2025 Active Transportation Program (Cycle 7)

Safe Routes Partnership Webinar

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Scoring Rubric Layout – Question Overview

2025 Active Transportation Program
Large 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 Destinations (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*

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Scoring Rubric Layout – Special Instructions for Evaluators

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 the context **of 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:
- Consider the impact of the proposed project on the community and how it will fit into the geographic context.
  - In doing this, the evaluator should consult the attached photos and any other information available to make an informed decision.
- When a project is a segment of a larger path/corridor, does the applicant explain the benefits of not only the entire project, but also the segment and why this particular segment is key to the bigger project?
  - The applicant should focus on the benefits of the particular segment and not try to claim the benefits of the entire path/corridor.

Scoring Rubric Layout – Scoring Table

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the public participation process will be utilized as part of the development of a plan.
3 Points	**The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates** that: • 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.
2 Points	• 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 outreach and engagement process utilized shows **continued** stakeholder support, • The planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.
1 Point	• 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 outreach and engagement process did not utilize ongoing and does not show **continued** stakeholder support, • 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.

Disadvantaged Communities

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators

- The following language was added:

  - For combined I/NI projects, applicants should explain how non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted toward the disadvantaged community. This should include discussions of strategies that will be used to ensure that the non-infrastructure programming is easily accessible to the disadvantaged community and relevant to their needs (e.g., development of community-relevant content, choice of venue, methods used to promote the program, materials in appropriate languages, etc.)

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Part C: Direct Benefit Scoring (Small Scoring Rubric)

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.
4	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; <u>and for combined I/NI projects, how the non-infrastructure events and programs will be targeted towards the disadvantaged community</u>.

- Language to be replicated in remaining score ranges

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Part C: Direct Benefit Scoring (Medium & Large Scoring Rubrics)

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.
4	The application **clearly and convincingly** addresses **all** of the following: • 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> • The applicant included **attachments** that show **evidence of thorough** engagement and outreach resulting in input and buy-in from the disadvantaged community. <u>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.</u>

• Language is replicated in remaining score ranges

Potential to Increase Walking and Biking (Need)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators

- The following language was added:

  - 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

    - induce mode shift

    - enhance connectivity, mobility, and health

    - introduce the community to existing and new improvements

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Part B Scoring

Points	Applicant's ability to make a case that the project will address the need for active transportation.
20-25, 16-19, or 16-18	The application **clearly and convincingly demonstrates** that the **project will best** address the active transportation need that was presented in part A by: • creating or improving links or connections, • encouraging the use of routes to very important destinations and community-identified destinations. Additionally: • For combined I/NI projects, implementing a non-infrastructure program that provides new skills and familiarity to the community.

- Language is replicated in remaining score ranges

Safety

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators

- The following language was added:

  - 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.

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Part B: Safety Countermeasures Scoring

Points	Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards with the project limits.
9-10 or 11-13	**The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates** that: • 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; <ins>**AND**</ins> • the proposed implementation of the countermeasure(s) should **fully mitigate** the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project. <ins>Additionally:</ins> • For projects with new or improved bicycle facilities, the applicant evaluated and selected appropriate bikeway types. • <ins>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.</ins>

• Language is replicated in remaining score ranges

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Public Participation & Planning

Public Participation & Planning Scoring

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.
9-10	The applicant **clearly and convincingly demonstrates** that: • 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. Additionally: • For combined I/NI projects, public input was considered in the development of the non-infrastructure encouragement and education programming.

