

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has prepared these scoring rubrics in coordination with Caltrans to provide additional guidance on the evaluation process. This document is principally intended to guide evaluators in scoring 2025 ATP applications. Applicants may also find this to be a useful resource when developing applications. This document, however, is not intended as the definitive formula for how applications will be scored. Evaluators may take other factors into consideration when scoring applications, such as the overall application quality, project context, and project deliverability.

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

Index:

Question #	Question Title	Page #
QUESTION #1	Disadvantaged Communities	Page 2
QUESTION #2	Potential to Increase Users	Page 8
QUESTION #3	Potential to Reduce Collisions	Page 13
QUESTION #4	Public Participation & Planning	Page 19
QUESTION #5	Context-Sensitive/Innovation	Page 24
QUESTION #6	Leveraging Funds	Page 26
QUESTION #7	Scope & Plan Consistency	Page 27

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium 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, the applicant will skip this question and move on to question 2.

If the applicant checked the box for "This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community," the score for Question #1 will be zero "0".

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

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

B. Identification of Disadvantaged Community: (0 points)

Select one of the following five options. The applicant must provide information for all Census Tract/Block Group/Place # that the project affects.

- Median Household Income
- CalEnviroScreen
- Free or Reduced Priced School Meals - Applications using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.
- Healthy Places Index
- Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool
- USDOT Equitable Transportation Community Explorer
- Other
 - Regional Definition
 - Projects on federally recognized Tribal Land or projects submitted by Tribal Governments (federally recognized Native American tribes)
 - Other Determinant of MHI

C. Direct Benefit: (0 - 4 points)

- 1. Explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, or meets an important community need. Address any issues of displacement that may occur as a result of this project, if applicable. If displacement is not an issue, explain why it is not a concern for the community.*
- 2. Explain how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project.*
- 3. Illustrate and provide documentation for how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. Address any issues of displacement that may occur as a result of this project, if applicable.*
- 3. For combined I/NI projects, describe how non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted toward the disadvantaged community whom the project benefits.*

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

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

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

When evaluating the first part of 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 an identified “need” that was identified by the local community, and is it supported by backup documentation/attachments?

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

- Will the improvements be physically convenient and safe for the community to access or use?
- Will the improvements provide a logical route that residents will use or want to use because it offers safe and convenient access?
- If the project is not located in the DAC, will they have reasonable access points to the project?

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

- Was the DAC actively involved in the project development?
- Did the DAC have the opportunity to provide their input on community needs?
- Does the DAC support this project?
- Was this project presented to the DAC in a local forum so that they could provide input? Or, was the project simply voted upon in a general agency meeting without really reaching out to the community to learn their needs and wants?
- Provide documentation of how the local residents and community groups were engaged for input on community and household needs and of any support from local community-based organizations and/or residents.
- 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.
 - The 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 they explain why it is not a concern.
 - The applicant should discuss how displacement is being addressed, whether through policies or workgroups.

For combined I/NI projects, when evaluating the fourth part of sub-question C, the evaluator should consider:

- Did the applicant explain how non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted toward the disadvantaged community?
- What strategies will be used to ensure that the non-infrastructure events and programs will be easily accessible to the disadvantaged community? How did the applicant ensure that the non-infrastructure events and programs are relevant to the needs of the disadvantaged community? (e.g., development of community-relevant content, choice of venue, methods used to promote the program, materials in appropriate languages, etc.)

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.
4 Points	<p>The application clearly and convincingly addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, or meets an important community need. <u>AND</u> • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u> • Illustrates and documents how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. <u>AND</u> <p>The applicant included attachments that show evidence of thorough engagement and outreach, resulting in input and buy-in from the disadvantaged community.</p> <p>For combined I/NI projects, the applicant also clearly and convincingly addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted towards the disadvantaged community.</p>
3 Points	<p>The application addresses at least three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, or meets an important community need. <u>AND</u> • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u> • Illustrates how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. <p>The applicant included attachments that show evidence of outreach to and buy-in from the disadvantaged community.</p> <p>For combined I/NI projects, the applicant also addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted towards the disadvantaged community.</p>
2 Points	<p>The application addresses at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, or meets an important community need. <u>AND</u> • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u> • Illustrates and documents how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. <p>The applicant included attachments that show evidence of outreach to the disadvantaged community and documents their buy-in.</p> <p>For combined I/NI projects, the applicant also addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted towards the disadvantaged community.</p>
1 Point	<p>The application minimally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network, or meets an important community need. <u>AND</u> • Explains how the disadvantaged community residents will have physical access to the project. <u>AND</u> • Illustrates and documents how the project was requested or supported by the disadvantaged community residents. <p>The applicant did not include attachments or attached minimal documentation showing evidence of outreach to the disadvantaged community.</p>

