

2021 Active Transportation Program Small 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, project context and project deliverability.

Note: For combined projects the term “project” refers to both the infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.

Index:

QUESTION #1:	Disadvantaged Communities	Page #
QUESTION #2:	Potential to Increase Users	Page #
QUESTION #3:	Potential to Reduce Collisions	Page #
QUESTION #4:	Public Participation & Planning	Page #
QUESTION #5:	Scope & Plan Consistency	Page #

2021 Active Transportation Program Small 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 may 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 Land
 - Other Determinant of MHI

C. Direct Benefit: (0 - 4 points)

*Explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, and/or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network and how the improvements meet an important need of the disadvantaged community. **Address any issues of displacement that may occur as a result of this project, if applicable.***

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 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 sub-question C the evaluator should consider:

- Does the project provide reasonable improvements to close missing gaps; increase needed routes or connections (such as access to and/or community safety for disadvantaged community residents to parks, greenways, open space, health care centers, transit stops, and other community assets); or address the poor conditions of an existing route?
- If developing a new route/connection, will the project result in a convenient and logical route that residents will want to use because it offers improved access to destinations the community commonly utilizes?
- Will the project address the lack of, or need for, active transportation planning? And/or does the project address the community concerns about the lack of pedestrian or bicycle safety education in their community?

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- If the project is not located in the DAC, will they have reasonable access points to the project?
- Applicants should also, when applicable, explain how anti-displacement policies and actions are being implemented in their community/city/county to discourage gentrification of the community being impacted by the project.
 - Applicant should address this, even if just to say that displacement is not an issue in their community. If displacement is not an issue an applicant should not be downgraded as long as it was addressed as not a concern of their Disadvantaged Community. Say WHY it is not applicable for your community.
 - Talk about how this is being addressed, whether through policies or work groups

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.
4 Points	The application clearly and convincingly Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network and/or meets an important disadvantaged community need.
3 Points	The application convincingly explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need.
2 Points	The application somewhat explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, and/or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network. It may meet an important disadvantaged community need.
1 Point	The application does not clearly explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network. It minimally meets an important disadvantaged community need.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not address how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community.

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

D. Project Location: (0 - 2 points)

Is your project located within a disadvantaged community?

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project is located within a DAC.
2 Points	Project location(s) are/is <u>fully</u> (100%) located within a DAC.
1 Point	Project location(s) are/is <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)

Points	Median Household Income (MHI) Criteria – MHI = \$56,982
--------	---

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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%	
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%	

Category	Points	Other DAC Criterion
----------	--------	---------------------

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Other MHI or CalEnviroScreen Assessment	0 or 1 point	If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment, to demonstrate that the community's median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income.
Regional Definition	0 or 1 point	If the applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community based on an adopted regional definition, the applicant must submit for consideration the regional definition, as well as how their specific community qualifies under that definition.
Federally Recognized Tribal Lands	4 points	Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).

2021 Active Transportation Program Small 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. (0-52 POINTS)

A. Statement of Project need. Describe the issue(s) that this project will address. How will the proposed project benefit the non-motorized users? What is the project's desired outcome and how will the project best deliver that outcome? (0-26 points)

Discuss:

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

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

- Applicants are not required to submit user counts at the time of application. User counts will be collected from applications that are successful in the program. "**Need**" must be considered in the context of the "**Potential** for increased walking and bicycling"
- "**Need**" must be considered in the context of **all** the following:
 - Connectivity to key destinations
 - Mobility to access everyday destinations and services
 - Local public health concerns
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must thoroughly demonstrate **all** of the above aspects of "need".

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

- Review the data provided for reasonableness from the proposed project.
 - The evaluator should consult the attached photos, and any other information available to make an informed decision.
 - A project 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 to a project.
- Evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for improvements in the project area.
 - When citing key destinations, does the applicant also explain *why* those destinations are important for the community being impacted?

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- Do they cite *specific* destinations or just say “schools” or “stores” or “amenities”?
- 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:
 - ❖ 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.).
- 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 a specific active transportation need.
19-24 Points	<p>The application compellingly demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents all of the following in a clear narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • data showing the local health concerns, including a comparison to statewide health data <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For NI components – the need for the education, encouragement and/or enforcement program
13-18 Points	<p>The application duly demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents: only 2 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • data showing the local health concerns, including a comparison to statewide health data <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For NI components – the need for the education, encouragement and/or enforcement program
7-12 Points	<p>The application demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents: only 1 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • data showing the local health concerns, including a comparison to statewide health data

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

	<p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For NI components – the need for the education, encouragement and/or enforcement program
1-6 Points	<p>The application minimally demonstrates “need” in the project area, and partially documents 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the lack of connectivity, the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, local health concerns <p>AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For NI components – the need for the education, encouragement and/or enforcement program
0 Points	<p>The application does not demonstrate “need” in any way in the project area in any of the three areas of need, and there is no mention of the need of the disadvantaged community and there is no mention of the NI program (if applicable).</p>

PLUS:

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

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

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

Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need: (0-26 points)

What type of active transportation need will the proposed project directly address (select one or more) of the following elements, and discuss how the project will be meeting the identified need.

Proposed project addresses:

- Close a gap?
- Creation of new routes?
- Removal of barrier to mobility?
- Other Improvements to existing routes?
 - Must provide a map identifying the location of each: gap closures and connections; new routes; and barriers and improvements.
 - Referencing this map, describe the existing route(s) that currently connect the affected transportation related and community identified destinations and why the route(s) are not adequate.

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- *Referencing this map, describe how the project links or connects, or encourages use of existing routes to transportation-related and community identified destinations where an increase in active transportation modes can be realized, including but not limited to: schools, school facilities, transit facilities, community, social service or medical centers, employment centers, high density or affordable housing, regional, State or national trail system, recreational and visitor destinations or other community identified destinations. Specific destination must be identified.*
- *For combined I/NI projects: discuss how the encouragement, education, and/or enforcement program will help address the needs.*

Breakdown of points:

- **“Need”** must be considered in the context of the “Potential for increased walking and bicycling”
- **“The proposed project will address”** must be considered in all of the following “needs”:
 - the lack of connectivity,
 - the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,
 - local health concerns
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate **all** of the above aspects of “need” for each improvement category.
 - Since each category addresses a different need, the answers provided should be specific to the improvement category.
- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is **not impacted by the number of categories documented** for addressing the active transportation need.
 - An application only documenting **one category** has the potential to receive full points as long as it can fully meet the scoring criteria. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that additional categories are not appropriate for the project to better or more fully address the need.
 - Applications documenting numerous categories should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that the project scope connected to each category is **relevant** to the non-motorized users’ needs in the project limits.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

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

- Evaluate if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed improvements are the best solution to address the need described in sub-question A.
- Evaluate if the destinations shown in the application are reasonably accessible by non-motorized users.
- Determine if an increase in active transportation modes can be realized by the project.
- Determine if the local public health department and/or local non-profit that provides support for health equity/addressing health disparities
 - was involved in aspects of the application such as supporting public engagement, developing project scope, supporting data and statistics to highlight the public health need, etc. AND
 - will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program.

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Points	Applicant's ability to make a case that the project will address need for active transportation.
20-25 Points	The application clearly and convincingly demonstrates that the project will best address the active transportation need presented in part A by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> creating or improving links or connections, encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations.
13-19 Points	The application demonstrates that the project will likely address the active transportation need presented in part A by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> creating or improving links or connections, encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations.
7-12 Points	The application somewhat demonstrates that the project will address the active transportation need presented in part A by: (at least 1 of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> creating or improving links or connections, encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations.
1-6 Points	The application minimally demonstrates that the project may address the active transportation need presented in part A by: (partially 1 or more of the following) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> creating or improving links or connections, encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations.
0 Points	The application did not demonstrate the project would address the need presented in Part A.

PLUS:

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

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

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

2021 Active Transportation Program Small 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. (0-25 POINTS)

A. Describe the project location's history of pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users, which this project will mitigate. (0-12 points)

Expectations for Evaluators:

Evaluators should evaluate all attachments, including:

- The “County/City Heat Map” and the “Community Heat Map” of the area surrounding the project limits: Points are based on the maps demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history, suggesting that the project limits represent one of their highest safety needs.
 - **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 believe the TIMS ATP tool accurately depicts 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, 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.

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- Longitudinal Improvements (bike lanes, sidewalks, road diets, etc.): crashes potentially effected 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 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 team determines the information is **incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated** they should note this in their evaluation comments and application should **not** receive full points for Part A.

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

- 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 per the “Influence Area” guidance below.
 - 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” improvements.
 - 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 (community 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 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.
- 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 Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project location represents one of the agency's top priorities for addressing ongoing safety. And applicant's ability to demonstrate that they have analyzed their past Crash/Safety Data and the proposed safety improvements correspond to the types and locations of the past collisions.
9-12 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> that demonstrates that the past collision locations are within the Influence Area of the proposed safety improvements. <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements, OR an applicant was able to clearly and convincingly explain why they are building the project despite the lack of collision data and why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the collision history.</p> <p>The application clearly and convincingly shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, • Collision types and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements. • there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements. <p>AND if applicable For NI components – clearly explains how the project educates bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or drivers about safety hazards and encourages safe behavior including through enforcement.</p>
5-8 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrates that some of the past collision locations are within the "<i>Influence area</i>" of the proposed safety improvements. <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements, OR an applicant was able to convincingly explain why they are building the project despite the lack of collision data and why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the collision history.</p> <p>The application convincingly shows: that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be somewhat impacted by the proposed safety improvements. • there are moderate safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements. <p>AND if applicable For NI components – moderately explains how the project educates bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or drivers about safety hazards and encourages safe behavior including through enforcement.</p>

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

1-4 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrates that a few of the past collision locations are within the Influence Area of the proposed safety improvements. <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements, OR an applicant was able to somewhat explain why they are building the project despite the lack of collision data and why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the collision history.</p> <p>The application somewhat shows: that the past crash/safety data was looked at by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be minimally impacted by the proposed safety improvements. there are minimal safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements. <p>AND if applicable For NI components – minimally explains how the project educates bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or drivers about safety hazards and encourages safe behavior including through enforcement.</p>
0 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrates that a few of the past collision locations are within the Influence Area of the proposed safety improvements. <u>Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports</u> demonstrate the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements, OR an applicant was able to minimally explain why they are building the project despite the lack of collision data and why this location is one of the top safety concerns despite the collision history.</p> <p>The application doesn't really show: that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are almost no safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements. <p>AND if applicable For NI components – does not explain how the project educates bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or drivers about safety hazards or encourages safe behavior including through enforcement.</p>

B. Safety Countermeasures (13 points max): Referencing the information provided in Part A, demonstrate how the proposed countermeasures directly address (one or more) of the following underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence (or potential occurrence) of pedestrian and/or bicyclist collisions.

Breakdown of points:

The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is not impacted by the number of “Potential safety hazards” and “Countermeasures” documented in the application.

- Applications only documenting one “Potential safety hazard” / “Countermeasure” has the potential of receiving full points **as long as** it can fully meet the scoring criteria and demonstrate that implementing only one countermeasure is appropriate to fully address the existing hazards.

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- Applications documenting numerous “Potential safety hazards” / “Countermeasures” should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that each safety hazard is relevant to the non-motorized users in the project limits and that **each** countermeasure being funded by the project is **necessary** to mitigate the potential for future crashes.
- Projects that appear to include elements/costs with little safety benefits should **not** receive as many points as projects with highly effective & efficient use of limited funding.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that they analyzed the past crash/safety data trends and appropriately selected safety countermeasure(s) with proven track record(s) for addressing the past trends.
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated each proposed safety countermeasure(s) is appropriately included in the project to mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards with the project limits.
10-13 Points	The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, • the applicant has described remedies for each need addressed in Part A, AND • the proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should fully mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.
7-9 Points	The applicant demonstrates fairly well that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, • the proposed countermeasure(s) should significantly (but not fully) mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.
4-6 Points	The applicant somewhat demonstrates that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed countermeasure(s) address the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, • the proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should somewhat mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.
1-3 Points	The applicant minimally demonstrates that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed countermeasure(s) have a track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, • there are doubts as to whether the implementation of the proposed countermeasure(s) will mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not prove the safety need of the proposed project and the countermeasures explained do not have the potential to mitigate the potential for future collisions.

