

TAP

Criteria Guidance



ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & PUBLIC FACILITIES
DIVISION OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & STATEWIDE PLANNING

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| CRITERIA GUIDANCE | 2 |
| PEB Scoring | 2 |
| Criteria | 2 |
| Health & Quality of Life..... | 2 |
| Safety | 3 |
| Match Contribution..... | 3 |
| M&O Costs | 4 |
| Public Support..... | 5 |
| Bridges Gaps or Removes Barriers..... | 5 |
| Tied to an Event | 6 |
| Intrinsic Qualities | 6 |
| Historic Transportation Facility..... | 6 |
| Capital Cost & Project Delivery | 7 |
| Other Factors | 7 |
| Criteria Weights | 8 |

CRITERIA GUIDANCE

This document is intended for both the Project Evaluation Board (PEB) and the communities nominating a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) project. This document can also be used for further clarification of the scoring criteria tables provided in the application.

PEB Scoring

PEB members shall refer to this document when scoring project nominations to aid in consistent and fair scores.

If the project information is missing for a category, not explained, or ambiguous the PEB member may decide to select 0 points.

If a project includes multiple facilities, each will be scored separately and then averaged for ONLY select criteria. For example, a project with three separate trail projects will get a single score for Health & Quality of Life but will receive a score for each trail and then averaged for the Safety criteria. Criteria to be scored separately and then averaged include the following: Safety, M&O Costs, Bridge Gaps, Intrinsic Qualities, Historic Transportation, and Capital Costs.

Criteria

Health & Quality of Life

Health & Quality of Life is a 'holistic' focus in the following areas: improves access to multiple modes of travel such as active transportation and transit, provides or improves access to everyday destinations, key facilities and recreational opportunities, improves social equity, improves air quality, removes impacts to environment, enhances neighborhood continuity, increases community cohesion and connects communities.

The definition of a measurable contribution to health & quality of life may include: the number and type of facilities accessible by a new active transportation facility or improved infrastructure, an estimated reduction of vehicle use (due to increased bike and pedestrian activity), a measure of improving health of a stream or wildlife habitat along a road, an estimated number of residents connected by a new active transportation facility, a measure of demographically diverse or disadvantaged persons able to use and access the new or improved infrastructure, etc.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (1) | (0) |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1. Health & Quality of Life | This project provides a significant (addresses 3 or more areas in the definition) measurable contribution to improved health & quality of life. | This project provides a moderate (addresses 2 areas in the definition) measurable contribution to improved health & quality of life. | This project provides a minor (addresses 1 area in the definition) measurable contribution to health & quality of life. | The project lacks any type of measurable contribution to health & quality of life. |

Safety

Prior crash history (vehicle to pedestrian, pedestrian to bicycle, etc.) may be used to support mitigating measures. Crash data is available from [Alaska Highway Safety Office](#), Crash Data Manager. If data is unavailable, other crash data may come from authoritative sources such as local care facilities or clinics, emergency response agencies or public documented materials.

If no crash data exists applications shall include documented crash potential or risk and/or include how the improvement addresses a documented emphasis area in the SHSP or other plans as listed above.

Crash data for other locations, other than the project location will **not** be accepted as a documented history of crashes.

A project may meet a documented strategy in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), a community/tribal highway safety plan or is addressed in a public transportation plan as a safety concern.

Communities proposing new facilities shall address the safety design standards and how the project proposes crash mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues. The [Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse](#) can be used to determine and provide guidance on safety design standards and crash mitigation applications. A CMF is a multiplicative factor that indicates the proportion of crashes that would be expected after implementing a countermeasure. Examples of countermeasures include increase bike lane width, install separated bike lanes, install sidewalk barrier, installing a raised island for cyclists, adding crosswalks, etc.

For “new facilities” maximum points is 3 where the project must emphasize safety design standards that mitigate crashes. If project does not emphasize the safety design standards or they are minimal the maximum point is 1.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (4-5) | (3) | (0) |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| 2. Safety | This project meets three of the following (5 pts) or two of the following (4 pts): A) a documented history of crashes, crash potential and risk; B) a documented strategy in the SHSP or other documented safety plans as listed; C) proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice by safety & design engineers to address safety issues. | This project meets one of the following: A) a documented history of crashes, crash potential and risk; B) a documented strategy in the SHSP or other documented safety plans as listed; C) proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice by safety & design engineers to address safety issues. For new facilities (max. 3 pts) the project must emphasize safety design standards that mitigate crashes. | No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential. No demonstrated traffic conflicts between modes. For new roads, the project minimally emphasizes or does not emphasize safety design standards recognized in professional practice to mitigate crashes. |

Match Contribution

The required match (9.03%) is based on the DOT&PF engineer’s estimate, not the project sponsor’s estimate. Contributions that exceed the required match per DOT&PF match policy 09.01.040 shall be considered for 3-5 additional points.

Example 1: City has committed to a contribution \$40,000 or 30.76% of the total project cost (\$130,000). Contribution is 21.73% more than the federal aid match minimum (9.03%). Project nomination receives 5 points.

A resolution is **required** for communities represented by a local governing body of the community or tribal government at the time of the nomination. For those communities not represented by a locally elected body, a public record of support is required. Cost estimates must be prepared or approved by DOT&PF.

In-kind match is acceptable but must be approved by DOT&PF.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (4-5) | (2-3) | (0) |
|---|--|---|--|
| 3. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs. | Contribution of cash based on DOT&PF approved estimate is above the minimum required federal aid match commitment of 9.03%. Contribution of cash is >10 - 15% (4 pts) and >15% (5pts). | Contribution of cash based on DOT&PF approved estimate is above the minimum required federal aid match commitment of 9.03%. Contribution of cash is 1 - 5% (2pts) and >5 - 10% (3pts) | Contribution covers no contribution beyond required federal aid match commitment of 9.03%. |

M&O Costs

Projects will be scored by one of two criteria depending on sponsorship: 1) non-DOT&PF facilities; Or 2) DOT&PF facilities. For non-DOT&PF facilities, commitment to continue ownership and operation of a locally-owned facility is required.

A resolution is **required** for communities represented by a local governing body of the community or tribal government at the time of the nomination. For those communities not represented by a locally elected body, a public record of support is required.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (0) |
|--|--|---|--|
| 4a. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&O costs (For non-DOT&PF facilities). | Sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility for a new facility. | Continued sponsor ownership and operation of locally-owned facility and results in local maintenance savings. | Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility. |

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (0) |
|--|---|---|------------|
| 4b. Departmental M&O costs and priority (For DOT&PF facilities). | A project that results in a 100% transfer of ownership/management responsibility, maintenance and operations to a local government. | A project that results in a less than 100% transfer of ownership and/or maintenance and operations to a local government. | No change. |

Public Support

A resolution is **required** for communities represented by a local governing body of the community or tribal government at the time of the nomination. For those communities not represented by a locally elected body, a “strong” public record of support is required where a large portion of population served by the facility (>50%) is supportive of the project.

Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and similar lists adopted by resolution will be considered as a resolution. Any document the sponsor would like to have considered as a ‘plan’ must include documentation of public involvement.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (1) | (0) |
|-------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 5. Public support | This project meets all of the following: A) includes resolution or strong public record of support; B) is identified as a high priority project in state, tribal, or local plans. | This project meets one of the following: A) includes resolution or strong public record of support; B) is identified as a high priority project in state, tribal, or local plans. | This project has some support but is not identified as a high priority. | No resolution or public record of support or project is not identified in state, tribal or local plans. |

Bridges Gaps or Removes Barriers

Projects that bridge the gap, or remove barriers, and/or provide interpretive area or rest area continuity will receive higher points. Projects that include access to historically disadvantaged communities in addition to bridging gaps or removing barriers or providing interpretive area or rest area continuity will receive a full 5 points.

For information and maps on historically disadvantaged communities see:

<https://usdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/d6f90dfcc8b44525b04c7ce748a3674a>

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (1) | (0) |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| 6. Project bridges gaps or removes barrier between existing trail systems or provides interpretive area or rest area continuity. | Project removes a barrier or bridges a gap or provides interpretive area or rest area continuity, AND is located in a historically disadvantaged communities. | Project removes a barrier or bridges a gap or provides interpretive area or rest area continuity. | Project adds value for other reasons. | Project does not bridge gaps, remove barriers or provide interpretive area or rest area continuity. |

Tied to an Event

Projects that support a specific event or activity will receive points. A resolution is **required** for communities represented by a local governing body of the community or tribal government at the time of the nomination. For those communities not represented by a locally elected body, a public record of support is required.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (1) | (0) |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|--|
| 7. Project is tied to an annual recreational, educational or tourism event or activity, and the public's support of that event. | Event or activity is of statewide or regional significance. | Event or activity is local and well known | Event is minor and local. | Project is not tied to an event or activity. |

Intrinsic Qualities

Projects with intrinsic qualities such as scenic, historic, cultural, natural, archaeological, or recreational qualities will receive points. Projects that include interpretive features (Ex. interpretive signs or designs) receive 5 points. Projects that includes intrinsic qualities that are public supported by way of resolution or public record of support receives 3 points. Projects that support intrinsic qualities but don't provide interpretive features or that don't have a resolution or public record of support will receive 1 point.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (1) | (0) |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 8. Project has intrinsic qualities such as scenic, historic, cultural, natural, archaeological, or recreational. | This project includes interpretive features of intrinsic qualities. | This project includes intrinsic qualities that are publicly supported at a statewide, regional or community level. | This project supports intrinsic qualities. | Project does not include intrinsic qualities. |

Historic Transportation Facility

Projects that include stabilization or renovation of a historic transportation facility will receive points.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3-4) | (0) |
|--|---|--|--|
| 9. Project includes stabilization or renovation of a historic transportation facility | Nomination includes letter or other documentation of inclusion of the renovated property on the National Historic Register or provides interpretation | Nomination includes letter of support from Office of History & Archeology that declares the property to be of significant (4 pts), or of moderate (3 pts) historical importance or provides interpretation | Project does not include stabilization or renovation of a historic property or interpretation. |

Capital Cost

Projects that entail no right-of-way, utilities and environmental factors will score higher than those with some or significant factors. Significant factors might include the need to secure ROW or utilities or having to go through environmental impact or assessment procedures.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (0) |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| 11. Capital Cost | Project not anticipated to involve ROW, utilities and environmental factors. | This project is anticipated to involve some ROW, utilities and/or environmental factors. | Project is anticipated to involve significant ROW, utilities and/or environmental factors. |

Other Factors

Other factors include projects that include innovation, creativity, or unique benefits not otherwise rated, such as partnerships to support funding or infrastructure improvements. Some examples include partnering with a local entity that pays for a bike lane, or sponsors a scenic overlook.

Criteria Scoring:

| Proposed Standard | (5) | (3) | (1) | (0) |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 12. Other Factors | This project includes more than two innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. | This project includes two innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. | This project includes one innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefit not otherwise rated. | Project exhibits no innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. |

Criteria Weights

| TAP STANDARD | Weight |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Tied to Event | 3% |
| Intrinsic Qualities | 3% |
| Capital Cost | 5% |
| Other Factors | 5% |
| M&O Costs | 5% |
| Historic Transportation | 10% |
| Public Support | 12% |
| Bridges Gaps or Removes Barriers | 12% |
| Contribution | 15% |
| Health & Quality of Life | 15% |
| Safety | 15% |