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

	For combined I/NI projects, the applicant minimally addresses how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted towards the disadvantaged community.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not address how the project closes a gap or provides connections, does not address how the disadvantaged community will have physical access to the project, and does not address how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community, AND the application did not include any support attachments. For combined I/NI projects, the applicant did not address how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted towards the 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)

Based on the option the applicant chooses for DAC identification, CTC staff shall give points per the tables below.

Points	Median Household Income (MHI) Statewide MHI = \$91,905, 80% = \$73,524	
0 Points	80% or greater of the statewide MHI	\$73,524.00 or greater
1 Point	75% to <80% of the statewide MHI	\$68,928.75 to \$73,523.99
2 Points	70% to <75% of the statewide MHI	\$64,333.50 to \$68,928.74
3 Points	65% to <70% of the statewide MHI	\$59,738.25 to \$64,333.49
4 Points	Less than 65% of the statewide MHI	\$59,738.24 or less

Points	CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score	
0 Points	Above 25% most disadvantaged	less than 40.05
1 Point	20% through 25% most disadvantaged	40.05 through 43.38
2 Points	15% through <20% most disadvantaged	43.39 through 47.54

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

3 Points	10% through <15% most disadvantaged	47.55 through 51.97
4 Points	<10% most disadvantaged	51.98 through 93.18

Points	National School Lunch Program Free or Reduced-Price Meals Percentage	
0 points	Less than 75% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
1 Point	≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
2 Points	> 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
3 Points	> 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches	
4 Points	> 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches	

Points	Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST)	
0 Points	Weighted average of the number of DAC categories project census tracts qualify under is less than 1	
1 Point	Weighted average of the number of DAC categories project census tracts qualify under is at least 1 and less than 3	
2 Points	Weighted average of the number of DAC categories project census tracts qualify under is at least 3 and less than 5	
3 Points	Weighted average of the number of DAC categories project census tracts qualify under is at least 5 and less than 7	
4 Points	Weighted average of the number of DAC categories project census tracts qualify under is 7 or greater	

Points	USDOT Equitable Transportation Community Explorer Final Index Score	
0 Points	Above 25% most disadvantaged	Less than 3.43447
1 Point	20% through 25% most disadvantaged	3.43447 to 3.53701
2 Points	15% through <20% most disadvantaged	3.53702 to 3.65156
3 Points	10% through <15% most disadvantaged	3.65157 to 3.78569
4 Points	<10% most disadvantaged	3.78570 or greater

Points	Healthy Places Index 3.0 Score*	
0 Points	Healthy Places Index Score above 25th Percentile	
1 Point	Healthy Places Index Score 20th through 25th Percentile	
2 Points	Healthy Places Index Score 15th through <20th Percentile	
3 Points	Healthy Places Index Score 10th through <15th Percentile	

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

4 Points	Healthy Places Index Score <10th Percentile
----------	---

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

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

2025 Active Transportation Program

Medium 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 NON-MOTORIZED USERS. (0-40 POINTS)

A. Statement of Project Need. Describe the community and the issue(s) that this project will address. How will the proposed project benefit non-motorized users of all ages and varying abilities, including students, older adults, and persons with disabilities? What is the project's desired outcome, and how will the project best deliver that outcome? (0-20 points)

Discuss:

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

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

Applicants are not required to submit user counts at the time of application. User counts will be collected from applications that are successful in the program.

