

# PC Final Transportation Alternative Project Evaluation Criteria

## Expanded Scoring Methodology 2015-2018 TIP

1	Size of Area Served		
		Relative size of population that will directly benefit. Highest score if facility is used by a high number of residents.	Category Weighting = <b>.75</b>
	a	Project will serve or benefit...	<b>Areawide</b> users 10 - Or -
			Area that is <b>less than areawide</b> (example NE, NW, SE, SW with Tudor and Seward Highway as general boundaries) 8 - Or -
			<b>More than one</b> community council, user group or purpose 6 - Or -
			<b>One</b> neighborhood 4
2	Preserves Existing Facility		
		Project preserves existing system. Highest score if project significantly preserves an existing facility and is immediately needed based on recommendations maintenance staff, and/or observations from field investigation.	Category Weighting = <b>.75</b>
	a	Preservation as part of the scope of the project:	<b>Significant</b> preservation of existing facility 5 - Or -
			<b>Major</b> preservation of existing facility 4 - Or -
			<b>Moderate</b> preservation of existing facility 3 - Or -
			<b>Some</b> clear preservation to existing facilities 2 - Or -
			<b>No</b> impact on preservation of existing facility 0
	b	Need based on recommendations of and/or observations from field investigation:	<b>Immediate</b> need 5 - Or -
			<b>Short term</b> (3-year) need 4 - Or -
			<b>Medium term</b> (6-year) need 2 - Or -
			<b>Long term</b> (> 6-year) need 0
3	Neighborhood Livability/Quality of Life		
		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.	Category Weighting = <b>.5</b>
	a	Project contributions to health, livability and quality of life by promoting or enhancing existing quality:	<b>significantly</b> contributes 10 - Or -
			<b>moderately</b> contributes 6 - Or -
			<b>no effect</b> 0

PC Final Transportation Alternative Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2015-2018 TIP

<b>4</b>	<b>Improves Safety</b>			
		Promotes safe movement of pedestrians and bicyclists and implements the strategies listed in the AMATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans aimed at reducing crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists. Highest score if project corrects documented pedestrian/ vehicle conflicts.		Category Weighting = <b>1.0</b>
	a	Project addresses locations of pedestrian and/or bicycle crashes, conflicts, or safety problems:	<b>Multiple</b> and <b>documented</b> crashes on corridor or intersection	10 - Or -
			<b>Possible preventable</b> crashes as demonstrated on similar facilities as identified through actual crashes	8 - Or -
			Provides <b>new facility</b> where none previously existed <u>or</u> <b>partially addresses</b> actual or possible crashes/conflicts	4 - Or -
			<b>Minimum safety impact</b> – widening existing facility, repave existing facility, etc.	0
<b>5</b>	<b>Economic Benefits</b>			
		Encourages economic development and/or redevelopment, through improved access and transportation opportunities; addresses impacts on urban areas and recreational or educational opportunities, or tourism activity. Highest score if the project will promote long term significant economic development and supports integrating transportation and land use.		Category Weighting = <b>.75</b>
	a	Project benefits economic development projects and/or facility improvements to support mixed-use/redevelopment, business area, employment center, transit supportive corridors, or other significant type of urban development area; recreation or education opportunities; and/or tourism activity:	<b>Significant</b> impacts	10 - Or -
			<b>Moderate</b> impacts	6 - Or -
			<b>Minimal</b> impacts	2 - Or -
			<b>Negligible</b> impacts	0
<b>6</b>	<b>Operations and Maintenance Commitment</b>			
		Commitment by project sponsor for O&M. Highest score if responsible agency commits to O&M on proposed project.		Category Weighting = <b>.5</b>
	a	Project commitment from responsible agency / project priority for sponsor:	<b>Commitment received</b> to operate and maintain proposed project OR project is a <b>very high</b> maintenance priority for sponsor	10 - Or -
			Project has a <b>minimum level of maintenance</b>	6 - Or -
			<b>No commitment</b> is perceived OR project is <b>not a maintenance priority</b> for sponsor	0

