



B. Project Need

1 | Mobility

a.	Points	Mobility	Score
	5 points	Applicant currently has a bicycle, pedestrian, mobility plan, or Safe Routes to School Plan, demonstrates a clear linkage between the proposed project and plan, and supports engagement and implementation goals of the plan.	For Reviewer Only
	2-4 points	Applicant currently has some form of bicycle, pedestrian or Safe Routes to School Plan and demonstrates there is some connection between the proposed project and the plan and supports engagement and implementation goals of the Plan. Alternatively, the applicant describes how this project will reasonably lead to the development of a plan in the future.	For Reviewer Only
	0-1 point	Applicant has no plans, and does not clearly articulate how the project will lead to future development.	For Reviewer Only
b.	Points	Mobility	Score
	3-5 points	Applicant presents a clear need for active transportation infrastructure improvements and shows how the proposed project will support equitable programming and infrastructure.	For Reviewer Only
	0-2 points	Applicant presents a limited need for active transportation infrastructure improvements and/or does not clearly illustrate how the proposed project will support equitable programming and infrastructure.	For Reviewer Only
c.	Points	Mobility	Score
	3-5 points	Applicant provides clear examples of current support or future plans and policies that will support greater rates of walking and biking. Describes a current or future policy environment where a quick build project will add considerable value.	For Reviewer Only
	0-2 points	Applicant provides few examples of current or future supportive plans and policies. Describes a policy environment where a quick build project will have limited impact.	For Reviewer Only

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE →



2020-2021 Sustainable Communities Program
Scoring Tables – Networking Visioning & Implementation Application

2 | Safety Benefits

a.

Group A – Population over 250,000				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-3	Rankings 1-5	Rankings 1-4	
10	Rankings 4-5	Rankings 6-7	Ranking 5	
5	Rankings 6-8	Rankings 8-10	Rankings 6-12	
0	Rankings 9+	Rankings 11+	Rankings 13+	
Group B – Population 100,001-250,000				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-14	Rankings 1-16	Rankings 1-14	
10	Rankings 15-26	Rankings 17-33	Rankings 15-34	
5	Rankings 27-39	Rankings 34-46	Rankings 35-45	
0	Rankings 40+	Rankings 47+	Rankings 46+	
Group C – Population 50,001-100,000				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-25	Rankings 1-35	Rankings 1-30	
10	Rankings 26-53	Rankings 36-59	Rankings 31-57	
5	Rankings 54-78	Rankings 60-85	Rankings 58-82	
0	Rankings 79+	Rankings 86+	Rankings 83+	
Group D – Population 25,001-50,000				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-28	Rankings 1-30	Rankings 1-28	
10	Rankings 29-48	Rankings 31-57	Rankings 29-45	
5	Rankings 49-72	Rankings 58-82	Rankings 46-74	
0	Rankings 73+	Rankings 83+	Rankings 75+	
Group E – Population 10,001-25,000				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-19	Rankings 1-26	Rankings 1-32	
10	Rankings 20-46	Rankings 27-46	Rankings 33-50	
5	Rankings 47-72	Rankings 47-81	Rankings 51-77	
0	Rankings 73+	Rankings 82+	Rankings 78+	
Group F – Population 2,501-10,000				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-24	Rankings 1-39	Rankings 1-31	
10	Rankings 25-42	Rankings 40-55	Rankings 32-53	
5	Rankings 43-48	Rankings 56-65	Rankings 54-62	
0	Rankings 49+	Rankings 66+	Rankings 63+	
Group G – Population 1-2,500				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1	Rankings 1-2	Ranking 1	
10	Rankings 2	Rankings 3-4	Ranking 2	
5	Rankings 3	Rankings 5-7	Rankings 3-7	
0	Rankings 4+	Rankings 8+	Rankings 8+	
Counties				
Points	Total Fatal & Injury	Bicyclists	Pedestrians	Score
15	Rankings 1-13	Rankings 1-26	Ranking 1-38	
10	Rankings 14-16	Rankings 27-37	Ranking 39-43	
5	Rankings 17-57	Rankings 38-50	Rankings 44-48	
0	Ranking 58	Rankings 51+	Rankings 49+	



