

Caltrans CCLGP Cycle 2 Application Scoring Rubric

NOTE:

*This rubric is to be used by Caltrans application evaluators in conjunction with their online evaluation form. Applicants should NOT complete and submit this form to Caltrans. It is provided to give applicants an idea of how their applications will be scored.

District: _____
 Project Title: _____
 Primary Applicant: _____
 Lead Evaluator Name: _____ Date: _____
 Lead Evaluator Phone Number: _____
 Lead Evaluator Email: _____
 2nd Evaluator Name: _____
 2nd Evaluator Email: _____
 3rd Evaluator Name: _____

NOTE:

*Do not enter any information in the shaded table below.
 *You can click on the titles below to go to the appropriate scoring tab.

Component No.	Component Title	Score Received	Max Score
1	Narrative	0	out of 30
2	Project's Relative Population Benefit to Underserved Communities	0	out of 30
3	Scope, Cost, Schedule	0	out of 40
Total Points:		0	out of 100 max points

Summary/Overall Comments

NOTE:

*This section is for the evaluators to note and explain any other items of interest related to their review of the application (i.e., has the applicant been sanctioned by the State of California, is the agency responsive and responsible, has the agency adhered to the posted guidelines, or has the applicant included ineligible items in their application?). See the CCLGP Cycle 2 Program Guidelines, including but not limited to the section entitled "Other Selection Considerations," for additional criteria.

NOTE:

Do not fill in shaded cells.

Only enter one score per line.

Justification for scores must be noted in detail in the "Evaluator Score Justification" column.

1			Narrative (Qualitative) Max 30 points	
Possible Points			Evaluator Considerations	Evaluator Score Justification
HIGH (2)	MEDIUM (1)	LOW (0)	How well does the project meet the program's statutory goals, requirements, and guidelines?	REQUIRED - Detailed explanation for the score.
Detailed, Complete, Clear, Low/No Risk, or N/A	Incomplete, Unclear, or Mild/Moderate Risk	Incorrect, Missing, or High Risk		
Project Location:				
			Project description, including location, elaborated on beyond what is already in the main application form	
			Project's proximity to Caltrans projects *Projects not near Caltrans-funded projects are more competitive	
			Description of public space(s) to be addressed (i.e. park, pathway, transit center, Federally recognized tribal land, etc.) *Includes location, visibility, and public access	
			Right of way status description: *If applicant does not own project space, discusses how owner has approved improvements and maintenance of them; applicant provided written documentation demonstrating this. *Projects on Caltrans right of way should discuss encroachment permits	
Community Need and Project Outcomes:				
			Expected outcomes relate to 4 goals of CCLGP program *Projects who meet more goals earn more points	
			The need to the community is demonstrated. *Discusses existing condition(s) for the project location(s). *The more severe the community need, the more competitive the project.	

Local Public Engagement Process:

			<p>Describes stakeholder/community engagement efforts that went into identifying the proposed elements as a priority for the community and how the engagement influenced the proposal.</p> <p>*The more specific the engagement is to the CCLGP project, the more competitive the project's application will be.</p> <p>*Describes how the project is consistent with or included in existing local or regional plans.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Project Deliverability:

			<p>Project will be completed, open to the public, and have all implementation funds expended by 06/30/26.</p> <p>*This is mandatory for all projects.</p>	
			<p>Risks to the project's scope, cost, or schedule are identified, as well as applicable mitigation measures.</p>	
			<p>For infrastructure projects, outstanding pre-construction work required to deliver this project described.</p> <p>*Less outstanding pre-construction work is worth more points</p>	
			<p>Permits needing to be obtained.</p> <p>*Less permits still needed or no permits needed is worth more points.</p>	

Maintenance:

