Section 1: Project Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **District:** |  |
| **County – Route – PM:** |  |
| **EA & Project ID (If Available):** |  |
| **Project Scope:** |  |
| **Purpose & Need:** |  |

Section 2: Pre-PID Initial Assessment [See [CAPTI Alignment Metrics](https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/division-transportation-planning/csis/2024-capti-alignment-metrics_a11y.pdf)]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPTI Principles** | **CAPTI Assessment** |
| * 1. **Safety**
 | Does the project implement safety measures aimed at reducing fatalities and severe injuries? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**If yes, please evaluate the safety needs level.[ ]  **High** [ ]  **Moderate** [ ]  **Low** |
| * 1. **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**
 | Does the project lead to increased or induced VMT?Does the project avoid inducing significant VMT growth by considering alternatives like pricing strategies or multimodal options? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**[ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.3 Accessibility** | Does the project increase accessibility relative to the existing baseline for (work & non-work) destination?Does the project impact disadvantaged or underserved communities? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**If yes, please check the modes that are accessible within a reasonable time threshold:[ ]  **Auto** [ ]  **Transit**[ ]  **Bike** [ ]  **Pedestrian Facilities**[ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.4 Mode Shift**  | Does the project close connectivity gaps in active transportation networks that intersect with the State Highway System? Does the project contribute to the creation of an integrated, statewide rail & transit network to provide multimodal travel options for all users in suburban and rural areas?Does the project encourage a safe bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure through small and underserved communities? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**[ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**[ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.5 Infill Development**Is the project:[ ] Overlapping urbanized areas[ ] Outside urbanized areas  | Does the project improve and strengthen access to and from Infill areas? Is the project located in High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs)? OR create a new HQTA ? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**[ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.6 Freight Sustainability and Efficiency** | If the project serves an unreliable freight segment/corridor, does the project improve freight reliability and efficiency? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.7 ZEV Infrastructure** | Does the project include ZEV infrastructure? Light, Medium, and Heavy-duty ZEVs? See ZEV Rubric for Infrastructure Type: [CAPTI Alignment Metrics (PDF)](https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/division-transportation-planning/csis/2024-capti-alignment-metrics_a11y.pdf) light, medium, and heavy-duty ZEVs? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.8 Equity & Public Engagement** | Does the project plan to do public engagement over and above the standard environmental review process? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |
| **1.9 Climate Risk** | Has the project identified specific climate stressors within the project area?If so, does the project plan to include resiliency measures for climate change effects, such as flooding, heat, and other extreme weather conditions? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown**[ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Unknown** |

Section 3: Self-Assessed Impact Scores

The Initial Impact Scores are self-assessed scores in addition to the alignment assessment. These scores will serve to inform how impactful a project is in carrying out CSIS goals and strategies, as well as provide a baseline for a project’s OVERALL impact in implementing the CSIS vision.

The following is a breakdown of scoring. Please conduct a thorough self-scoring using the most current, best available project information and data.

*If any Metric is out of scope or not applicable to the project, please place an asterisk (\*) next to the score of 0. Provide additional justification below the table.*

* 0-2 = No impact or minimal impact
* 3-4 = Some impact, but not substantial
* 5-6 = Moderate impact
* 7-8 = Significant impact
* 9-10 = Major, transformative impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CAPTI Principle** | **Criteria** | **Score (1-10)** |
| **1.1 Safety** | Does the project enhance a safe and secure transportation system, incorporating safety improvements that reduce fatalities and severe injuries for *all* users within the corridor/project area? |  |
| **1.2 Vehicle Miles Traveled** | Does the project contribute to a significant reduction in VMT without inducing further VMT growth? |  |
| * 1. **Accessibility**
 | Does the project improve multimodal mobility, support an integrated statewide rail and transit network, provide affordable travel options, and increase destination accessibility for *all* users? |  |
| **1.4 Mode Shift** | Does the project encourage a shift from private vehicles to more sustainable and efficient modes of transportation (e.g., biking, walking, public transit)? |  |
| **1.5 Infill Development** | Does the project promote compact, infill development, foster walkable communities, or support housing near transit centers to enhance housing-transportation affordability and access to economic centers? |  |
| **1.6 Freight Sustainability and Efficiency** | Does the project enhance freight efficiency, economic competitiveness, and reduce freight-related emissions and pollutants, minimizing environmental justice impacts? |  |
| **1.7 ZEV Infrastructure** | Does the project invest in light, medium, or heavy-duty ZEV infrastructure, or improve ZEV accessibility, especially in rural and remote areas? |  |
| **1.8 Equity & Public Engagement** | Does the project help reduce transportation burdens for disadvantaged communities (DACs), people with disabilities, Native American tribes, and other disadvantaged groups? Was comprehensive community engagement conducted, with high-quality engagement materials provided? |  |
| **1.9 Climate Risk** | Does the project contribute to statewide and regional climate adaptation and mitigation goals, including emissions reduction targets, and enhance resilience to climate change and other climate-related risks? |  |
| **Total Impact Score** |  |

Section 4: Program Fit

Does the Project meet the objectives and eligibility criteria of the discretionary funding program? (e.g., SB1, SCCP, TCEP, INFRA, HSIP, etc.) Please provide additional justifications for initial CAPTI alignment as needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District Investment Planning Manager/District Representative:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Name, Signature (Date)** | HQ PID Nomination Manager/HQ Representative:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

 **Name, Signature (Date)** |