B. Project Need

1 | Mobility Benefits

a.

Points	Mobility Benefits	Score
11-15 Points	Agency has no existing plan, policy, ordinance, or program, or they have not been updated in more than 5 years.	For Reviewer Only
6-10 points	Agency completed some planning related to technology assessment or adoption, and project sponsor provides comprehensive justification for the need for additional planning. Proposed project area is not included in any previous planning work.	For Reviewer Only
0-5 points	Agency has updated policy or plans related to technology assessment or adoption, and/or presents limited justification to support the need for more planning. Proposed project area is included in previous planning work.	For Reviewer Only

b.

Points	Mobility Benefits	Score
6-10 Points	Applicant presents a clear need for technology-based policy and shows how the proposed project will support sustainable mobility and transportation/communication infrastructure.	For Reviewer Only
0-5 points	Applicant presents a limited need for technology-based policy and/or does not clearly illustrate how the proposed project will support sustainable mobility and transportation/communication infrastructure.	For Reviewer Only

2 | SCS Implementation

a.

Points	SCS Implementation	Score
11-15 points	Applicant supports implementation of 5 or more SCS policies or strategies and clearly describes how the project will significantly support SCS implementation.	For Reviewer Only
5-10 points	Applicant supports implementation of 2-4 SCS policies or strategies and somewhat describes how the project will support SCS implementation.	For Reviewer Only
0-4 points	Application supports implementation of 0-1 SCS policies or strategies and does not describe how the project will support SCS implementation.	For Reviewer Only

3 | Disadvantaged Community Need

a.

Points	Disadvantaged Community Need	Score
11-15 points	Applicant provides clear examples of how the project will benefit communities of disadvantaged areas listed above. The project area is located in, or will directly benefit, one or more disadvantaged areas or communities. The Healthy Places Index (HPI) Score is equal to or below 35.	For Reviewer Only
6-10 points	Applicant provides clear examples of how the project will benefit communities of disadvantaged areas listed above, but the project area is not located in a disadvantaged area. The HPI Score is equal to or less than 65 but more than 35.	For Reviewer Only
0-5 points	Applicant provides few or no examples of how the project would benefit disadvantaged areas listed above. The project area is not located in a disadvantaged area. The HPI Score is greater than 65.	For Reviewer Only

C. Scope of Work & Project Outcomes

1 | Project Benefits & Scope of Work

a.

Points	Projects Benefits & Scope of Work	Score
6-10 points	Approach is clear and comprehensive. Incorporates a data-based methodology with strong connection to project benefits. Applicant identifies project benefits that are achievable within a reasonable timeframe.	For Reviewer Only
0-5 points	Approach is feasible but lacks a data driven methodology or has a weak connection to project benefits. Applicant identifies project benefits, but they do not tie to the needs of the community or are unrealistic.	For Reviewer Only

b.

Points	Project Benefits & Scope of Work	Score
5 points	Applicant identifies critical tasks and their associated deliverables to achieve the stated desired outcomes. Tasks clearly link to well thought out strategies and a comprehensive work plan.	For Reviewer Only
3-4 points	Applicant identifies reasonable tasks and some of the associated deliverables to achieve the stated desired outcomes. Tasks are linked to overarching strategies, but the connection may be vague.	For Reviewer Only
0-2 points	Applicant identifies tasks and deliverables, but they are not appropriate, realistic, or supportive of the project.	For Reviewer Only

2 | Supports SCS Implementation

a.

Points	SCS Implementation	Score
11-15 points	Applicant identifies clear, critical links between proposed project tasks and key Connect SoCal strategies. Answer is comprehensive and inclusive of long-term regional planning goals.	For Reviewer Only
6-10 points	Applicant identifies reasonable links between proposed project tasks and key Connect SoCal strategies. Connections to long-term regional goals may be limited or vague.	For Reviewer Only
0-5 points	Applicant identifies few links between proposed project tasks and key Connect SoCal strategies, and they are not supportive of long-term regional planning goals.	For Reviewer Only

3 | Use of Innovative Technology or Policy

a.

Points	Use of Innovative Technology or Policy	Score
4-5 points	Project includes several critical innovative technologies or policies that will significantly improve mobility functions or best practices.	For Reviewer Only
2-3 points	Project includes some critical innovative technologies or policies that will significantly improve mobility functions or best practices.	For Reviewer Only
0-1 points	Project includes minimal to zero innovative technologies or policies, and/or the connection to improved mobility functions or best practices is limited.	For Reviewer Only

D. Partnerships & Engagement

1 | Partnerships for Planning & Implementation

a.

Points	Partnerships for Planning & Implementation	Score
3-5 points	Applicant identifies existing or proposed partnerships included in the project and clearly describes how they will be incorporated. Alternatively, applicant clearly defines possibilities for multi-jurisdictional or expanded project impact.	For Reviewer Only
0-2 points	Applicant identifies existing or proposed partnerships but fails to clearly describe how they will be incorporated. Applicant provides limited or no potential multi-jurisdictional or expanded project impact.	For Reviewer Only

2 | Inclusive Diverse & Equitable Stakeholder Engagement

a.

Points	Commitment	Score
7-10 points	The applicant has provided letters of commitment for the project from diverse stakeholders and clearly outlines the types of activities each stakeholder will perform to ensure impacted communities are involved. The number of commitment letters, relative to the scope of the project, exceeds expectations.	For Reviewer Only
4-6 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. The number of commitment letters, relative to the scope of the project, is sufficient to meet project needs.	For Reviewer Only
2-3 points	The applicant has provided letters of commitment for the project, but they do not outline any specific commitments, the project approach is vague, or the number of letters, relative to the scope of the project, is insufficient.	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

Scoring Matrix

Project Title: _____

Reviewer's Name: _____

Agency: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Scoring Criteria	Points Possible	Points Received
Focus Area B: Project Need	55 points	
Mobility Benefits	25	
SCS Implementation Need	15	
Disadvantaged Community Need	15	
Focus Area C: Scope of Work & Project Outcomes	30 points	
Project Benefits & Scope of Work	15	
Supports SCS Implementation	10	
Use of Innovative Technology of Policy	5	
Focus Area D: Partnerships & Engagement	15 points	
Partnerships for Planning & Implementation	5	
Inclusive Diverse & Equitable Community Engagement	10	

Reviewer's Notes