- “**Need**” must be considered in the context of the “**potential** for increased walking and bicycling” among users of all ages and varying abilities.
- “**Need**” must be considered in **all** of the following:
 - Connectivity to key destinations
 - Mobility to access everyday needs and services
 - Local public health concerns
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must thoroughly demonstrate **all** of the above aspects of “need,” and should address the needs of vulnerable and underserved populations, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), older adults, and persons with disabilities.

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

- Review the data provided for reasonableness from the proposed project.
 - 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?

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium 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:
 - ❖ A thorough and nuanced discussion of existing health condition(s) amongst targeted users (responses should be more sophisticated than simply stating, “Walking and biking is good for health because it increases physical activity.”) AND
 - ❖ The physical or social conditions (known as the social determinants of health) in the target community that contribute to the current health conditions (beyond other elements already addressed in the application, including bike/ped infrastructure gaps and barriers, collision rates, etc.) AND
- 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.
16-18 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 AND if applicable • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For NI components – the need for the education and encouragement program.
11-15 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 AND if applicable • For projects benefiting a disadvantaged community – the need for the project in that community, • For NI components – the need for the education and encouragement program.
5-10 Points	<p>The application somewhat demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents only 1 of the following clearly, and at least one other partially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • data showing the local health concerns, including a comparison to statewide health data AND if applicable • For NI components – the need for the education and encouragement program.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

1-4 Points	The application minimally demonstrates “need” in the project area, and partially documents 1 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of connectivity, • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users, • local health concerns <p style="text-align: center;">AND if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For NI components – the need for the education and encouragement program.
0 Points	The application does not demonstrate “need” in the project area in any of the three areas of need , there is no mention of the need of the disadvantaged community, and there is no mention of the NI program (if applicable).

PLUS:

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

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

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

B. Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need: (0-20 points)

- *Close a gap?*
- *Creation of new routes?*
- *Removal of barrier to mobility?*
- *Other improvements to existing routes?*
- *Describe the non-infrastructure program, the population it will serve, and how the program will use education and encouragement to address the needs identified in Part A.*

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

- “**Need**” must be considered in the context of the “potential for increased walking and bicycling” for all ages and varying abilities.
- “**The proposed project will address**” must be considered in all of the following “needs”:
 - 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.
- For combined I/NI projects, evaluators should evaluate how the non-infrastructure programming will address the needs identified in Part A. Applicants should discuss how the non-infrastructure program will:
 - provide new skills and familiarity to the community

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- induce mode shift
- enhance connectivity, mobility, and health
- introduce the community to existing and new improvements
- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-question is **not impacted by the number of categories documented** for addressing the active transportation need.
 - An application only documenting **one category** has the potential of receiving full points as long as it can fully meet the scoring criteria. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that additional categories are not appropriate for the project to better or more fully address the need.
 - An application documenting numerous categories should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that the project scope connected to each category is **relevant** to the non-motorized users' needs in the project limits.

A "very important destination" includes those that offer access to goods, services, and activities that society considers particularly important, e.g., a hospital or other health care facility, a grocery store, a transit station, a community center, a retail center, or an employment center (where the community can reasonably expect to find employment). The applicant 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. For combined I/NI projects, the applicant should address both infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.
- 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 community-based organization that provides support for health equity/addressing health disparities.
 - Was the local public health department or community-based organization involved in aspects of the application such as supporting public engagement, developing project scope, supporting data and statistics to highlight the public health need, etc.; and
 - Will the local public health department or community-based organization continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program?

Points	Applicant's ability to make a case that the project will address the need for active transportation.
16-19 Points	<p>The answers in Part B clearly demonstrate without a doubt that the project will best address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● creating or improving links or connections, ● encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally: For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community.</p>
11-15 Points	<p>The answers in Part B demonstrate that the project will address the active transportation need presented in Part A by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● creating or improving links or connections, ● encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally: ● For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community.</p>

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

6-10 Points	<p>The answers in Part B somewhat demonstrate that the project has the potential to address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by: (only 1 of the following)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community.
1-5 Points	<p>The answers in Part B minimally demonstrate that the project may address the active transportation needs presented in Part A by doing only 1 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community.
0 Points	<p>The application did not demonstrate in any way that the project would address the need presented in Part A.</p>

PLUS:

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

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

Points	Applicant’s ability to make a case that the proposal 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.

