

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

1	Improves Safety	Source – National Goal (Safety)		
		Promotes safe movement of people and goods. Highest score if project has substantial immediate public safety benefit as identified in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), and/or concurred with by traffic management staff.		Category Weighting = 1.0
	a	Current safety ratings:	Intersections with a HSIP Safety Index rating ≥ 0.9 -or- Roadway segments with a severity Indicator rating > 0.002	5 - Or -
			Site has above average statewide crash rates for type of facility	4 - Or -
			Recent changes to traffic pattern create high crash & predicted severe injury crashes	3 - Or -
			Site has average or below average statewide crash rates for type of facility	0
	<i>Multiply the score from section "a" by the score in section "b" to calculate total points</i>			
	b	Potential to improve / address safety strategy: <i>Safety strategies are identified in Alaska's Strategic Traffic Safety Plan.</i>	Ideally suited to address safety strategies	2 - Or -
			Will only partially address safety strategies	1 - Or -
			Does not address any safety strategy	0 - Or -
			Reduces public safety	-0.8
2	Reduces Congestion	Source – National Goal (Congestion Reduction)		
		Promotes efficient movement of people and goods. Highest score if project improves mobility by mitigating immediate and substantial traffic congestion. Scoring will focus on "Level of Service" calculations when available and observations from ADOT/MOA Traffic Management staff.		Category Weighting = 0.9
	a	Congestion reduction: (LOS is calculated and/or concurred by ADOT and MOA traffic management staff)	Significant reduction anticipated and existing LOS is "E" or "F" in AM or PM	10 - Or -
			Moderate reduction anticipated and existing LOS is "E" or "F" in AM or PM	5 - Or -
			Has no affect on congestion	0 - Or -
			Increases congestion.	-5

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

3	Preserves Existing Facility	Source – National Goal (Infrastructure Condition)	
		Preserves existing system. Highest score if project significantly preserves an existing facility and is immediately needed based on recommendations of a pavement management system, maintenance staff, and/or observations from field investigation.	Category Weighting = 0.9
	a	<p>Significant preservation and need based on recommendations of a pavement management system, maintenance staff, and/or observations from field investigation.</p> <p>To be eligible for points in this category, preservation must be a major element of the project cost or purpose.</p>	<p>Significant preservation of existing facility with clear immediate need</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10 - Or -</p>
			<p>Major preservation of existing facility with clear short term (3-year) need</p> <p style="text-align: right;">8 - Or -</p>
			<p>Moderate preservation of existing facility with clear short term (3-year) need</p> <p style="text-align: right;">6 - Or -</p>
			<p>Moderate preservation of existing facility with clear medium term (6-year) need</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4 - Or -</p>
			<p>Minor preservation of existing facility</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2 - Or -</p>
			<p>No impact on preservation of existing facility</p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>
4	Economic Benefits	Source – National Goal (Freight Movement and Economic Vitality)	
		Encourages economic development, redevelopment, and/or freight mobility through improved access and transportation opportunities; addresses impacts on urban areas, freight corridors, recreational or educational opportunities, or tourism activity. Highest score if the project will promote long term significant economic development, enhanced freight mobility, and supports integrating transportation and land use.	Category Weighting = .75
	a	<p>The project benefits economic development projects and/or facility improvements to support mixed use/redevelopment, business areas, employment centers, transit supportive corridors, other significant types of urban development areas; recreation or education opportunities; and/or tourism activity.</p>	<p>Significantly benefits</p> <p style="text-align: right;">5 - Or -</p>
			<p>Moderately benefits</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4 - Or -</p>
			<p>Minimally benefits</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3 - Or -</p>
			<p>No economic benefits</p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>
	b	<p>The project improves efficiency of freight mobility along freight corridors and the improvement is specifically addressed in a City, State or AMATS study or plan as an economic development proposal having economic benefits.</p>	<p>Region-wide significance (Mat-Su / Statewide) <u>and</u> identified in the AMATS MTP</p> <p style="text-align: right;">5 - Or -</p>
			<p>City-wide significance (MOA Only) <u>and</u> identified in a state or local plan</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4 - Or -</p>
			<p>Anchorage Bowl only significance <u>and</u> identified in a state or local plan</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3 - Or -</p>
			<p>No significance</p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>
	c	<p>Adversely affects economic development, or freight mobility.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">-5</p>	

