear, and organized work plan with in-depth detail that outlines the various tasks and costs of the program
2-3 Points	The applicant submits an average 22-R that includes a work plan with enough detail and organization to outline the various tasks and costs of the program, but may be unclear in some areas.
1 Point	The applicant submits a weak 22-R that includes a work plan that is poorly developed and vague or unclear in outlining the various tasks of the program
0 Points	The applicant failed to provide the 22-R.

Points	Evaluating the 22-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan): Consistency
3 Points	The applicant submits a strong 22-R that is fully consistent with and reflects the applicants responses throughout the application
1-2 Points	The applicant submits an average 22-R that is mostly consistent with and reflects the applicants responses throughout the application
0 Points	The applicant submits a weak 22-R that is inconsistent with the applicants responses throughout the application

Points	Evaluating the 22-R (Non-Infrastructure Work Plan): Compliance
3 Points	The applicant fully complies with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance.
1-2 points	The applicant partially complies with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance.
0 Points	The applicant does not comply with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance