

PC Final Approved Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

<b>1</b>	<b>Reduces Congestion</b>		
		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.	Possible Total Points = 20
	a	Significant reduction of existing congestion, and congestion reduction is a major element of the project cost or purpose. Existing congestion is Level of Service "E" or "F" in "am" <b>and</b> "pm" as calculated and/or concurred by ADOT and MOA traffic management staff.	20
	b	Significant reduction of existing congestion and congestion reduction is a major element of the project cost or purpose. Existing congestion is Level of Service "E" or "F" in "am" <b>or</b> "pm" as calculated and/or concurred by ADOT and MOA traffic management staff.	16
	c	Moderate reduction of existing or projected congestion and congestion reduction is a major element of the project cost or purpose. Existing congestion is Level of Service "E" or "F" in "am" <b>and</b> "pm" as calculated and/or concurred by ADOT and MOA traffic management staff.	12
	d	Moderate reduction of existing or projected congestion and congestion reduction is a major element of the project cost or purpose. Existing congestion is Level of Service "E" or "F" in "am" <b>or</b> "pm" as calculated and/or concurred by ADOT and MOA traffic management staff.	8
	e	Some reduction of existing or projected congestion as calculated and/or concurred by ADOT and MOA traffic management staff.	4
	f	Increases congestion.	-4
<b>2</b>	<b>Improves Safety</b>		
		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.	Possible Total Points = 20
	a	Project site has HSIP Safety Index rating greater than 1 or recent changes to traffic pattern create high accident & severe injury potentials, <b>and</b> project is ideally suited to address safety issue.	20
	b	Project site has HSIP Safety Index rating greater than 1 or recent changes to traffic pattern create high accident & severe injury potentials, <b>but</b> project will only partially address safety issue.	16
	c	Project site has above average crash rates or recent changes to traffic pattern create above average accident and injury potential, <b>and</b> project is ideally suited to address safety issue.	12
	d	Project site has above average crash rates or recent changes to traffic pattern create above average accident and injury potential, <b>but</b> project will only partially address safety issue.	8
	e	Provides some clear improvement to public safety.	4
	f	Reduces public safety	-4
<b>3</b>	<b>Preserves Existing Facility</b>		
		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.	Possible Total Points = 20
	a	Significant preservation of existing facility with clear immediate need based on recommendations of a pavement management system, maintenance	20

PC Final Approved Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

		staff, and/or observations from field investigation, and preservation is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	
	b	Major preservation of existing facility with clear short term (3-year) need based on recommendations of a pavement management system, maintenance staff, and/or observations from field investigation, and preservation is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	16
	c	Moderate preservation of existing facility with clear short term (3-year) need based on recommendations of a pavement management system, maintenance staff, and/or observations from field investigation, and preservation is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	12
	d	Moderate preservation of existing facility with clear medium term (6-year) need based on recommendations of a pavement management system, maintenance staff, and/or observations from field investigation, and preservation is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	8
	e	Should provide some clear preservation to existing facilities.	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Economic Benefits</b>		
		Encourages economic development, redevelopment, or freight mobility. Highest score if the project will promote long term economic development, substantial freight mobility, and neighborhood revitalization.	Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Significantly and clearly benefits economic development, and the transportation improvement is specifically addressed in City, State or AMATS study or plan as an economic development proposal having economic benefits OR substantially improves efficiency of freight mobility along freight corridors of region-wide (greater than city-wide) significance.	15
	b	Moderately benefits economic development, and the project is part of a general strategy identified in a City, State or AMATS study or plan as an economic development proposal having economic benefits OR moderately improves efficiency of freight mobility along freight corridors of region-wide (greater than city-wide) significance.	12
	c	Project has clear and substantial benefits to economic development OR provides clear and substantial improvements to freight mobility within the Anchorage Bowl.	9
	d	Minimally benefits economic development or freight mobility.	6
	e	No economic benefits or impact on freight mobility.	0
	f	Adversely affects economic development, neighborhood revitalization, or freight mobility.	-3
<b>5</b>	<b>Population Served</b>		
		Relative size of population that will directly benefit. Highest score if the facility will be used by high number of residents based on Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT).	Possible Total Points = 20
	a	Facility has existing or anticipated AADT over 30,000	20
	b	Facility has existing or anticipated AADT over 20,000.	16
	c	Facility has existing or anticipated AADT over 10,000.	12
	d	Facility has existing or anticipated AADT over 5,000.	9
	e	Facility has existing or anticipated AADT over 3,000	3
	f	Facility has existing or anticipated AADT over 1,000.	1
<b>6</b>	<b>Improves Quality of Life</b>		