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

5	Neighborhood Livability/ Quality of Life	Source – National Goal (Environmental Sustainability) & MTP goals 1,3, 4,5,8	
		Project promotes quality of life by addressing problems such as flooding, noise pollution, crime, unsightliness, etc., or helps to revitalize neighborhood livability. Depending on the project, livability factors could include but are not limited to walkability, access to amenities and urban centers, access to parks and trails, safety, proper landscaping, proper lighting, seasonally adaptive infrastructure and aesthetics including landscaping of high positive visual impact, to include potential artistic, recreational, natural, historic, or other valued and beneficial spaces. Highest score if project improves neighborhood livability.	Category Weighting = .25
	a	How does the project affect health, livability and quality of life by promoting or enhancing existing quality?	Significantly contributes 10 - Or -
			Moderately contributes 5 - Or -
			No affect 0 - Or -
			Adversely affects -1.5
6	Support of Project	Source – National Goal (Reduced Project Delivery Delays) & MTP goals 6 & 8	
		Support from public, elected officials, affected stakeholders, and governmental agencies. Highest score if strongly and clearly supported by all groups.	Category Weighting = .25
	a	Documented support:	Broad based area-wide support and project is in an approved plan 10 - Or -
			Local area support for project (resolution from local government) 6 - Or -
			Limited support only (neighborhood petition, community council resolution) 2 - Or -
			No significant support for project is documented 0
7	Project Deliverability	Source – National Goal (Reduced Project Delivery Delays)	
		Project is a deliverable project. Highest score if analysis clearly demonstrates that there are no obstacles to construction of the project if funding is provided. Issues to be considered include permitting, right-of-way acquisition and utility relocations.	Category Weighting = .5
	a	Obstacles to construction:	No obstacles are foreseeable 10 - Or -
			Likely to be overcome 8 - Or -
			Require significant effort to resolve 4 - Or -
			Unlikely to be overcome 0

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

8	Connectivity	Source – National Goal (Congestion Reduction, System Reliability & Freight Movement and Economic Vitality) & MTP goals 1,2,3,5,7	
		Promotes access and circulation needs by constructing missing links. Highest score if project provides significant connections between large segments of the city such as downtown to midtown, etc, provides for new or improved NHS connectors, and are consistent with the land use policy map for the Anchorage Bowl and Eagle River Comprehensive Plans (Major Employment Centers, Redevelopment/ Mixed Use Areas, Transit Supported Development Corridors, Town Centers and Industrial Reserves).	Category Weighting = 0.9
	a	Provides needed roadway connections:	Between large segments of the city such as Downtown to Midtown and U-Med 5 - Or -
			Between neighborhoods while preserving neighborhood(s) integrity 4 - Or -
			Within neighborhoods while preserving neighborhood(s) integrity 3 - Or -
			With limited connectivity benefit 2 - Or -
			No connectivity benefit 0
	b	Includes modal links and/or improves mode transitions to: (1 point for each, 3 points max)	Mode examples: Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian, Port, Railroad, Air, Etc... 1 - 3 - Or - No facilities 0
	c	Improvements are needed immediately ?	Yes 2 - Or - No 0
9	Functional Classification	Source – National Goal (Congestion Reduction & Freight Movement and Economic Vitality)	
		The project is identified as an integral part of the transportation network in the Official Streets and Highways Plan (OS&HP). Highest score if the route is identified as a Freeway or Expressway.	Category Weighting = .5
	a	OS&HP Classification:	Freeway or Expressway 10 - Or -
			Major Arterial 7 - Or -
			Minor Arterial 4 - Or -
			Collector 1 - Or -
			Local Street 0

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

10	Operation and Maintenance Budget	Source – National Goal (Infrastructure Condition) & MTP goal 3	
		Reduces O&M Costs. Highest score if the project will notably reduce costs to operate and maintain the facility.	Category Weighting = .5
	a	O&M Costs:	Significantly reduces existing O&M costs & addressing O&M budget increases is a major element of the project cost or purpose 10 - Or -
			Significantly reduces existing or projected O&M Costs and addressing O&M budget increases is a major element of the project cost or purpose 7 - Or -
			Moderately reduces existing or projected O&M Costs and addressing O&M budget increases is a major / moderate element of the project cost or purpose 4 - Or -
			Minimally reduces existing or projected O&M Costs and addressing O&M budget increases is a minor element of the project cost or purpose 1 - Or -
			Notably increase O&M budget -3
11	Cost/Benefit Value	Source – MTP goals 3	
		Highest score if design work demonstrates the project is clearly buildable with a comparably low cost of if there is a calculated score of 5 or above using the Benefit Cost Formula = [Project cost (in thousands) / Length[in miles(minimum length 1 mile)] / existing ADT or projected ADT in 1 st year of operation].	Category Weighting = .5
	a	Design efforts indicate the project is buildable and the calculated score is:	≤ \$0.5 10 - Or -
			≤ \$1.0 7 - Or -
			≤ \$2.0 4 - Or -
			≤ \$3.0 1 - Or -
			≤ \$5.0 -3 - Or -
			> \$5.0 -5
12	Environmental Justice	Source – MTP goals 1,2,3,5,6,7,8	
		Project considers benefit of transportation improvements compared with any negative impacts to EJ Area (based on GIS analysis of EJ zones) Highest score if project has a positive impact on low-income and minority TAZ's.	Category Weighting = .35
	a	Project is located within ¼ mile of an EJ Area and provides for new or improved access to: (2 points for each)	Transit facilities 3 - And / Or -
			Pedestrian facilities 3 - And / Or -
			Bicycle facilities 3 - And / Or -
			No improved access 0
	b	Project is located within ¼ mile of an EJ Area and has a negative impact on access to transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	-5

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

13	Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Source – National Goal (Safety, Congestion Reduction, System Reliability and Freight Movement and Economic Vitality)		
		Project incorporates ITS elements. Highest score if ITS elements fill in gaps by completing critical systems; enhance interagency cooperation; increase reliability; promote multimodal use; are included in MOA Regional ITS Architecture.		Category Weighting = .25
	a	Does the Project fill in gaps in the existing (ITS) infrastructure?	Yes	2 - Or -
			No	0
	b	Does the project enhance interagency cooperation?	Yes	2 - Or -
			No	0
	c	Does the project contribute to or increase system reliability?	Yes	2 - Or -
			No	0
	d	Does the project promote multimodal usage?	Yes	2 - Or -
			No	0
	e	Is the project included in MOA Regional ITS Architecture?	Yes	2 - Or -
			No	0

Note to Project Sponsor: A Systems Engineering Analysis is required is required to be submitted to FHWA through ADOT&PF Central Region for all projects having ITS elements prior to construction or deployment of ITS. If a project is not included in the existing ITS Architecture, project sponsor shall submit a request to AMATS Coordinator to add project to Architecture.

PC Final Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria

Expanded Scoring Methodology

2015-2018 TIP

14	Freight System Performance & Reliable Access	Source – National Goals (Congestion Reduction, System Reliability and Freight Movement and Economic Vitality) and MTP goals 1,2,4,6	
		Promotes overall system performance benefits to freight users by reducing travel time, improving bottlenecks, enhancing reliability and efficiency while diminishing conflicts with other modes. Protects and improves access to freight related and other intermodal areas	Category Weighting = .5
	a	The project improves or completes a facility identified by AMATS or the State as an intermodal or freight problem area in the following documents: (1 point for each)	AMATS 2035 MTP 1 - And / Or -
			AMATS Freight Problem Area Map 1 - And / Or -
			Anchorage Freight Movement Survey or another adopted & applicable plan(s) 1
	b	The project implements a solution to a freight movement issue or by removing barriers,(e.g. at grade separation; bridge openings).	Yes 1 - Or -
			No 0
	c	The project reduces / increases conflict with freight and one or more motorized and/or non-motorized passenger modes – e.g. road geometrics – turning radii; etc.	Reduces 1 - Or -
			Increases -3
	d	The project improves reliable access within or to freight related and/or intermodal/last mile facilities identified by AMATS or the State in the following documents: (1 point for each)	AMATS 2035 MTP 1 - And / Or -
			AMATS Freight Problem Area Map 1 - And / Or -
			Anchorage Freight Movement Survey or another adopted & applicable plan(s) and/or the area is identified as a freight generator 1
	e	The project improves reliable access :	Within or to an intermodal/last mile facilities . 1 - And / Or -
			Along or connection to a designated freight routes . 1 - And / Or -
			Decreases reliable access to freight areas, intermodal connections, and transportation facilities. -3
15	Security/Emergency Response	Source – MTP goals 2,5,6	
		Project improves connectivity for emergency response or evacuation purposes, AFD 4-minute response times, or addresses a transportation action item in MOA All Hazards Mitigation Plan. Highest score if project addresses all three.	Category Weighting = .35
	a	Project improves Security/Emergency Response:	Improves evacuation route , diversion route, or alternate diversion route. 4 - And / Or -
			Improves AFD 4 minute response times . 3 - And / Or -
			Addresses transportation action item in MOA All Hazards Mitigation Plan 3 - And / Or -
			Reduces security /increases incident response times. -5