2025 Active Transportation Program

Medium 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. (12 points max)*

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 significant when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community's collision history, suggesting that the project limits will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.
 - Note: If an applicant can explain why they are building the project despite the lack of collision data, they can still receive the majority or all of the points. Examples of reasons why an applicant may choose to build a project in an area with no or few collisions are:
 - It is a new facility.
 - It is so unsafe that there is no bike/ped activity, or it has been banned (e.g., school campus rules).
 - Some communities have residents who do not report collisions
 - If the project is not in one of the highest-density crash locations, does the applicant **thoroughly** explain *why* this location was chosen?
- Project Area Collision Map: Points are based on the map demonstrating that the past collision locations are within the "**Influence Area**" of the proposed safety improvements. Evaluators should consider the overall project limits AND the limits of the specific improvements/scope of the project.
- Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports: Points are based on summaries, lists, and reports demonstrating the overall number of collisions and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.
 - Note: Applicants are allowed to provide safety data in a different format if they prefer OR if they do not have the collision data.
 - These different data formats that can also show the safety need include: surveys from communities asking about the safety of the project area, near-miss data, information from crowdsourcing applications (such as Street Story), a systemic safety analysis identifying high-risk features or typologies, etc.
 - If an applicant uses an alternate format for safety data, they **must** still attach the appropriate documentation to prove the safety concerns of the project area.

Influence Area Guidance

A project's expected safety "Influence Area" (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 the 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 affected by and within the limits of the improvement.

2025 Active Transportation Program

Medium 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 questions **1 or 2**, and have the **option** to respond to **both**.

Sub-questions 1 and/or 2 and 3 do not receive any points. The evaluator should verify that the required information in 1 and/or 2 and 3 is provided and complete. If the evaluator team determines the information is **incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated**, they should note this in their evaluation comments, and the application should **not** receive full points for part A.

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

- Applicant must provide the output files from the new TIMS ATP tool (or they may use their own collision database data/software to produce equivalent documents)
- Only pedestrian and bicycle collisions are included.
- The output files provided by the applicant must meet the following parameters:
 - The project’s “Influence Area,” as defined by the applicant and shown in the output documents, must be consistent with the project maps/plans attached to the application AND must be reasonable per the “Influence Area” guidance below.
 - Evaluators should consider point reductions for this question if the applicant included crash data that is not **reasonably** tied to the influence area of the proposed safety improvements and the applicant does not provide a reasonable explanation for choosing the project location.
 - The collisions represent the most recent 5-11 years of available crash data. (Note: SWITRS and TIMS crash data is typically 1.5 to 2.5 years old before it is loaded into the crash database).
 - If the applicant does not use the TIMS ATP tool and instead uses their own collision database data/software, then the following additional checks and analysis must be done by the evaluators prior to awarding points:
 - Crashes are from official crash reports. The full crash reports do not have to be included, but their report number and agency must be identifiable.
 - Only pedestrian and bicycle crashes are included.
 - The number of crashes entered into the table is directly supported by both the map and the listing.
 - Attachments **must** be included to support alternative data (surveys, school policy, or a letter from the school explaining the policy to discourage walking and biking due to safety, etc.)
- The data entered in the application table is accurate and reflects the documentation the applicant provides in alignment with the above requirements.

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

- The applicant demonstrated that they **analyzed** the past crash/safety data to identify the **specific crash-type trends** that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken.
- The applicant demonstrated there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements. The applicant should discuss safety threats to vulnerable and underserved communities, including disadvantaged communities (if applicable), students, older adults, and persons with disabilities.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium 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. • That the applicant considered safety threats to vulnerable and underserved populations.
5-8 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u>, which demonstrates that some 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 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:</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 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.
1-4 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

0 Points	<p>The applicant included a <u>Project Area Collision Map</u> demonstrating 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:</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. • There are almost no safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP-eligible improvements.
----------	---

B. Safety Countermeasures (13 points max): Describe how the project improvements will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities. Referencing the information you provided in Part A, demonstrate how the proposed countermeasures directly address the underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence of pedestrian and/or bicyclist collisions.

