To:	David Stillman, Transportation Manager, City of Cupertino
	Matthew Schroeder, Senior Transportation Planner, City of Cupertino
From:	Christopher Kidd and George Foster, Alta Planning + Design
Date:	August 5, 2025
Re:	Cupertino ATP: Draft Project Prioritization Criteria

Introduction

Proposed improvements will prioritize the development of a complete active transportation network that improves fair outcomes, safety, access, and comfort for people of all ages and abilities.

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

- Safety
- Access
- Sustainability
- Multimodal Balance
- Fairness

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 within ¼-mile of a HIN corridor 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*	School located nearby	10 pts if within ¼-mile of schools 0 pts if not	10	25
	High Frequency Transit Proximity	Presence of major transit stops along the roadway	5 pts for 0.5 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 0 pts if not.	5	
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, and shopping centers along the roadway	10 pts for 0.5 mile proximity to a park or other destination 0 pts if not.	10	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Roadway has high bicycle trip potential or high e-bike trip potential	5 pts: 50% share of short trips 0 pts: <50% share of short trips	5	10
		Fills network facility gap within a segment	5 pts if gap filled 0 pts if no gap filled	5	
Balance	*Roadway Impact*	Potential need for lane reduction or parking removal based upon aerial imagery	-10 pts if parking removal or lane reduction is needed to implement project -0 pts if parking or lane reduction is not needed to implement project	-10	-10
Fairness	*Public Input*	Roadway was positively identified during public outreach process	20 pts if roadway has net +10 comments/likes 10 pts if roadway has net +5 comments/likes 0 pts if roadway has less than net +5 comments/likes	20	20

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 within ¼-mile of a HIN corridor 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*	School located nearby	10 pts if within ¼-mile of schools 0 pts if not	10	30
	High Frequency Transit Proximity	Presence of major transit stops along the roadway	10 pts for 0.5 mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 0 pts if not.	10	
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, and shopping centers along the roadway	10 pts for 0.5 mile proximity to a park or other destination 0 pts if not.	10	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Roadway has high active pedestrian trip potential	5 pts: 50% share of short trips 0 pts: <50% share of short trips	5	10
		Fills facility gap within a segment	5 pts if gap filled on one, or both sides of segment 0 pts if no gap filled	5	
Fairness	*Public Input*	Roadway was identified during public outreach process	20 pts if roadway has net +10 comments/likes 10 pts if roadway has net +5 comments/likes 0 pts if roadway has less than net +5 comments/likes	20	20

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 within ¼-mile of a HIN corridor 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*	School located nearby	10 pts if within ¼-mile of schools 0 pts if not	10	30
	High Frequency Transit Proximity	Presence of major transit stops along the roadway	10 pts for 1-mile proximity to major transit stops (VTA) 0 pts if not.	10	
	Parks & Other Destination Proximity	Presence of parks, the library, and shopping centers along the roadway	10 pts for 1-mile proximity to a park or other destination 0 pts if not.	10	
Sustainability	*Active Trip Potential*	Roadway has high active trip potential	5 pts: 50% share of short trips 0 pts: <50% share of short trips	5	10
		Fills facility gap within a segment	5 pts if gap filled on one, or both sides of segment 0 pts if no gap filled	5	
Fairness	*Public Input*	Roadway was identified during public outreach process	20 pts if roadway was identified by 10 residents 10 pts if roadway was identified by 5 residents 0 pts if roadway was identified by 4 or less residents	20	20