To: David Stillman, Transportation Manager, City of Cupertino

Matthew Schroeder, Senior Transportation Planner, City of Cupertino

From: Christopher Kidd, Alta Planning + Design

Date: December 10, 2025

Re: Cupertino ATP: Project Prioritization Criteria

Introduction

Proposed improvements will prioritize the development of a complete active transportation network that imposes fair outcomes, safety, access, and comfort for people of all ages and abilities. Draft criteria were originally proposed in the Summer of 2025, with criteria screened with the Bicycle Pedestrian Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council in the Fall of 2025 for their input. Following input from these bodies, prioritization criteria were updated to better reflect feedback.

Criteria for prioritization have been aligned with the Goals of the Active Transportation Plan:

- Safety
- Access
- Sustainability
- Multimodal Balance
- Cost Effectiveness

Projects will be scored according to their corresponding tables below, then scores will be normalized to create a unified set of scores for a single project list.

Project Type	Maximum Score	Score modifier	Consolidated list maximum score
Bicycle Network Recommendations	100	1x	100
Pedestrian Intersection Recommendations	80	1.25x	
Pedestrian Sidewalk Recommendations	80	1.25x	
Transportation Technology Corridor Recommendations	90	1.11x	

Table 1: Bicycle Network Project Prioritization Matrix

Goal	Criteria	Metric (Source)	Scoring	Max Score	Goal Max Score
Safety	*Collision History*	Roadway segment is near a corridor identified in the City of Cupertino Vision Zero Action Plan (2024) High Injury Network (HIN)	20 pts if on a HIN corridor 10 pts if within 1000 ft 0 pts if not	20	30
	Stress Level	Max score from bicycle level of stress analysis	10 pts: BLTS 4 5 pts: BLTS 3 0 pts: BLTS 2 or 1	10	
Access	*School Proximity*	Project is located along a SR2S suggested routes to school	20 pts if along a suggested route 0 pts if not	20	30
	High Frequency Transit Proximity	Presence of major transit stops along the roadway	5 pts within 0.25 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 2 pts within 0.5 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 0 pts if not.	5	
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, senior center/facilities and shopping centers along the roadway	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on # of destinations within 0.5 mile per mile of project length.	5	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Roadway has high bicycle trip potential or high e-bike trip potential	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on average ATP score	5	10
	SAST Gap Score	Project is within a high gap score area	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on average gap score	5	
Balance	*General Roadway Impact*	Potential need for lane reduction or parking removal based upon aerial imagery	10 pts if no parking removal or lane reduction is needed to implement project	10	20
	Arterial Roadway Impact	Potential need for lane reduction or parking removal based upon aerial imagery	0 pts if needed to implement project	10	
Cost Effectiveness	*Fiscal Responsibility*	Project cost	10 pts if below $500k 5 pts if $500k - $2M 0 pts if over $2M	10	10

Table 2: Pedestrian Intersection Project Prioritization Matrix

Goal	Criteria	Metric (Source)	Scoring	Max Score	Goal Max Score
Safety	*Collision History*	Roadway segment is near a corridor identified in the City of Cupertino Vision Zero Action Plan (2024) High Injury Network (HIN)	20 pts if on a HIN corridor 10 pts if within 1000 ft 0 pts if not	20	30
	Stress Level	Max score from pedestrian level of stress analysis	10 pts: PLTS 4 5 pts: PLTS 3 0 pts: PLTS 2 or 1	10	
Access	*School Proximity*	Project is located along a SR2S suggested routes to school	20 pts if along a suggested route 0 pts if not	20	30
	High Frequency Transit Proximity	Presence of major transit stops along the roadway	5 pts within 0.25 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 2 pts within 0.5 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 0 pts if not.	5	
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, senior center/facilities and shopping centers along the roadway	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on # of destinations within 0.5 mile	5	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Roadway has high active pedestrian trip potential	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on average ATP score	5	10
	SAST Gap Score	Project is within a high gap score area	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on average gap score	5	
Cost Effectiveness	*Fiscal Responsibility*	Project cost	10 pts if below $500k 5 pts if $500k - $2M 0 pts if over $2M	10	10

Table 3: Pedestrian Sidewalk Projects Prioritization Matrix

Goal	Criteria	Metric (Source)	Scoring	Max Score	Goal Max Score
Safety	*Collision History*	Roadway segment is near a corridor identified in the City of Cupertino Vision Zero Action Plan (2024) High Injury Network (HIN)	20 pts if on a HIN corridor 10 pts if within 1000 ft 0 pts if not	20	30
	Stress Level	Max score from pedestrian and bicycle level of stress analysis	10 pts: PLTS 4 5 pts: PLTS 3 0 pts: PLTS 2 or 1	10	
Access	*School Proximity*	Project is located along a SR2S suggested routes to school	20 pts if along a suggested route 0 pts if not	20	30
	High Frequency Transit Proximity	Presence of major transit stops along the roadway	5 pts within 0.25 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 2 pts within 0.5 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 0 pts if not.	5	
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, senior center/facilities and shopping centers along the roadway	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on # of destinations within 0.5 mile.	5	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Roadway has high active trip potential	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on average ATP score	5	10
	SAST Gap Score	Project is within a high gap score area	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on average gap score	5	
Cost Effectiveness	*Fiscal Responsibility*	Project cost	10 pts if below $500k 5 pts if $500k - $2M 0 pts if over $2M	10	10

Table 4: Transportation Technology Corridors Prioritization Matrix

Goal	Criteria	Metric (Source)	Scoring	Max Score	Goal Max Score
Safety	*Collision History*	The corridor includes an intersection identified as a VZAP High Injury Network Intersection	4 pts for every intersection ranked 1-7 in the corridor 2 pts: if 7-24 0 pts: 24-48	10	40
	Collision History	# of collisions with a cause of "unsafe speed" per mile (according to Cupertino Vision Zero Dashboard Data)	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on percentage of total collisions on the corridor (last 5 yrs) by # of collisions with a cause of “unsafe speed”.	10	
	Collision History	# of collisions with a cause of "traffic signals and signs" per mile (according to Cupertino Vision Zero Dashboard Data)	Scale 0 to 5 pts based on percentage of total collisions on the corridor (last 5 yrs) by # of collisions with a cause of “traffic signals and signs”.	10	
	Level of Traffic Stress	Average PLTS for the corridor	10 pts: PLTS 4 5 pts: PLTS 3 0 pts: PLTS 2 or 1	10	
Access	*School Proximity*	% of corridor length on Suggested Route to School	20 pts: >75% of length on Suggested Route 10 pts: 25–75% 0 pts: <25%	20	30
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, senior center/facilities and shopping centers along the corridor	Scale 0 to 10 pts based on # of within .25 miles of corridor per mile of project length.	10	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Average bicycle/e-bike short-trip share intersecting the corridor	Scale 0 to 10 based on average ATP score for bicycle/e-bike	10	20
	SAST Gap Score	% of corridor length within high SAST gap-score areas	Scale 0 to 10 based on average gap score	10	