2020-2021 Sustainable Communities Program
Scoring Tables – Networking Visioning & Implementation Application

Safety Benefits Table Notes

- California Office of Traffic Safety groups cities by population and ranks them within each group
- Counties are ranked against other counties in the state
- Some of the categories jurisdictions are ranked by include:
 - All collisions
 - Bicycle involved collisions
 - Pedestrian involved collisions
- Points were distributed based on how cities in the SCAG region ranked in each group (see table)
- The final safety score for each jurisdiction is an average of the scores of the three categories

b.

Points	Safety	Score
3-5 points	Additional factors are identified that pose significant challenges to expanding rates of walking and bicycling and/or reducing collisions. A clear plan for engaging stakeholders and agency staff to address the issues identified.	For Reviewer Only
0-2 points	Additional factors are mentioned but clear strategies for engaging stakeholders are not provided.	For Reviewer Only



3 | Disadvantaged Communities & Public Health

a.

Points	Public Health	Score
5 points	Score is equal to or below 25.	For Reviewer Only
3 points	Score is equal to or less than 50, but more than 25.	For Reviewer Only
1 point	Score is equal to or less than 75, but more than 50.	For Reviewer Only
0 points	Score is greater than 75.	For Reviewer Only

b.

Points	Disadvantaged Communities – Severity	Score
5 points	The project is entirely within an Environmental Justice Area, a Community of Concern, and an SB 535 Disadvantaged Area or within a Native American Tribal Land.	For Reviewer Only
4 points	The project is entirely within an Environmental Justice Area, Community of Concern, or SB 535 Disadvantaged Area and partially in the others.	For Reviewer Only
3 points	The project is partially within an Environmental Justice Area, a Community of Concern, and an SB 535 Disadvantaged Area.	For Reviewer Only
2 points	The project is partially within two of the three: Environmental Justice Area, Community of Concern, or SB 535 Disadvantaged Area.	For Reviewer Only
1 point	The project is partially within an Environmental Justice Area, Community of Concern, or SB 535 Disadvantaged Area.	For Reviewer Only
0 points	The project is not within an Environmental Justice Area, Community of Concern, or SB 535 Disadvantaged Area.	For Reviewer Only

c.

Points	Disadvantaged Communities – Direct Benefit	Score
5 points	The project will clearly benefit members of a Disadvantaged Community and improves health outcomes. Applicant has provided clear and implementable anti-displacement strategies.	For Reviewer Only
3-4 points	The project will clearly benefit members of a Disadvantaged Community AND improve health outcomes.	For Reviewer Only
1-2 points	The project will clearly benefit members of a Disadvantaged Community OR will clearly improve health outcomes.	For Reviewer Only
0 points	The project will not benefit a Disadvantaged Community or improve health outcomes.	For Reviewer Only



C. Desired Outcomes

1 | Safety Strategies

a.	Points	Safety	Score
	3-5 points	Approach is clear and comprehensive. Illustrates data-based methodology for identifying and targeting collision “hot spots” and measuring and evaluating safety and prioritizing educational and engagement programs. A letter of support from a supporting agency is provided detailing commitment.	For Reviewer Only
	0-2 points	Approach is feasible but lacks a data driven approach for identifying collision “hot spots” and evaluating safety outcomes” and/or informing targeted educational programs. No partnership with a supporting agency.	For Reviewer Only

2 | Public Health Strategies

a.	Points	Public Health	Score
	3-5 points	Approach is clear and comprehensive and describes tools and strategies that will be used to evaluate and prioritize health outcomes. A letter of support a from public health partner is provided detailing how the partner will support the project.	For Reviewer Only
	0-2 points	Approach is not clear and/or comprehensive, tools and strategies are not clearly defined. Lacks a letter of support from a public health partner.	For Reviewer Only

