# Safe Routes to Transit Application Scoring Guidance
# Cycle II: FY 2007/2008 – 2008/2009

This document is a general guide to the criteria that reviewers will use to evaluate applications. A full description of these criteria is provided in the Evaluation Criteria document. Please note that scoring of projects under these criteria is advisory only–final selection of projects will account for geographic and mode equity and is subject to the judgment of the SR2T Advisory Committee.

***Note:*** *ALL applications are scored based on criteria one (1) through six (6); proposed CAPITAL projects are also scored using criteria seven (7) through twelve (12); proposed PLANS are also scored using criteria thirteen (13) through seventeen (17). Each criterion (except for Implementation) is to be applied to the overall project, of which the submitted project may be one phase/component (such as environmental review for a new pathway).*

## SR2T Project applications will be scored on the following criteria:

| ***Criteria*** | ***Points*** | ***Description*** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Bridge Nexus | 0-10 | Project will increase regional transit ridership and reduce congestion on state-owned bridges. It serves a high number of existing and potential users on a regional transit service with high frequencies.<br>Specific considerations:<br>• Proposed project connects to existing regional transit.<br>• Transit service has high number of riders/day.<br>• Project will serve a relatively high number of bicyclists/pedestrians making commute or utilitarian trips.<br>• Transit service is frequent. |
| 2. Multi-modal | 0-10 | • Project includes a bicycle component, pedestrian component, AND a transit station, stop, or vehicle component.<br>• All applications are strongly encouraged to include elements that improve BOTH walking and bicycling.<br>• Projects should incorporate improvements at transit stations/stops or onboard vehicles, as well as elements that improve access for pedestrians and bicyclists to the transit station/stop. |
| 3. Implementation | 0-5 | Project has realistic and reasonable funding scenario, cost estimates, and timeline. Project will likely be completed within 3 years. |
| 4. At-Risk/Underserved Communities | 0-5 | Project has been designed to directly benefit low-income and/or minority community households, seniors and/or children |
| 5. Multi-Jurisdiction Project Sponsorship | 0-5 | Project has several active co-sponsors—primarily agency sponsors, but also potentially non-profit and community sponsors. |
| 6. Outside Funding | 0-5 | High % of total project cost will be funded by secured sources, preferably by non-traditional bicycle and pedestrian project funds. |
| 7. Innovation/Pilot Project | 0-10; & potential additional time | Project is an innovative, non-standard design part of a pilot project that, if successful, will provide a new traffic control device or treatment for inclusion in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual or similar standard, and is potentially replicable across the region. Project uses innovative approach or tackles a difficult problem in a unique way. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. Appropriate Solution/Well-Designed Project | 0-10 | Project proposes an appropriate solution given existing conditions and challenges.<br>For Access Projects:<br>• Project is extensive in length or scope.<br>• Project is designed using or exceeding recognized standards and/or best practices for similar bike/ped projects.<br>• Project does not create any obstacles to or conflicts for bike/ped travel.<br>• For pedestrian projects, ADA access has been incorporated.<br>For Transit Station/Stop Projects:<br>• Facilities are sufficient to meet demand<br>• Facilities integrate well into existing transit system.<br>• Facilities are easy to use and understand.<br>• If applicable, facilities accommodate persons with a disability. |
| 9. Total Trip | 0-10 | For Access Projects:<br>• Project is extensive in length or scope.<br>• Project is designed to provide safe and convenient bicycle and/or pedestrian access throughout the project limits, with no safety gaps or project segments where bicycle and/or pedestrian access has not been thoughtfully considered.<br>• Project connects with existing ped/bike facilities and, thus, provides extensive facilities beyond project limits.<br>• Project closes a major gap or overcomes absolute barrier in a bike or ped facility in the vicinity of a transit station and therefore eliminates extremely circuitous travel (i.e., there are no existing options such as. existing city streets, a bridge, overcrossing, connecting path through a park for traveling along the corridor).<br>For Transit Station/Stop projects:<br>• Facilities are conveniently located and protected from the elements.<br>• Facilities have easily accessible ingress/egress and avoid conflicts with other transit users. |
| 10. Personal Safety/Security | 0-10 | Project has been designed to address a demonstrated or obvious personal safety and/or security problem. For instance,<br>• A transit station/stop bicycle facility project may address high theft rates, unlit or unsafe storage location, insufficient security measures, etc.<br>• A transit station/stop pedestrian facility project may address high crime rates, unlit or unsafe facilities, etc. |
| 11. Traffic Awareness/Safety/Speeds | 0-10 | Project has been designed to address traffic speed/awareness/safety concerns.<br>• Project addresses high collision rates, high prevailing vehicle speeds and volumes, poor sight lines, long, unprotected crossings, turning motions, etc.<br>• Project increases motorists' awareness of pedestrians and |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | bicyclists.<br>• Project creates an environment in which pedestrians and bicyclists are acknowledged users are the roadway.<br>• If project involves off-street segments, safe interfaces between users and road traffic have been created (for instance at crossings, ends of trail). |
| 12. Cost Effectiveness | 0-5 | • Relatively low cost per potential daily user of the facility, and relatively low cost per expected new transit rider as a result of the project.<br>• High number of daily users.<br>• Projects operating & maintenance costs are addressed and accounted for. |
| 13. Local Support | 0-5 | Project has strong bicyclist and pedestrian, as well as other, community support. To score highly, the specific project:<br>• Is included in more than one agency-adopted policy documents (e.g. General Plan, Strategic or Neighborhood Plan, Local Bike or Pedestrian Plan, or in a higher level Plan, such as countywide or the Regional Bike Plan).<br>• Has been reviewed by a local bicycle and/or pedestrian advisory committee, or other similar committee with bicycle and pedestrian representation.<br>• Project is included in an official Plan of one or more transit agencies.<br>• Additional public meetings have taken place. |
| **TOTAL** | **100** | |

