

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

Instructions: This document provides guidance on how to score the applications for each criterion. Essentially, it describes what a high, medium and low score would look like. Using this document is important, as it will insure that everyone is scoring the applications using the same reference points. It is a guide, however, and does not have to be followed strictly, especially if it does not fit each application. As indicated, some criteria will be scored by staff; all remaining criteria will be scored by BPAC. The application sections that may address each criterion are listed. Other sections of the application may also be useful to review. Criteria weighting will be applied to the scores after they are submitted.

Note: All criteria (except for Implementation) are to be applied to the overall project, of which the submitted project may be one phase/component (such as environmental review for a new trail).

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
Gap Closure			
	■	4 – 5	High: Project <i>closes</i> a major gap in a bike or ped facility and therefore eliminates extremely circuitous travel. There are no existing options for traveling along the corridor (e.g. a bridge, overcrossing, a major pedestrian shortcut).
		2 – 3	Med: Project provides the <i>missing link</i> which will complete a countywide bikeway corridor or a significant corridor segment (e.g. bike lanes that will connect otherwise discontinuous bike lanes), or a pedestrian facility (such as a sidewalk, pathway, or crosswalk). Or, project makes improvements to a significant barrier to walking or biking, such as at a difficult intersection or roadway segment.
		1	Low: Project <i>extends</i> an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility (e.g. bike lane or sidewalk), working towards closing a gap but not eliminating it.
		0	Not a gap closure project.
Safety & Security			
	■	4 – 5	High: Project has been designed expressly to address a demonstrated safety or security problem (e.g. collision statistics are high, there are a large number of complaints/near misses or there are many significant reported security issues that inhibit bicycle or pedestrian travel).
		2 – 3	Med: Project will improve an existing facility/corridor where there are some safety or security concerns (e.g. high vehicle traffic volumes or speeds, some reported collisions or security issues, etc).
		1	Low: Project will likely improve safety or security, even though there are no known problems, and project was not designed specifically to address safety or security issues.
		0	No safety or security benefit.

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

Criteria	Application Section(s)	Points (0 – 5)	Ranking and Descriptions
Countywide Priority			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	4-5	<p>High: Generally, project will <i>strongly help</i> the county to achieve its <i>highest</i> priority bicycle and pedestrian projects, as defined in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If pedestrian project: All areas of countywide significance have equal priority, with two exceptions: For Bay Trail – project must be defined as the <i>trail spine</i> by ABAG/Bay Trail. For any project, the grant-funded portion of project must be <i>almost exclusively</i> pedestrian infrastructure elements that are highly effective, as defined in Appendix F of the Pedestrian Plan, as opposed to amenities. ▪ If bicycle project: Project is either on the “High-Priority Project” list (Table 5-5 in the Bicycle Plan) or is a Transit Priority-Zone project (as described Chapter 3 of the Bicycle Plan). If agency has completed its High-Priority Project, then project must be on the “Next Highest Priority Project” list in Appendix E-2. ▪ If combined bicycle/pedestrian project: must meet one of above criteria, but will be highest scoring if it meets both.
		2-3	<p>Medium: Generally, project will <i>help</i> the county to achieve its priority bicycle and pedestrian projects, as defined in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If pedestrian project: If Bay Trail project – project is defined as a <i>trail connector</i> by ABAG/Bay Trail. For any project, grant-funded portion of project must <i>mainly</i> include pedestrian infrastructure elements that are highly effective, as defined in Appendix F of the Pedestrian Plan, as opposed to amenities. ▪ If bicycle project: Project is a feasibility study for a project on the Financially Constrained Network.
		0-1	N/A – All projects must have high or medium Countywide Priority.

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

Access to Areas of Countywide Significance			
	▪	4 – 5	<p>High: Project is designed to <i>serve major transit lines/stations and/or activity centers</i> with countywide significance (these areas will be listed in a separate document, and will differ in some cases for bikes and peds). May provide access to or within these areas. Example types of projects: New walking or biking routes, improved access along routes, transit stop/station infrastructure (bike parking, lighting, pathfinder signage, bicycle stair channels, etc), or improved access for bicycles on transit.</p> <p>High scoring project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide direct, convenient, safe routes, both throughout the project itself and at either end of the project, especially at the intersections. ▪ If transit-access related, will provide uninterrupted access and entry to the transit stations/stop. ▪ Serve multiple areas (i.e. a transit line/station and an activity center with countywide significance, or more than one transit lines/stations and/or activity centers). ▪ If bikeway access to transit project, project creates a safe, convenient route to a transit station/stop where none currently exists and connects the transit station/stop to a countywide bicycle corridor.
		2 – 3	<p>Med: Project is designed to <i>serve major transit lines/stations and/or activity centers</i> with countywide significance (these areas will be listed in a separate document, and will differ in some cases for bikes and peds), or provides/improves access to a Bay-spanning bridge. May provide access to or within these areas. For bikeway projects in transit-priority zones, project must connect the transit station/stop to a local bikeway.</p> <p>Medium scoring project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Serve one area (i.e. a transit line/station or an activity center with countywide significance).
		1	<p>Low: Project <i>serves locally-serving transit lines/stations and/or activity centers</i>, such as schools, smaller health care facilities, local parks, local government buildings, and local commercial centers.</p>