For projects proposing new or improved bikeways, describe the issues that were considered when evaluating and selecting the project's bikeway facility type (i.e., Class I, II, III, and/or IV).

For combined I/NI projects, describe how the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programs address the safety issues identified in Part A.

Breakdown of points:

The number of points an applicant/project receives on Part B is not impacted by the number of "Potential safety hazards" and "Countermeasures" documented in the application.

- Applications only documenting one "Potential safety hazard" / "Countermeasure" have the potential of receiving full points **as long as** they can fully meet the scoring criteria and demonstrate that implementing only one countermeasure is appropriate to fully address the existing hazards.
- Applications documenting numerous "Potential safety hazards" / "Countermeasures" should not automatically receive additional or full 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 few or no safety benefits should **not** receive as many points as projects with highly effective and efficient use of limited funding.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- Evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that they analyzed the past crash/safety data trends and appropriately selected safety countermeasure(s) with proven track record(s) for addressing the past trends.
 - Safety countermeasures can include both on-road improvements, as well as separated paths and trails.
- Evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that each proposed safety countermeasure(s) is appropriate to mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.
- For projects proposing new or improved bikeways, evaluators should evaluate the extent to which the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types given the context of the project and any constraints the applicant faced. This can include but is not limited to:

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- Community input
 - Place type (e.g., rural, suburban, urban)
 - Posted speed limits
 - Proposed operating speed
 - Roadway cross section
 - Traffic volume
 - Safety concerns outlined in Part A
 - Traffic calming measures
 - Surrounding land use types
 - Roadway classifications
 - Right-of-way, utility, and environmental constraints
 - Other considerations
- For combined I/NI projects, evaluators should evaluate the extent to which the non-infrastructure program will address the safety concerns outlined in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users about safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards within the project limits.
11-13 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, ● 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 project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types. ● For combined I/NI projects, the proposed non-infrastructure programming will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.
7-10 Points	<p>The applicant demonstrates fairly well that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, ● the proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should significantly (but not fully) mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types. ● For combined I/NI projects, the proposed non-infrastructure programming will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.
4-6 Points	<p>The applicant adequately demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the proposed countermeasure(s) can address the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, ● the proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should somewhat mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For combined I/NI projects, the proposed non-infrastructure programming will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.
1-3 Points	<p>The applicant minimally demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed countermeasure(s) can address the past crash/safety needs addressed in Part A, there are doubts as to whether the implementation of the proposed countermeasure(s) will mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the project area. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types. For combined I/NI projects, the proposed non-infrastructure programming will address the safety needs discussed in Part A by encouraging safe behaviors, educating users on safety hazards, and/or complementing infrastructure improvements.
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not in any way prove the safety need of the proposed project and the countermeasures explained do not have the potential to mitigate future collisions.</p>

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

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

Describe the community-based public participation process that culminated in the project. Combined I/NI projects should address both infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.

A. What is/was the process of defining designs to prepare for the future needs of users of this project? How did the applicant analyze the alternatives and impacts on the transportation system to influence beneficial outcomes?

General Guidance on stakeholders and their involvement in a project:

There is a difference between outreach and engagement. Applicants who engage constituents should receive a higher score than those who conduct only outreach.

- **Engagement:** is a two-way process involving inclusive interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit and agreement on a project. Engagement allows stakeholders to initiate input and provide input that may change the design or the scope of the project.
- **Outreach:** is a way to connect, inform, and get feedback from stakeholders. Outreach does not always allow for changes to the design or scope of a project; it is akin to an in-depth and well-informed marketing campaign for a targeted audience.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- Projects with larger scopes and costs should demonstrate a more extensive internal planning process, including the analysis of a wide range of alternatives.