3 | Community Engagement Strategies

a.	Points	Public Participation	Score
	4-5 points	Project includes robust and innovative outreach strategies that will engage identified targeted audience.	For Reviewer Only
	2-3 points	Project includes sufficient outreach and includes outreach strategies to reach identified targeted audience.	For Reviewer Only
	0-1 point	Project includes minimal or limited outreach strategies.	For Reviewer Only

4 | Project Outcomes & Scope of Work

a.	Points	Desired Outcomes	Score
	3-5 points	Applicant identifies desired outcomes, goals, and objectives that meet the needs of the community and are achievable within a reasonable timeframe.	For Reviewer Only
	0-2 points	Applicant identifies the desired outcomes, goals, and objectives but does not tie them to the needs of the community or they are inappropriate for the context of the project.	For Reviewer Only

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE →



2020-2021 Sustainable Communities Program
Scoring Tables – Networking Visioning & Implementation Application

b.

Points	Scope of Work	Score
11-15 points	Applicant identifies reasonable tasks to achieve the stated desired outcomes, goals, and objectives. Tasks clearly link to well thought out safety, public health, and community engagement strategies.	For Reviewer Only
6-10 points	Applicant identifies reasonable tasks to achieve the stated desired outcomes, goals, and objectives.	For Reviewer Only
0-5 points	Applicant identifies tasks but they are not appropriate or realistic for completing the project with the proposed budget.	For Reviewer Only

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE →



D. Partnerships & Engagement

1 | Cost Effectiveness

a.	Points	Cost Effectiveness	Score
	3-5 points	Applicant identifies existing methodologies/tools/templates to be included in the project and clearly describes how they will be incorporated into project. Alternatively, applicant clearly defines method and approach for ensuring project results in multi-jurisdictional impact.	For Reviewer Only
	0-2 points	Project identifies existing methodologies/tools/templates but fails to clearly describe how they will be incorporated into the project. Applicant provides limited or no evidence to support that the project will have multi-jurisdictional impacts.	For Reviewer Only

2 | Commitments, Partnerships & Leveraging

a.	Points	Commitment	Score
	5 points	The applicant has provided letters of commitment for the project from diverse stakeholders and clearly outlines the types of activities each stakeholder will undertake to support the project.	For Reviewer Only
	3-4 points	The applicant has provided letters of commitment for the project and they somewhat outline the types of activities each stakeholder will undertake to support the project.	For Reviewer Only
	1-2 points	The applicant has provided letters of support for the project and they do not outline any level of commitment.	For Reviewer Only
	0 points	The applicant has not provided any letters of commitment.	For Reviewer Only

b.	Points	Partnership Leveraging	Score
	5 points	Letters of commitment outline exceptional participation by agencies that will inform and support the project, including staff time and other resources. Compensation has been included in the Budget for non-governmental organizations.	For Reviewer Only
	3-4 points	Letters of commitment outline sufficient participation by agencies to support and inform the project.	For Reviewer Only
	1-2 points	Letters provide only vague commitments to support the project.	For Reviewer Only
	0 points	The applicant has not provided any letters of commitment.	For Reviewer Only

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE →



2020-2021 Sustainable Communities Program
Scoring Tables – Networking Visioning & Implementation Application

Scoring Matrix

Project Title: _____
 Reviewer's Name: _____
 Agency: _____
 Phone Number: _____
 Email: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Scoring Criteria	Points Possible	Points Received
Focus Area A: Project Need	50 points	
Mobility Benefits	15	
Safety Benefits	20	
Disadvantaged Communities and Public Health	15	
Focus Area B: Project Desired Outcomes	35 points	
Safety Strategies	5	
Public Health Strategies	5	
Community Engagement Strategies	5	
Project Outcomes and Scope of Work	20	
Focus Area C: Partnerships and Engagement	15 points	
Cost Effectiveness	5	
Commitments, Partnerships, and Leveraging	10	

Reviewer's Notes