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project.

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

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, etc.).
- **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.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The level of expected planning for a project is **directly connected** to the **magnitude and complexity** of the proposed changes/designs and to the impacts to the overall active transportation network.

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

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

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- Consider whether or not the applicant appropriately used their agency's active transportation technical planning to develop and refine the project scope.
- Consider the level to which the technical planning considered both existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system.
- Consider the level to which the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.
- Consider whether or not the outreach and engagement process was ongoing and shows **recent stakeholder support**.
 - Outreach and engagement from previous Plans can be cited, but applicants should explain how it was determined that this project was still a high priority for the community
- Give consideration to all attachments the agency provided in connection with this question, including but not limited to: any applicable public outreach process/proposal/plan, links to websites, meeting agendas, meeting sign-in sheets, meeting minutes, public service announcements, letters of support, new alternatives or major revisions that were identified, etc.
 - Consider the level to which the letters of support emphasize that the project represents the top or one of the top active transportation priorities for the community, targeted end users, or public stakeholders.
 - Consider the level to which the attachments show the applicant engaged the disadvantaged community the project is supposed to be benefitting (when applicable).
 - IF an applicant did not attach ANY documentation to show a thorough and effective public engagement process the application should NOT receive full points.
- Consider the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to identify and improve the effectiveness of the project and ensure the project is one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.
 - Additional consideration can be given for outreach which has been ongoing for a longer duration.
- Consider the magnitude of the proposed project when considering the extent to which the project represents one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate what the process to prepare for existing and future needs of users of this project was, who was engaged in the public participation and planning process and how the stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project.
8-10 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system • The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process and reached out to all necessary stakeholders. • AND the applicant attached documentation that supports a thorough and effective public engagement process.

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

5-7 Points	<p>The applicant demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system • The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process. • AND the applicant attached documentation that supports a thorough and effective public engagement process.
3-4 Points	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system • The planning process was somewhat integrated into the public participation process. • AND the applicant attached documentation that supports a public engagement process.
1-2 Points	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope was developed through a technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) • The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system • The planning process was minimally integrated into the public participation process. • AND the applicant did not attach documentation or attached very little documentation to support a thorough public engagement process.
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not prove the project scope is a result of technical planning, that the applicant did not consider the existing and future needs of the project users, and the planning process was not in any way integrated into the public engagement process.</p>

2021 Active Transportation Program Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #5: SCOPE AND PLAN CONSISTENCY (0-3 POINTS)

A. Complete the Attachment B (Engineer's Checklist).

Applicants are required to complete Attachment B as part of all Infrastructure applications.

Breakdown of points:

Evaluators will consider the following:

- Consistency between the Layouts/maps, Engineer's estimate, and Proposed Scope
- Compliance with the Engineer's Checklist
- Complete project schedule

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to follow any directions in filling out the Engineer's checklist and associated attachments, the evaluator should **not** give full points for this sub-question and should use their best judgment to choose the score they believe best represents the information given.

Points	Evaluating Layouts/Maps
1 Points	The submitted layouts/maps are complete, clear, and/or provide sufficient detail to determine the full scope of the proposed project
0 Point	The submitted layouts/maps are poorly developed or vague in outlining the various elements of the proposed project, or the applicant failed.

Points	Evaluating Engineer's Estimate
1 Points	The submitted estimate is thorough and consistent with the elements and phases of the proposed project
0 Points	The applicant failed to provide an estimate that matches the proposed elements

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