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

- Consider the level to which the applicant demonstrated the agency's active transportation technical planning conducted as part of developing and refining 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 whether or not the outreach and engagement process was ongoing and shows **continued** stakeholder support.
 - Outreach and engagement from previous Plans can be cited, but applicants should explain how it was determined that this project was still a high priority for the community.
- Consider the level to which the process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate that a public participation process was utilized to develop this project, and that they analyzed the range of alternatives and impacts on the transportation system through a thorough public engagement process.
5-6 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project, and that allowed for public input to shape the project, The planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system, The outreach and engagement process utilized has been ongoing and shows continued stakeholder support, The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.
3-4 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project scope was developed through a sufficient 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 the transportation system. The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.
1-2 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project scope was developed through a poor technical planning process (not appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) The planning process marginally considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system. The planning process was not effectively integrated into the public participation process.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not in any way prove the project scope is a result of technical planning and does not in any way consider the existing and future needs of the project users.

B. Describe who was/will be engaged in the identification and development of this project. Describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project. If applicable, describe any unique engagement challenges that the community faced and how they were addressed. If applicable, describe the feedback received during the stakeholder engagement process. For combined I/NI projects, describe any public input on the development of the encouragement and education programming.

Breakdown of points:

- Points will be awarded based on the extent that the relevant stakeholders (see below) were and will be engaged in the **development** of the project and the level of community outreach and meeting/event accessibility, and how the applicant utilized any feedback received during the engagement process.
- The level of expected public outreach and participation for a project is **directly connected** to the **magnitude and complexity** of the proposed project and the community characteristics being served and/or impacted by the project.
- Evaluators should consider strategies that applicants used to overcome unique community challenges (e.g., recent natural disasters, continued impacts from COVID-19, etc.) when evaluating this question. However, the level of community engagement should still be appropriate for the magnitude and complexity of the project.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

General Guidance on stakeholders and their involvement in a project:

- Public stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end-users, community leaders, elected officials, community-based organizations, advocacy organizations, local businesses, and members of vulnerable or underserved populations (e.g., older adults, youth, persons with disabilities, members of disadvantaged communities, etc.).
 - Consider the level to which the attachments show the applicant engaged with the disadvantaged community the project is supposed to benefit (when applicable).
 - Were the stakeholders allowed to give input that changed the project?
- Governmental stakeholders can include other departments, agencies, jurisdictions, etc., impacted by the proposed project that are NOT the applicant (these can include, but are not limited to, transportation agencies, local health departments, schools/school districts, emergency services, metropolitan planning organizations, law enforcement, etc.)
- In-person, virtual, and hybrid meetings and/or events. 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 and other community events, demonstration events, door-to-door solicitation, walk or bike audits, etc.
 - **How the meetings or events were noticed:** local newspapers, agency websites, radio announcements, social media posts on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc., school parent group meetings, places of worship, local publications in other languages, flyers, etc.
 - **How the meetings or events were documented:** Meeting sign-in sheets, virtual participant lists, virtual chat logs, meeting notes, letters of support, photos, etc.
 - **Where the meetings or events took place:** Virtual meeting platforms, schools, community centers, city council hall, parks or other outdoor locations to accommodate safe in-person gatherings and social distancing, etc.
 - **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, virtual accessibility features such as captioning and interpretation, food provided, etc.
 - **The stakeholders' involvement in the decision-making body:** technical advisory committee, citizens' advisory committee, etc.
- Other methods used to engage and obtain input from the community, such as crowdsourcing maps and surveys.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- Consider **all** attachments to show the engagement process, including but not limited to: any applicable meeting minutes, letters of support, new alternatives or major revisions that were identified, meeting agendas, meeting sign-in sheets, public service announcements, 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.
- 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 level to which the attachments show the applicant engaged with the **disadvantaged community** the project is supposed to benefit (when applicable).
- If applicable, describe feedback from the community received during the engagement process.
- Consider the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to ensure the project is one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.
- 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.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

- For combined I/NI projects, evaluators should ensure that the applicant discusses the public participation and planning process for the infrastructure AND non-infrastructure elements of the project.