## SR2T Bicycle/Pedestrian Transit Access Plans are scored on the following criteria:

| ***Criteria*** | ***Points*** | ***Description*** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Bridge Nexus/Demand | 0-10 | Plan is intended to identify projects that will increase regional transit ridership and reduce congestion on state-owned bridges. It serves a high number of existing and potential users on a regional transit service with high frequencies.<br>Specific considerations:<br>• The proposed plan connects to existing regional transit.<br>• Transit service has high number of riders/day.<br>• Plan will serve a relatively high number of bicyclists/pedestrians making commute or utilitarian trips.<br>• Transit service targeted by plan is frequent. |
| 2. Multi-modal | 0-10 | Plan addresses bicycle, pedestrian, and transit station/stop or vehicle elements. |
| 3.Implementation | 0-5 | Plan creation has realistic and reasonable funding scenario and timeline. Plan development will likely be completed within 3 years. |
| 4. At-Risk/Underserved Communities | 0-5 | Plan will be designed to directly benefit low-income and/or minority community households, seniors, or children. |
| 5. Multi-Jurisdiction Project Sponsorship | 0-5 | Plan has several active co-sponsors—primarily agency sponsors, but also potentially non-profit and community sponsors. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Outside Funding | 0-10 | High % of total plan cost will be funded by secured sources, preferably by non-traditional bicycle and pedestrian funds. |
| 14. Innovation and Regional Significance | 0-10 | Plan will address an area/topic that has not previously been examined, or is not commonly examined, and is important at the regional level. Plan results can be repeated across the region, and may inform future plan s and projects in the region. |
| 15. Scope and Plan Design | 0-15 | • Clearly addresses access to transit;<br>• Includes intermodal connections;<br>• Focuses on resolving a significant barrier to transit access;<br>• Will result in system-wide transit enhancements;<br>• If implemented will improve access for a large number of people;<br>• Emphasizes implementation and prioritization of projects;<br>• Will result in recommendations that are likely to be implemented;<br>• Plan focuses on the needs of utilitarian bicyclists or pedestrians, rather than recreational users;<br>• Identifies potential funding sources; and,<br>• Presents a draft implementation timeline. |
| 16.Personal Safety/Security | 0-10 | Plan specifically addresses one or more documented personal safety or security problems that discourage bicycling and walking to transit. |
| 17. Traffic Safety | 0-10 | Plan specifically addresses one or more documented traffic safety problems that discourage bicycling and walking to transit. |
| 18. Local Support | 0-5 | The creation (or update) of the Plan has been recommended by pedestrians and bicyclists and a public body, and this body reviewed and provided input on the Plan components. |
| 19. Plan Status | 0-10 | There is currently no existing plan addressing elements of proposed plan, or existing plan is outdated. |
| **TOTAL** | **100** | |