

PC Final Transportation Enhancement Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

<b>1</b>	<b>Size of Area Served</b>		
		Relative size of population that will directly. Highest score if facility is used by a high number of residents.	Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Project located as to serve or benefit areawide users.	15
	b	Project located as to benefit an area that is less than areawide (example NE, NW, SE, SW with Tudor and Seward Highway as general boundaries).	12
	c	Project located as to benefit more than one community council, user group or purpose.	9
	d	Project located as to benefit one neighborhood.	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Preservation of Existing System</b>		
		Project preserves existing system. Highest score if project significantly preserves and existing facility.	Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Project significantly preserves an existing facility.	15
	b	Project expands the usefulness of existing facility.	12
	c	Project will help maintain the usefulness of existing facility.	9
	d	Project does not promote preservation of existing facility.	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Quality of Life</b>		
		Improves quality of life by addressing problems such as flooding, noise pollution, crime, unsightliness, etc. Highest score if several significant problems are addressed.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Project significantly contributes to health and quality of life by promoting or enhancing existing quality.	10
	b	Project moderately contributes to health and quality of life by improving existing quality of life.	6
	c	Project will have no effect on quality of life issues.	0
<b>3</b>	<b>Safety</b>		
		Promotes safe movement of pedestrians and bicyclists and implements the strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan aimed at reducing crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists. Highest score if project corrects documented pedestrian/ vehicle conflicts.	Possible Total Points = 20
	a	Project directly addresses actual multiple pedestrian and/or bicycle crashes, safety problems on corridor or intersection.	20
	b	Project directly addresses possible preventable pedestrian and/or bicycle crashes as demonstrated on similar facilities as identified through actual crashes.	15

PC Final Transportation Enhancement Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

	c	Project partially addresses pedestrian and/or bicycle patterns or conflicts which result in actual or potential crashes.	7
4	<b>Economic Benefits</b>		
		Encourages economic development, recreational, educational or tourism activity. Highest score if the project will promote long term enhancements on an areawide basis.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Project enhances a recreational, educational or tourism activity of a city wide or long standing basis.	10
	b	Project is tied to a recreational, educational or tourism activity OR has the potential to enhance property values.	6
	c	No commitment is perceived for operations and maintenance OR project is not a maintenance priority for sponsor.	0
5	<b>Project operations and maintenance commitment</b>		
		Commitment by project sponsor for O&M. Highest score if responsible agency commits to O&M on proposed project.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Project has commitment from responsible agency to operate and maintain proposed project OR project is a very high maintenance priority for sponsor.	10
	b	Project has a minimum level of maintenance.	6
	c	No commitment is perceived for operation and maintenance OR project is not a maintenance priority for sponsor.	0
6	<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 and 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 officials and support is significantly greater than opposition. (4 of 5 groups	12

PC Final Transportation Enhancement Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

		supportive).	
	c	Moderate support from community councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials and appointed bodies or from responsible local or state agencies and support is significantly greater than opposition. (3 of 5 groups supportive).	9
	d	Mixed support from community councils, affected stakeholders, elected officials and appointed bodies or from responsible local or state agencies and support is greater than opposition. (2 of 5 groups supportive).	3
	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).	1
	f	Strong and overwhelming opposition is documented.	-3
7	Consistency with Adopted Plan		
		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, Areawide Trails Plan, Bike Plan, Pedestrian 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 an immediate 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 (5 year) priority of owner.	6
	e	Included in OS&HP, or a major local road that is a medium term (6 year) priority of owner.	3
8	Multi-modal characteristics		
		Promotes multi-modal uses of transportation systems. Highest score if project includes significant multi-modal links.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Includes significant multi-modal links (transit, bike pedestrian facilities).	10
	b	Includes multi-modal links (transit, bike pedestrian facilities).	6

PC Final Transportation Enhancement Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

	c	Includes minimal multi-modal links.	2
	d	No multi-modal improvements are included.	0
9	Aesthetic Considerations		
		Project provides landscaping improvements that have a high positive visual impact. Highest score if project provides high positive impact landscaping.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Project will provide landscaping of high positive visual impact.	10
	b	Project will provide positive impact for landscaping.	6
10	Project co-funding efficiency		
		Project co-funding or leveraging other resources. Highest score if co-funded by responsible agency greater than 25% of total estimated project cost.	Possible Total Points = 10
	a	Project is co-funded by responsible or other agency. Greater than 25% of total estimated project cost .	10
	b	Project is co-funded by responsible or other agency. Greater than 25 – 16% of total estimated project cost.	8
	c	Project is co-funded by responsible or other agency. Greater than 15 -11% of total estimated project cost.	6
	d	Project is co-funded by responsible or other agency. Greater than 10 – 6% of total estimated project cost.	4
	e	Project is co-funded by responsible or other agency. Greater than 5 - 1% of total estimated project cost.	2
11	Connectivity		
		Project provides pathway or sidewalk connections by constructing missing links. Highest score if new connections are made between large segments of city.	Possible Total Points = 15
	a	Provides significant pathway or sidewalk connections between large segments of the city such as downtown to midtown, etc.	15
	b	Provides pathway or sidewalk connections <b>between</b> neighborhoods or community council areas.	9
	c	Provides pathway or sidewalk connections <b>within a</b> neighborhood or community council area.	3
	d	Isolated section of new pathway or sidewalk.	0
12	Cost/ Benefit		
		Relative benefit/ cost provides most benefit to cost. Highest score if project provides improvement not	Possible Total Points = 15

PC Final Transportation Enhancement Project Evaluation Criteria  
Expanded Scoring Methodology  
2010-2013 TIP

		currently available at reasonable cost.	
a		Provides a facility or improvement not currently available at a cost reasonable to public use.	15
b		Significantly improves upon or expands the level of service or number of facilities available to the public but at a cost higher than Category A projects.	9
c		Moderately improves upon or expands the level of service or number of facilities available to public while costing a large amount.	3
d		No change in the level of service or number of facilities to public.	-3