			<p>If applicable, maintenance plans identified.</p> <p>*N/A for most non-infrastructure projects EXCEPT litter abatement and artwork.</p>	
			<p>Lifespan of improvement(s) identified.</p>	
			<p>Activities and resources listed to maintain those improvements throughout the lifespan identified.</p> <p>*Resources and commitment of resources to fund maintenance are identified.</p>	
			<p>For landscape projects, plant established plans included.</p>	

0 0 0

<p>Narrative Total</p> <p>0</p> <p>out of 30 possible</p>

NOTE:

- *Do not fill in shaded cells.
- *In general, whichever score is calculated in the attachment titled "Area Surrounding the Project Site and Relative Population Benefit to Underserved Communities Form" is the score they will receive in this section.
- *The more points out of 30 is calculated for PB, the more competitive the application.
- *Correct PB calculations will be between 0 and 30.
- *Incorrect calculations (i.e. over 30 or obviously exaggerated numbers) will receive point reductions in this section.

2	Project's Relative Population Benefit to Underserved Communities
	<u>(Quantitative)</u> <u>Max 30 points</u>

Project's Relative PB to Underserved Communities Total
out of 30 possible

Evaluator Notes

NOTE:

- *This space is for the evaluator to note and explain any calculations errors found or other reasons for deductions to the score.

NOTE:

Do not fill in shaded cells.

Only enter one score per line.

Justification for scores must be noted in detail in the "Evaluator Score Justification" column.

3				<u>Scope, Cost, and Schedule</u>	
				(Quantitative) Max 40 points	
Possible Points			Evaluator Considerations		Evaluator Score Justification
HIGH (2)	MEDIUM (1)	LOW (0)			REQUIRED - Explanation for the score.
Detailed, Complete, Clear, Low/No Risk, or N/A	Incomplete, Unclear, or Mild/Moderate Risk	Incorrect, Missing, or High Risk			
Scope: (Scope is determined by reviewing infrastructure activities, non-infrastructures tasks, the narrative project description, and the project outcomes spreadsheet)					
			Infrastructure activities and/or non-infrastructure tasks align with project outcomes and description in the Narrative.		
			For infrastructure projects, the activities are detailed enough to get a clear idea of what the project entails.		
			For infrastructure projects, the scope is detailed enough for evaluator to be reasonably certain that project is well thought-out and able to be completed by the project deadline		
			For non-infrastructure projects, the tasks are detailed enough to get a clear idea of what the project entails.		
			For non-infrastructure projects, the scope is detailed enough for evaluator to be reasonably certain that project is well thought-out and able to be completed by the project deadline		
			Usability of the project for the public/surrounding communities is explained/detailed.		
			The project has tangible and lasting benefits to the public/surrounding communities.		
Cost: (Look at the costs in the spreadsheet)					
			Itemized cost breakdowns are included for all applicable infrastructure activities and/or non-infrastructure tasks.		
			For infrastructure projects, the CCLGP participating portion of the Preliminary Engineering (PE) cost is 25% or less		
			For infrastructure projects, the CCLGP participating portion of the Construction Engineering (CE) cost is 15% or less		
			Costs seem reasonable, salient, and conservative.		

Schedule: (Look at the schedule in the spreadsheet as well as the section on Project Deliverability in the Narrative)

			Project is shovel-ready, with minimal, if any, outstanding pre-construction work or permits.	
			Schedule contains start and end dates of salient infrastructure activities and/or non-infrastructure tasks.	
			Schedule shows all activities and/or tasks completed and all implementation funds expended by 06/30/26.	
			For infrastructure projects, the schedule shows the facilities open to the public by 06/30/26.	
			For landscape projects, plant establishment is included in the schedule.	
			Activities and/or tasks seem reasonable and salient.	
			Room is left in the schedule for delays.	
			Schedule risks noted in the narrative are reflected in the schedule.	
			Section in the Narrative for Project Deliverability aligns with this schedule.	
0	0	0		

<p>Scope, Cost, Schedule Total</p> <p>0</p> <p>out of 40 possible</p>