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points (0 – 5)</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
At-Risk/Under-Served Communities			
	▪	4 – 5	High: Project has been designed to directly benefit children, seniors, and/or residents of economically disadvantaged neighborhoods AND project is located in an area with exceptionally higher than average percentages of the above listed groups (for Alameda County).
		2 – 3	Med: Project is located in an area with exceptionally higher than average percentages of the above listed groups (for Alameda County).
		1	Low: Project will <i>indirectly benefit</i> a significant number of children, seniors, and/or residents of economically disadvantaged neighborhoods.
Local Support			
	▪	4 – 5	High: Project has strong community support. The specific project is included in more than one of the agency’s adopted policy documents (e.g. General Plan, Specific Plan, Neighborhood Plan, Local Bike or Pedestrian Plan); AND has been reviewed by a local bicycle and/or pedestrian advisory committee, or other pertinent committee; AND additional outreach meetings have taken place.
		2 – 3	Med: Project has some community support. Project is included in at least one of the agency’s adopted policy documents (General Plan, Specific Plan, Neighborhood Plan, Local Bike or Ped Plan, etc), and some community outreach has been completed for this project (may include review by local bike/ped advisory committee).
		1	Low: Community outreach is planned as part of the project, but none done to date.
Demand			
	▪	4 – 5	High: Project will serve a high number of users (relative to other projects in the County and within the same Planning Area), and has a high potential of attracting new bicycling and/or walking trips. High scoring bike projects in transit priority zones will: Serve a transit station/stop with the highest existing or potential bicycling demand (for BART, determined by “Bicycle Access Growth Potential” in BART Bicycle Access and Parking Plan). If bicycle parking/storage project, project will provide facilities to meet existing demand plus an additional 10%.
		2 – 3	Med: Project will serve a high number of users (relative to other projects in the County and within the same Planning Area).
		1	Low: Project will serve a moderate number of users (relative to other projects in the County and within the same Planning Area).
		0	Project will serve a small number of users.

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points (0 – 5)</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
Mult-Modal Benefit			
	▪	4 – 5	High: Project will equally and directly benefit both bicyclists and pedestrians.
		2 – 3	Med: Project will directly benefit both bicyclists and pedestrians, although the project may be focused more on one mode over the other.
		1	Low: While project is designed to benefit one mode, it will at least indirectly benefit the other mode.
		0	Project is designed for one mode, and provides no benefit to the other.

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points (0 – 5)</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
East Bay Regional Park District Project (<i>Staff scoring</i>)			
	▪	1	East Bay Regional Park District project that is included in the Countywide Bicycle or Pedestrian Plan. May be a facility within a park or a trail, as identified in the Park District’s Master Plan 1997.
		0	Not an EBRPD project.
Implementation (<i>Staff scoring</i>)			
	▪	4 – 5	High: Staff has coordinated internally, full funding is in place. Cost estimates and timeline are highly realistic and reasonable. Feasibility issues have been considered and no major obstacles to implementing the project are apparent. Project is ready to move forward and can be easily completed within two years, if not sooner. Previous Measure B grants, if any, have been completed on-time, and within budget and scope.
		2 – 3	Medium: Staff has coordinated internally, full funding is in place. Cost estimates and timeline are mostly realistic and reasonable. Project will likely take two full years at most to complete.
		1	Low: Staff has coordinated internally, full funding is not yet secured and/or cost estimates and timeline are less realistic and reasonable, given project scope. Project may have difficulty being completed within two years.
Outside Funding * (<i>Staff scoring</i>)			
	▪	5	50% or more of the funding for the (overall) Project is coming from other secured sources. (Notes: Other sources may include Measure B Local Bike and Ped Safety funds. Secure funds are grant and other funds that are <i>committed</i> to the project, with a resolution or signed agreement.) IF Feasibility Study, project has 60% or more in secured matching funds.
		4	40% to 49% of the funding for the Project is coming from other secured sources; OR 50% or more of funding is coming from other sources, not yet secured. IF Feasibility Study, project has 55% in secured matching funds.
		3	30% to 39% secured outside funding; OR 40% to 49% from other sources not yet secured. OR the requested funds are highly important for securing outside funding, as no other funds are available for this purpose. IF Feasibility Study, project provides minimum 50% in secured matching funds, as required.
		2	20% to 29% secured outside funding; OR 30% to 39% of funding is coming from other sources, not yet secured.
		1	10% to 19% secured outside funding; OR 20% to 29% from other sources not yet secured.

Capital Projects: Scoring Guidance - DRAFT

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points (0 – 5)</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
		0	Less than 10% secured outside funding; OR less than 20% from other sources not yet secured.
* <i>The calculations for Outside Funding do not include in-kind funding.</i>			