# PC Final Transportation Alternative Project Evaluation Criteria

## Expanded Scoring Methodology 2015-2018 TIP

<b>7</b>	<b>Support of Project</b>			
		Support from public, elected officials, affected stakeholders, and governmental agencies. Highest score if strongly and clearly supported by all groups.		Category Weighting = <b>.75</b>
	a	<b>Documented support</b>	<b>Broad based area-wide support and project is in an approved plan</b>	10 - Or -
			<b>Local area support for project (resolution from local government)</b>	6 - Or -
			<b>Limited support only (neighborhood petition, community council resolution)</b>	2 - Or -
			<b>No significant support for project is documented</b>	0
<b>8</b>	<b>Multi-Modal Characteristics</b>			
		Promotes multi-modal uses of transportation systems. Highest score if project includes significant multi-modal links.		Category Weighting = <b>.5</b>
	a	Includes <b>multimodal/intermodal</b> links and/or improves <b>mode transitions</b> to: (3 points for each)	Transit Facilities	3 - And / Or -
			Bicycle Facilities	3 - And / Or -
			Pedestrian Facilities	3 - Or -
			No facilities	0
<b>9</b>	<b>Project Co-Funding Efficiency</b>			
		Encourages pursuit of additional non-Federal matching funds (i.e. CBERRRSA mill levy, ADEC Matching Grants, State Legislative Grants, etc.) for capital projects. Highest score if non-AMATS/non-bond matching funds for over 50% of the project is reasonably certain.		Category Weighting = <b>.5</b>
	a	Non-Federal matching funds	<b>&gt; 50%</b> of the total cost is certain	10 - Or -
			<b>&gt; 10%</b> of the total cost is probable	4 - Or -
			<b>Required</b> amount is possible	1 - Or -
			Required matching funds <b>not likely</b>	-3

**PC Final Transportation Alternative Project Evaluation Criteria**  
 Expanded Scoring Methodology  
 2015-2018 TIP

<b>10</b>	<b>Connectivity</b>			Category Weighting = <b>.75</b>
		Project promotes pathways or sidewalk connections by constructing missing links and/or provides seamless connection to transit. Highest score if connections are made between large segments of city.		
	a	Provides pathway or sidewalk connections:	Between <b>large segments</b> of the city such as downtown to midtown, between major employment centers and town centers, etc or if project is listed in the AMATS Pedestrian or Bicycle Plans as a needed new connection	10 - Or -
			Between <b>major employment centers</b> , town centers, schools, neighborhoods or community council areas	6 - Or -
			<b>Within a neighborhood</b> or community council area	2 - Or -
			<b>Isolated</b> section of new pathway or sidewalk	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Cost/ Benefit</b>			Category Weighting = <b>.5</b>
		Relative benefit/ cost provides most benefit to cost. Highest score if project provides improvement not currently available at reasonable cost.		
	a	Cost/Benefit:	Provides a facility or improvement <b>not currently available</b> at a <b>cost reasonable</b> to public use	10 - Or -
			<b>Significantly improves</b> upon or expands the level of service or number of facilities available to the public but at a cost <b>higher than what is reasonable</b>	6 - Or -
			<b>Moderately improves</b> upon or expands the level of service or number of facilities available to public while <b>costing a large amount</b>	3 - Or -
			<b>No change</b> in the level of service or number of facilities to public	-3
<b>12</b>	<b>Environmental Justice</b>			Category Weighting = <b>.6</b>
		Project is consistent with MTP equity goals. Project serves EJ population; highest score if project provides new or improved multi-modal links.		
	a	Project is located within ¼ mile of an EJ Area and provides for new or improved access to:  (3 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		-5

**PC Final Transportation Alternative Project Evaluation Criteria**  
 Expanded Scoring Methodology  
 2015-2018 TIP

		access to transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.		
<b>13</b>	<b>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)</b>			
		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.		Possible Total Points = Category Weighting = <b>.25</b>
	a	Does the Project fill in gaps in the existing (ITS) infrastructure?	Yes No	2 - Or - 0
	b	Does the project enhance interagency cooperation?	Yes No	2 - Or - 0
	c	Does the project contribute to or increase system reliability?	Yes No	2 - Or - 0
	d	Does the project promote multimodal usage?	Yes No	2 - Or - 0
	e	Is the project included in MOA Regional ITS Architecture?	Yes No	2 - Or - 0
<p><i>Note to Project Sponsor: A Systems Engineering Analysis is required is required to be submitted to FHWA through ADOT&amp;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.</i></p>				