Points	Applicant's ability to illustrate who was/will be engaged in the development of the project and describe how stakeholders will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project.
4 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes who was engaged in the identification and development of the project, Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged, The project scope was developed through a comprehensive public participation process which included all appropriate levels of public and governmental stakeholders and was appropriate with the magnitude of the project, If applicable, fully described feedback from the community received during the engagement process <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
3 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficiently describes who was engaged in the identification and development of the project, Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged, The project scope was developed through a sufficient public participation process which included appropriate levels of public and governmental stakeholders If applicable, described feedback from the community received during the engagement process <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
2 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimally describes who was engaged in the identification and development of the project and how stakeholders will continue to be engaged, The project scope was developed through a public participation process that included some public and/or governmental stakeholders and was not appropriate for the magnitude of the project If applicable, minimally described feedback from the community received during the engagement process <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
1 Point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes who was engaged in the identification and development of the project, Describes how stakeholders will continue to be engaged, The project scope was developed through a poor public participation process, which included minimal public and/or governmental stakeholders and was not appropriate for the magnitude of the project Did not describe feedback from the community received during the engagement process <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
0 Points	Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not in any way document the outreach and engagement, prove the project scope was developed through an adequate public participation process, or specify who was or will be engaged. For combined I/NI

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

	projects, the application does not show that public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.
--	--

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #5: CONTEXT-SENSITIVE BIKEWAYS/WALKWAYS AND INNOVATIVE PROJECT ELEMENTS (0-5 POINTS)

A. Context-sensitive bikeways/walkways

How are the “recognized best” solutions employed in this project appropriate to maximize user comfort and for the local community context?

As you address this question, consider the following:

- *The posted speed limits and actual speed;*
- *The existing and future motorized and non-motorized traffic volume;*
- *The widths for each facility;*
- *The amount of physical separation from vehicular traffic; The adjacent land use, and*
- *How the project is advancing a low(er) stress environment on each facility or a low-stress network*
 - *What is the current stress level? (low, medium, or high)*
 - *If the stress level is medium or high, is the project going beyond minimum design standards to maximize comfort and potential users of all ages and abilities?*
 - *What features are included to promote low-stress, comfortable, and safe walking and/or biking conditions?*
 - *Does the project expand on or create a low-stress network?*

B. Innovative Elements

Does this project propose any solutions that are new to their region? Were any innovative elements considered, but not selected? Explain why they were not selected. Combined I/NI projects should address both infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements. Are any elements of the non-infrastructure program innovative or new to the region?

A. For Combination I/NI Projects Only: Evaluation and Sustainability

For projects with non-infrastructure elements, describe how the effectiveness of the program will be measured and how the program will be sustained after completion.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

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

- The project satisfies the purpose and needs of a full range of stakeholders, including users of all ages and abilities.
- The project is a safe facility for both the user and the community.
- The project is in harmony with the community, and it preserves the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historical, and natural resource values of the area.
- The project exceeds the expectations of both designers and stakeholders and achieves a level of excellence in people's minds.
- The project involves the efficient and effective use of the resources (time, budget, community) of all involved parties.
- The project is designed and built with minimal disruption to the community.
- The project is seen as having added lasting value to the community.
- For combined I/NI projects, on part C, the evaluator should consider:
 - The amount of times the program is evaluated (before, during, after).
 - Whether the evaluation tools/method can be replicated.
 - Whether the evaluation tools/methods described are realistic and doable.
 - Whether the program is seen as having added lasting value to the community.
 - Whether the described sustainability plan is realistic and doable.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Points	The applicant’s ability to demonstrate that the “recognized best” solutions employed in this project are appropriate to maximize user comfort and appropriate to the local community context. AND the applicant’s ability to explain what innovative elements are being utilized, or why innovative elements were <i>not</i> selected.
5 Points	<p>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized best solutions were employed in this project, and • The project is proposing innovative solutions to best address the project’s issues/needs, or • Recognized best solutions were employed, and innovative elements were considered; and the reason for not selecting the innovative elements is very clear and compelling. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, the applicant included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.
3-4 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized best solutions were employed in this project, and/or • The project is proposing innovative solutions, or • Viable innovative elements were considered, and the explanation for not selecting the innovations is noted. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, the applicant included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.
1-2 Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized best solutions were employed, and/or • Innovative elements were considered but not selected, and no explanation was given. <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For combined I/NI projects, the applicant included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming, but minimal explanation was given.
0 Points	<p>Evaluators can award a zero if the solutions are not appropriate to maximize user comfort, and innovative solutions were not proposed, or the reason for not selecting the innovations was not explained. The applicant did not include or consider innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.</p>

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #6: LEVERAGING FUNDS (0-5 POINTS)

Breakdown of points:

Points will be awarded based on the amount of non-ATP funding pledged to the project.

