

Programs: Scoring Guidance

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, and the referenced attachments, is important, as it will ensure 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 and some will be scored by staff and BPAC; 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.

Criteria	Application Section(s)	Points	Ranking and Descriptions
Countywide Priority (Staff and BPAC Scoring)			
		4 - 5	High: Program will serve residents from the entire County; OR the program will be a demonstration or pilot involving 4 or more jurisdictions/areas/non-profits that could readily be applied at other agencies/jurisdictions.
		2 - 3	Med: Program will be a demonstration or pilot that could readily be applied at other agencies/jurisdictions, and that involves 2-3 jurisdictions or 2-3 different agencies/non-profits working together innovatively to bring a new program to a community.
		0 - 1	Low: The program will be a demonstration or pilot in one jurisdiction that could readily be applied at other agencies/jurisdictions.
Effectiveness/Well-Designed (Including Multi-Modal)			
		4 - 5	High: The type of program (or a similar type) has been shown to be <i>highly</i> effective at encouraging bicycling and/or walking, or improving bicycle and/or pedestrian safety. Program has been thoughtfully developed, utilizes the latest knowledge and resources in the field, and is likely to be continued, or benefits are likely to continue, after grant-funds are spent. Where applicable, program has considered both bicycling and walking.
		2 - 3	Med: The type of program (or a similar type) has been shown to be effective at encouraging bicycling and/or walking, or improving bicycle and/or pedestrian safety, and is well-thought out.
		0 - 1	Low: The type of program (or a similar type) is well-thought out, but potential effectiveness is unclear.

Programs: Scoring Guidance

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
Demand			
		4 - 5	High: Program will serve a high number of users (relative to other programs in the County and within the same Planning Area), and is likely to attract new users to bicycling and /or walking.
		2 - 3	Med: Program will serve a moderate number of users (relative to other programs in the County and within the same Planning Area), and may attract new users to bicycling and/or walking.
		0 - 1	Low: Program will serve a low number of users (relative to other programs in the County and within the same Planning Area).
Safety			
		4 - 5	High: Program has been designed expressly to address a specific demonstrated safety issue (e.g. collision rates are high for the targeted population or area).
		2 - 3	Med: Addressing perceived and/or demonstrated safety is a significant component of the program.
		1	Low: Addressing perceived and/or demonstrated safety is one of many components of the program.
		0	Safety is not a focus of the program.
At-Risk/Under-served Communities			
		4 - 5	High: Program has been designed to directly benefit children, seniors, people with disabilities, and/or residents of economically disadvantaged neighborhoods AND program is targeted to areas with higher than average percentages of the above listed groups (for Alameda County). (See Scoring Attachment C.)
		2 - 3	Med: Program is targeted to an area with higher than average percentages of the above listed groups (for Alameda County). (See Scoring Attachment C.)
		0 - 1	Low: Program is minimally, or not at all, focused on children, seniors, people with disabilities, and/or residents of economically disadvantaged neighborhoods.

Programs: Scoring Guidance

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
Local Support			
		4 - 5	High: Program is included in an adopted General Plan, Specific or Neighborhood Plan, or local Bike or Pedestrian Plan. Program has demonstrated community support from a variety of entities. Working with the community is a top focus of the program.
		2 - 3	Med: Program has demonstrated community support from a variety of entities. Working with the community is a top focus of the program.
		0 - 1	Low: Community outreach will be completed as a part of the program, but none has been done to date.
Outside Funding (Staff scoring) -- *The calculations for Outside Funding do not include in-kind funding.*			
		5	50% or more of the funding for the Program 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 program, with a resolution or signed agreement.)
		4	40% to 49% of the funding for the Program is coming from other secured sources; OR 50% or more of funding is coming from other sources, some of which may not yet be secured.
		3	30% to 39% secured outside funding; OR 40% to 49% from other sources, some of which may not yet be secured.
		2	20% to 29% secured outside funding; OR 30% to 39% from other sources, some of which may not yet be secured.
		1	10% to 19% secured outside funding; OR 20% to 29% from other sources, some of which may not yet be secured.
		0	Less than 10% secured outside funding; OR less than 20% from other sources, some of which may not yet be secured.
Implementation (Staff Scoring)			
		4 - 5	High: All partners have demonstrated full support for the program; there is a clear

Programs: Scoring Guidance

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Application Section(s)</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Ranking and Descriptions</i>
			program lead agency. All funding is in place. Cost estimates, timeline and staffing needs are highly realistic and reasonable. Feasibility issues have been considered and no major obstacles are apparent for program implementation. Previous Measure B grants, if any, have been completed on-time, and within budget and scope.
		2 - 3	Medium: Program partners have coordinated, full funding is in place. Cost estimates, timeline and staffing needs are realistic and reasonable.
		0 - 1	Low: Unclear if all program partners have coordinated, full funding is not yet secured and/or cost estimates, timeline and staffing needs are not realistic and reasonable, given program scope; OR program may have difficulty being completed within two years.