PC Final Approved Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

		Improves quality of life by addressing problems such as flooding, noise pollution, crime, speeding, unsightliness, etc. Highest score if several significant problems are addressed.	Possible Total Points = 20
	a	Substantial and clearly identified improvement to quality of life is needed immediately and the improvement is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	20
	b	Major and clearly identified improvement to quality of life is needed within short term (3-year) and the improvement is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	16
	c	Major and clearly identified improvement to quality of life is needed within medium term (6-year) and the improvement is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	12
	d	Moderate improvement to quality of life with anticipated need within medium term (6-year) and the improvement is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	6
	e	Should provide some quality of life benefit.	3
	f	The project adversely affects quality of life more than it improves it	-3
<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.	Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Significant and documented support from Community Councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials, appointed bodies and from responsible local or state agencies and support is significantly greater than opposition. (5 of 5 groups supportive)	15
	b	Significant support from Community Councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials, appointed bodies and from responsible local or state agencies and support is significantly greater than opposition. (4 of 5 groups supportive)	12
	c	Moderate support from Community Councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials, appointed bodies or from responsible local or state agencies and support is greater than opposition. (3 of 5 groups supportive)	9
	d	Mixed support from Community Councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials, appointed bodies or from responsible local or state agencies and support is greater than opposition. (2 of 5 groups supportive)	6
	e	Some support from Community Councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials, appointed bodies or from responsible local or state agencies and support is greater than opposition. (1 of 5 groups supportive)	3
	f	Strong and overwhelming opposition is documented.	-3
<b>8</b>	<b>Consistency with Adopted Plan</b>		
		Implements existing adopted plans. Highest score if the project is consistent with adopted plans including the Comprehensive Plan, the LRTP, the OS&HP, Pavement Management System Recommendation, Trails Plan, Drainage Studies, Freight Mobility Study, Adopted TIP or CIP, etc.	Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Included in LRTP and/or Comprehensive Plan as a short range priority, and consistent with other adopted plans.	15
	b	Included in LRTP and/or Comprehensive Plan, consistent with another plan, and a medium priority of owner.	12
	c	Included in OS&HP, consistent with another plan, and a short term (3-year) priority of owner.	9
	d	Included in OS&HP, consistent with another plan, and a medium term (6-	6