• Language is replicated in remaining score ranges

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Context Sensitivity & Innovation

Context Sensitivity and Innovation Scoring (Medium & Large Scoring Rubrics)

Points	The applicant's ability to demonstrate that the "recognized best" solutions employed in this project are appropriate to maximize user comfort and are appropriate to the local community context AND the applicant's ability to explain what innovative elements are being utilized, or *why* innovative elements were *not* selected.
5	**The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates** that: • 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**. <u>Additionally:</u> • <u>For combined I/NI projects, the applicant included and/or considered innovative elements in the non-infrastructure programming.</u>

• Language is replicated in remaining score ranges

Transformative Projects

Transformative Projects (Large Scoring Rubric)

Points	Transforming the non-motorized environment and how other new or proposed funded projects or policies in the vicinity of this project will attribute to the transformative nature of this project
5	**The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates** that: • The project is transforming the non-motorized environment, and/or • This project is being combined with other projects, policies, and/or ordinances to make a transformative change, • The applicant **clearly** addressed the potential for the project to support the existing and planned housing developments, especially affordable housing. • Additionally • <u>For combined I/NI projects, the non-infrastructure program will contribute to the transformative nature of the project</u>.

- Language is replicated in remaining score ranges

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

New Disadvantaged Community Identifiers

ATP Disadvantaged Community Identifiers

- Two new identifiers in addition to the existing identifiers. All existing identifiers can still be used:

  - Median Household Income

  - CalEnviroScreen

  - Healthy Places Index

  - National School Lunch Program

  - Tribal Lands

  - Regional Definitions

  - Other Definitions

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

USDOT Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Explorer

- Web tool to help agencies understand cumulative burdens communities face.

- National results compare census tracts nationally

- State results compare census tracts on a state-by-state basis

- Measures five components:

  - Transportation Insecurity

  - Climate & Disaster Risk Burden

  - Environmental Burden

  - Health Vulnerability

  - Social Vulnerability

- Indicators under each component are summed and percentile ranked to come to a Final Index Score

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

USDOT ETC Explorer – Scoring Rubric

- **USDOT Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Explorer**
  - A census tract identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to the ETC Explorer State Results (final index score must be greater than or equal to 3.43447). The map and data can be found on the United States Department of Transportation website.

Points	USDOT ETC Explorer	
0	Above 25% most disadvantaged	Less than 3.43447
1	20% to 25% most disadvantaged	3.43447 to 3.53701
2	15% to <20% most disadvantaged	3.53702 to 3.65156
3	10% to <15% most disadvantaged	3.65157 to 3.78569
4	<10% most disadvantaged	3.78570 or greater

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

ETC Explorer Example

Census Tract #	Population	State Results Index Score
18097310104	3025	3.75400
18097310105	3911	4.45703
18097310106	4256	3.93064
18097310108	3725	2.93657

- **Weighted average of Index Scores:** 3.78459
- **Severity score:** 3
- **Location score:** 1 (partially)

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

California Transportation Commission

Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST)

- Tool identifies disadvantaged census tracts nationally.

- A tract must meet **one** indicator threshold in one of the tool's categories of burden to be classified as disadvantaged.

- Categories include:

  - Climate Change
  - Health
  - Legacy Pollution
  - Water and Wastewater
  - Tribal Lands

  - Energy
  - Housing
  - Transportation
  - Workforce Development
  - Neighboring DACs

- No ranking – tract may qualify as a DAC under 0 categories, 1 categories, or several.

California Transportation Commission

CEJST – Scoring Rubric

- **Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST)**

  - A census tract identified as disadvantaged in at least one of the tool's ten disadvantaged community categories (climate change, energy, health, housing, legacy pollution, transportation, water and wastewater, workforce development, Tribal overlap, and neighboring disadvantaged tracts). The map can be found on the [federal Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool website](#).

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

CEJST Example

Census Tract #	Population	# of DAC Categories
01015000600	1893	6
01015000700	2918	3
01015000800	981	5
01015000900	3617	3

- **Weighted average of DAC categories:** 3.81
- **Severity score:** 2
- **Location score:** 2 (fully)

Staff Contacts

Laurie Waters
Laurie.Waters@catc.ca.gov

Beverley Newman-Burckhard
Beverley.Newman-Burckhard@catc.ca.gov

Elika Changizi
Elika.Changizi@catc.ca.gov

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Thank you

CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION