

PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised October 1, 2010)
AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. Safety Weighting: 5	Substantially increases safety	Moderately increases safety	Maintains Status Quo	N/A	N/A
2. Health & Quality of Life (Access to Basic Necessities) Weighting: 4	Provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life	Provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life	Has no effect either positive or negative on health/quality of life issues	N/A	N/A
3. Economic Benefits Weighting: 3	Provides significant permanent economic opportunities or benefits statewide or interstate. A formal economic evaluation is required.	Provides moderate identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits regionally or locally	Maintains Status Quo	N/A	N/A
4. Community Support Weighting: 2	Community Public record and state/local plans fully support project. A supporting resolution from local government is required for Community class airports. Local Sponsors receive 5 points, if a supporting resolution has been submitted confirming sponsorship.	Majority of public record supports the project. Nominally supported in official state/local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented towards the project	Majority of public record opposes the project. Not supported in official state/local plans.	Abundance of public record opposes the project. Opposing resolution from local elected body. Contradicts official state/local plans.
5. Community M&O Contribution Weighting: 5	Local government assumes ownership of facility, including M&O responsibilities and federal grant obligations	Local government assumes full M&O responsibility of facility	Local government assumes no new responsibilities or cost	N/A	N/A

**PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised October 1, 2010)
AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
6. Local Capital Contribution Weighting: 5	Contribution of state match, design, ROW, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5% of project cost. All Local Sponsors receive at least 1 point.	Contribution of state match, design, ROW, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5% of project cost. All Local Sponsors receive at least 1 point.	Provides no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
7. Maintenance & Operations Weighting: 4	Very High M&O priority	Moderate M&O priority	Not an M&O priority	N/A	N/A
8. Security / Certification (Certified Airports Only) Weighting: 5	Corrects deficiencies to meet minimum requirements		No affect on security/certification	N/A	N/A
9. Aviation Alternatives Weighting: 3	N/A	N/A	No access to other public aviation facilities	Moderate facility redundancy with access to another public airport	Substantial facility redundancy with access to another public airport
10. Community Transportation Alternatives Weighting: 4	No other transportation alternatives available	Transportation alternatives available. See Note #1.	Transportation alternatives available. See Note #1.	Other alternatives may provide comparable transportation benefits	Other alternatives will provide superior transportation benefits
Note #1: Under Criteria 10, all season road access available to the contiguous highway system or to an alternative airport = 0. Seasonal road access available to the contiguous highway system or to an alternative airport = 2. All season ferry/barge service available =1. Seasonal ferry/barge service frequency: Weekly or more frequent service = 2; Less frequent than weekly but more frequently than monthly service = 3; Less frequently than monthly service = 4.					

**PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised October 1, 2010)
AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
11. Runway Length Extension to Meet 3,300' Statewide Standard for Community Airports Weighting: 5	Existing runway is: less than 2,000 feet = 5 2,000 to 2,499' = 4 See Notes # 2, 3 & 4	Existing runway is: 2,500' to 2,999' = 3 Less than 3,200' = 1 See Notes # 2, 3 & 4	Existing runway is 3,200 feet or greater = 0 See Notes # 2, 3 & 4	NIA	N/A
<p>Note # 2: For airports with existing runways less than 3,000' that do NOT otherwise receive any points under Criteria 11, projects which install runway edge lighting receive 1 point and projects which resurface the runway receive 1 point.</p> <p>Note # 3: For cross wind runway projects, see Criteria Guidance.</p> <p>Note #4: For airport relocation project evaluations, the runway lengths evaluated will be the existing airport runway lengths on the airport proposed for relocation.</p>					
12. Airport Surface Condition Weighting: 5	For gravel surfaces -- Improves poor / failing airport surface to all-weather capability For paved surfaces -- See Criteria Guidance for appropriate raw scores	For gravel surfaces -- Airport surface condition is servicable but needs improvement For paved surfaces -- See Criteria Guidance for appropriate raw scores	For gravel surfaces -- Airport surface condition is good For paved surfaces -- See Criteria Guidance for appropriate raw scores	NIA	N/A
13. Avigation Hazards: Trees in approach; Aircraft in Safety Area; Severe Xwinds/Turbulence; Wildlife Hazards Weighting: 2	Corrects significant hazards	Corrects minor hazards	Maintains Status Quo	N/A	N/A
14. Erosion/ Flooding Weighting: 4	Alleviates immediate threat to airport	Addresses problem needing attention	Maintains Status Quo	N/A	N/A

PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised October 1, 2010)
AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
15. Other Factors Not Previously Evaluated Weighting: 4	Project shows significant innovation or unique benefits not previously evaluated	Project shows moderate innovation or unique benefits not previously evaluated	All project ranking factors previously evaluated	N/A	N/A

Cost Effectiveness Criterion

16. Cost Effectiveness: This criterion applies to Community Class or Local Class airports. It also applies to any Regional Class airport that is neither a Primary airport nor a Part 139 certified airport. It does not apply to those Regional Class airports that are either Primary airports or Part 139 certified airports, since these airports are assumed to serve a larger population than a single community. Airport Improvement projects that are expensive relative to the number of residents in the community served will be assessed negative points based on the following per capita expense ratios:

<u>Project Capital Cost per Permanent Year Around Resident</u>	<u>Raw Score</u>
\$50,000 or Less	0
Greater than \$50,000	-1
Greater than \$100,000	-2
Greater than \$150,000	-3
Greater than \$200,000	-4
Greater than \$250,000	-5
Greater than \$300,000	-6
Greater than \$350,000	-7
Greater than \$400,000	-8
Greater than \$450,000	-9
Greater than \$500,000	-10

The Criteria Weighting is **10**, in order to make this criterion meaningful relative to placement of high per capita cost projects in the Spending Plan.

In situations where the airport serves a role of statewide or regional importance, but has no or only a few permanent residents that it serves, a minimum population of 25 (or some other value) will be assigned for the purpose of calculating this criterion.