The Commission will only consider cash funds for leveraging. Pre-construction (PA&ED, PS&E, and R/W) phases funded by the local agency will be considered for leveraging even if the funds were expended before the application deadline.

Except for State Transportation Improvement Program funding, the Commission will only consider funds that are not allocated by the Commission on a project-specific basis as eligible funds for leveraging points. The Commission will not consider in-kind or non-infrastructure funds as eligible for leveraging.

Points	Amount Leveraged
1 Point	At least 1% to 5% of total project cost
2 Points	More than 5% to 10% of total project cost
3 Points	More than 10% to 15% of total project cost
4 Points	More than 15% to 20% of total project cost
5 Points	More than 20% of total project cost

- **Applications submitted by Tribal Governments (federally recognized Native American Tribes) and projects that are on Tribal Lands will be awarded five leveraging points.**
- **Applicants must attach a signed letter of commitment indicating the amounts and sources of leveraged funds. Applicants without a signed letter of commitment will not receive leveraging points. Applicants may also include other documentation to substantiate leveraging, including meeting minutes from a governing body, a budget sheet, a board or council resolution, etc.**

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #7: SCOPE AND PLAN CONSISTENCY (0-5 POINTS)

A. Complete Attachment B (Engineer’s Checklist).

Applicants are required to complete Attachment B as part of all Infrastructure and 25-R for combination (Infrastructure & Non-Infrastructure) applications.

Breakdown of Points:

Evaluators will consider the following:

- Consistency between the Layouts/Maps, Engineer’s Estimate, and proposed scope
 - The layouts should clearly show all of the proposed scope (the scale should be appropriate)
 - The evaluator should easily be able to determine if improvements are on one or both sides of the roadway or at all corners of an intersection, e.g., bulb-outs.
 - Are the right-of-way lines shown? Especially if the improvements are outside of the existing facilities. Are existing power poles and other utilities shown?
 - Was a cross-section included showing the existing facilities and how the improvements will meet the existing facility?
 - Does the supplied cross-section resemble the location? Or if existing facility widths differ, are there cross-sections for them?
 - For Combo Projects (Projects with Infrastructure (IF) and Non-Infrastructure (NI)), evaluators will evaluate the Exhibit 25-R for:
 - A complete, clear, and detailed scope;
 - How well it reflects the applicant’s responses throughout the application; and
 - How well the overall scope meets the purpose and goals of the ATP.
- Compliance with the Engineer’s Checklist
 - Were items checked as completed that are not shown in the documents?
 - New traffic signals require a traffic warrant showing that the signal is needed. Is/are the warrants attached?
 - For Combo Projects, evaluators will also consider the Exhibit 25-R for compliance with Non-Infrastructure Guidance.
- Complete project schedule
 - Does the schedule allow adequate time to complete each phase, including:
 - Environmental studies, if needed?
 - Acquisitions and Utility relocations, if needed?
 - For Combo Projects, evaluators will also consider how the NI phase coordinates with IF phases and, if it is a school program, coordination with school schedules.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

If the applicant failed to follow any directions in filling out the Engineer’s checklist and associated attachments, the evaluator should not give full points for these sub-questions.

Points	Evaluating Layouts/Maps
3 Points	The submitted layouts/maps are complete, clear, and provide sufficient detail to determine the full scope of the proposed project.
2 Points	The submitted layouts/maps contain enough detail and/or organization to outline the various elements of the proposed project, but may be unclear in some areas.
1 Point	The submitted layouts/maps are poorly developed or vague in outlining the various elements of the proposed project.
0 Points	The applicant failed to provide layouts/maps.

2025 Active Transportation Program Medium Infrastructure Scoring Rubric

Points	Evaluating Engineer's Estimate
1 Point	The submitted estimate is thorough and consistent or mostly 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 Point	The submitted schedule fully incorporates 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 necessary phases and/or does not provide adequate time to complete the phases (PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, CON, and CON-NI).