**Capital Grant Application Assessment – Criteria and Weighting**

**Road Safety Grant**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weighting****(W)** |
| Evidence of high risk or vulnerable casualty groups  | 5 |
| Targets locations or routes with a history of KSI casualties  | 4 |
| Evidence to support the need for intervention and that proposed schemes address the principal causes of collisions  | 4 |
| Value for money  | 4 |
| Deliverability | 3 |
| Engagement with the relevant vulnerable road group users | 3 |
| Targets sites, routes or areas with a history of a significant number of slight injury and damage only collisions  | 3 |
| Improves community benefits particularly for those living in disadvantaged communities  | 2 |
| Encourages walking and cycling and the use of sustainable travel | 2 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Match funding (a contribution of 10% is recommended)( ≤ 10% = 1; 11-20% = 2; 21% -30% = 3; etc) | 3 |

**Safe Routes in Communities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weighting****(W)** |
| Has the scheme been included in the authority’s ERM or INM? | Y/N |
| Was the scheme included on the 2014 list of schools? | Y/N |
| Creates or improves routes for pupils travelling active to school | 5 |
| Improves safety for pupils travelling to school  | 4 |
| Number of pupils that could benefit from the scheme( up to 100 = 1; 100-250 = 2; 250-500 = 3; 500+ = 4) | 4 |
| Engagement with children and young people | 4 |
| Wider community benefits, particularly for those living in disadvantaged communities | 3 |
| Value for money  | 3 |
| Deliverability | 3 |
| Match funding (a contribution of 10% is recommended)( ≤ 10% = 1; 11-20% = 2; 21% -30% = 3; etc) | 3 |

Notes

For Safe Routes in Communities, schemes should be on or linked to routes that have been identified within the Existing Routes Map or Integrated Network Map submitted to Ministers for approval. We also invite applications for schools that are not in designated localities under the Active Travel Act, but which were identified by local authorities in the list submitted in 2014 as requiring action.

In the event that further work is required before the Integrated Network Map of an authority can be approved, then, funding will be awarded in principle for successful schemes, and released once the map has been approved.

a) Scoring

5 = Outstanding

4 = Very Good

3 = Good

2 = Adequate

1 = Poor

0 = None or No Evidence

b) Calculation – The weighting is multiplied by the scoring for the assessment values, which are all added together to give the final value.

c) Match funding – a contribution of 10% is recommended. Schemes that include match funding will attract additional scores.

**Road Safety Revenue Grant - Criteria**

Local authorities have been provided with an indicative allocation to fund educational initiatives. The indicative allocation is the maximum amount of funding that will be given.

Eligibility will be determined as follows:

1. Funding is for priority interventions (Pass Plus Cymru; Megadrive; Motorcyclist training; Kerbcraft; National Standards Cycle training);
2. Funding for other proven interventions or for new interventions that meet the requirements for supporting information as follows:
* Data to demonstrate why an intervention is needed for a specified target group in the authority;
* Evidence used to determine why the selected intervention is the right approach
* Description of delivery method and how that approach was identified as appropriate;
* The costs of developing and/or delivering the intervention and an assessment if these represent value for money. You should explain what difference the investment will make with reference to your evaluation evidence on casualty reduction.
* Evidence of collaboration with stakeholders and partners at planning stage
* For existing interventions, evaluation reports and plans for ongoing monitoring and review.
* For new interventions, a description of how robust evaluation will be incorporated into the design of the intervention.