PC Final Approved Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

		year) priority of owner.	
	e	Included in OS&HP or a major local road that is a medium term (6-year) priority of owner.	3
<b>9</b>	<b>Improves Roadway Connectivity</b>		
		Promotes access and circulation needs by constructing missing road links. Highest score if project provides significant roadway connections between large segments of the city such as downtown to midtown, etc.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Provides significant roadway connections between large segments of the city such as Downtown to Midtown.	10
	b	Provides needed roadway connections between neighborhoods.	7
	c	Provides needed roadway connections within neighborhoods.	4
	d	Provides some connectivity benefit.	1
<b>10</b>	<b>Intermodal/Multimodal Characteristics</b>		
		Promotes intermodal or multimodal use of the transportation system.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Includes significant multimodal links (transit, bike, pedestrian facilities) or significantly improves access to Port of Anchorage, ARRC rail terminal at Ship Creek or Anchorage International Airport, and improvements are needed immediately.	10
	b	Includes moderate multimodal links (transit, bike, pedestrian facilities) or moderately improves access to Port of Anchorage, ARRC rail terminal at Ship Creek or Anchorage International Airport, and improvements are needed.	7
	c	Includes minimal multimodal or intermodal improvements.	4
	d	Includes no multimodal or intermodal improvements.	0
<b>11</b>	<b>Functional Class in OS&amp;HP</b>		
		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.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Identified as a Freeway or Expressway in OS&HP	10
	b	Identified as an Major Arterial in OS&HP	7
	c	Identified as a Minor Arterial in OS&HP	4
	d	Identified as a Collector in OS&HP	1
<b>12</b>	<b>Operation and Maintenance Budget Impact</b>		
		Reduces O&M Costs. Highest score if the project will notably reduce costs to operate and maintain the facility.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Significantly reduces existing O&M Costs and addressing O&M budget increases is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	10
	b	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
	c	Moderately reduces existing or projected O&M Costs and addressing O&M budget increases is a major element of the project cost or purpose.	4

PC Final Approved Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

	d	Some O&M budget reduction is anticipated.	1
	e	The project will notably increase O&M budget.	-3
<b>13</b>	<b>Funding Efficiency</b>		
		Encourages pursuit of additional non-AMATS/non-bond matching funds (i.e. CBERRRSA mill levy, ADEC Matching Grants, Federal Earmarks, etc.) for capital projects and discourages loss of funding due to expenditure time-traps. Highest score if non-AMATS/non-bond matching funds for over 50% of the project is reasonably certain or if time-trap regulations indicate funding is required immediately.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Non-AMATS/non-bond matching funds for over 50% of the project are certain or time-trap regulations indicate funding is required immediately.	10
	b	Non-AMATS/non-bond matching funds for over 30% of the project are reasonably certain or time-trap regulations indicate funding is required in the short term (3-year).	7
	c	Non-AMATS/non-bond matching funds for over 10% of the project are probable.	4
	d	Matching funds are possible.	1
<b>14</b>	<b>Cost/Benefit Value</b>		
		Project is cost effective. Highest score if completed design work demonstrates the project is clearly buildable with a comparably low cost or if there is a calculated score of 5 or above using the Benefit Cost Formula = $[(\text{Project cost (in thousands)} / \text{Length [in miles (minimum length 1 mile)]}) / \text{existing ADT or projected ADT in 1st year of operation}]$ .	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Completed design efforts clearly indicate the project is buildable and the costs are low for the benefit received or calculated score of \$0.5/VMDT or less. Clear value.	10
	b	Ongoing design efforts indicate that the project is buildable and the costs are probably reasonable for the benefit received or calculated score of \$1.0/VMDT or less. Probable value.	7
	c	Field Investigation indicates that the project is probably buildable and benefits seem reasonable for the cost or calculated score of \$2.0/VMDT or less. Possible value.	4
	d	Project appears to have value relative to cost or calculated score of \$2.0/VMDT or less.	1
	e	Project is technically difficult to build and cost is very high for the benefit or calculated score of \$5.0/VMDT or less.	-3
	f	Project is technically difficult to build and cost is very high for the benefit or calculated score of \$7.0/VMDT or less.	-5
<b>15</b>	<b>Neighborhood Integrity</b>		
		Project promotes or revitalizes neighborhood integrity. Highest score if project improves neighborhood integrity.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Improves neighborhood integrity.	10
	b	Affects on neighborhood integrity are insignificant.	7
	c	Negatively impacts neighborhood integrity	-3
<b>16</b>	<b>Environmental Approval Readiness</b>		

PC Final Approved Roadway and Safety Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

			Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Environmental approval likely with categorical exclusion.	15
	b	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment, or draft document circulated.	7
	c	Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Impact Statement.	0
	d	Environmental approval unlikely.	-15
	c	Negatively impacts neighborhood integrity	-3