



**2018 to 2021
Community Transportation Program
Project Evaluation Criteria**

**Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
(DOT&PF)
Division of Statewide Planning and Program Development**

**DRAFT
June 2017**

Fiscal Uncertainty

Fiscal uncertainty in the federal-aid program and state funding is driving ADOT&PF to make very conservative funding projections into the near future. It also drives the ADOT&PF to narrow its focus rather than make sweeping change to the scoring criteria.

Unlike other states Alaska does not have taxes or fees dedicated to transportation needs. The consequence is a dependence on federal-aid to fund Alaska's transportation needs. This dependence makes Alaska especially sensitive to changes in federal – aid transportation funding. Historically federal transportation bills are not funded beyond five years and often require several extensions or the passage of a new bill to keep funding in place.

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act into law—the first federal law in over a decade to provide long-term funding certainty for surface transportation infrastructure planning and investment. The FAST Act authorizes \$305 billion over fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for highway, highway and motor vehicle safety, public transportation, motor carrier safety, hazardous materials safety, rail, and research, technology, and statistics programs. Funding beyond 2020 will require another transportation bill be enacted or the current one to be extended.

On the state level there is much uncertainty about the future of funding for transportation projects. The state is currently trying to fill a budget gap and funding for any new capital projects is at a minimum. Many communities are feeling the pressure to do more with less. The criteria recognizes the burden being placed on local communities and attempts to account for those projects whose match are over and beyond the minimum required as well as recognizing the role of operations and maintenance.

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
	Scoring Criteria			
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
<p>1. Economic benefits if not new mode or facility.</p> <p>Weighting: 1</p>	<p>Endorsed in an economic development plan by a public entity and provides new direct access to a community resource.</p>	<p>Identified in an economic development plan by a public entity; or provides new or improved access to an important community resource.</p>	<p>Supports minimal, speculative, or temporary economic opportunities; or benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Economic benefits analysis in 1 shall not consider benefits due to project construction.</i></p>				
<p>2. Health and quality of life (for example air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities)</p> <p>Weighting: 2</p>	<p>This project provides a measureable significant contribution to improved health or quality of life; or reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.</p>	<p>This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life; or reduces or removes an existing negative factor.</p>	<p>Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.</p>	<p>This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.</p>

**2018 – 2021
STIP Project Scoring Criteria Draft**

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
	Scoring Criteria			
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
<p>3. Safety. Meets goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</p> <p>5 Year Safety Historical Concentrations</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) severe crashes on a segment or intersection with a 5-year crash rate exceeding the statewide average; B) a long term pattern of fatal or major (incapacitating) injury accidents; C) a documented high accident potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic; or D) HSIP* costs/mile of project length within top 15% concentration of all crash sites based on HSIP costs.</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) A minor injury or property damage crashes on a segment or intersection with a 5-year crash rate exceeding the statewide average; or B) Anecdotal evidence of traffic conflicts between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic; or C) HSIP costs/mile of project length within top 25% of concentration of all crash sites based on HSIP costs.</p>	<p>No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential in other categories:</p> <p>A) crashes on the project's segments or intersections have a crash rate below the statewide average. B) Historical crash patterns identified are less than 3 or more crashes per year. C) No demonstrated traffic conflicts between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic. D) HSIP costs/mile of project length is above average concentration of all crash sites based on HSIP costs.</p>	<p>Proposes features which are recognized in practice to worsen highway safety such as a project that:</p> <p>A) would be contrary to a strategy of the SHSP in a significant manner; or B) Proposes other work that is viewed as contrary to producing a safer roadway environment for motorized or non-motorized users.</p>
<p><i>Minimum latest available 10 year record. When using anecdotal crash information from first hand (EMS, Fire, Police, M&O - on-scene responsibility) = maximum score is 4 points. When using anecdotal safety information from second-hand sources (not on-scene responsibility) or data not recognized in practice = maximum score 2 points.</i></p> <p><i>*Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</i></p>				
<p>4. Improves intermodal transportation or lessens redundant facilities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment or significantly reduce operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or significantly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p>	<p>May reduce the need for capital investments and /or result in a reduction in operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p>	<p>Does not impact other mode or adjacent facility requirements.</p>	<p>Will increase demand on another mode or facility requiring additional capital expenditure; or a new increase in operating cost.</p>

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs. Weighting: 5	Contribution of cash matching funds: .2 pt per each 1% of project cost in excess of the required federal aid match.		Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A
<i>Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. An official DOT cost estimate is required. DOT sponsored projects will not exceed the minimum match. See official match policy.</i>				
6a. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&O costs. (For non-DOT&PF sponsored projects.) Weighting: 5	Sponsor will assume ownership and management responsibility if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Continued sponsor ownership and management responsibility of locally owned facility and community currently assumes management responsibility for all roads functionally classed minor collector and below (3pts) Or responsibility for all roads functionally classed Local (2pts)	Sponsor assumes ownership and management responsibility of proposed or existing locally owned facility=0pt	Project would increase M&O costs significantly.
<i>Sponsor commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned.</i>				
6b. Departmental M&O costs and priority (For DOT&PF sponsored projects.) Weighting: 0 or 5	Significant M&O priority.	Moderate M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.

**2018 – 2021
STIP Project Scoring Criteria Draft**

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
	Scoring Criteria			
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
7. Public support Weighting: 3	Project has a resolution of support from the local elected body or a public record of support for a project located in an area not represented by a locally elected body AND is identified as a high priority project in state, tribal, or local plans.	Project has a resolution of support from local elected body; and supported in official state, tribal, or local plans or; There is a public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough	Project has resolution of support from local elected body.	No resolution of support from Local elected body Or There is no public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough
<i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i>				
8. Environmental approval readiness? Weighting: 2	Environmental approval complete; or Environmental approval likely with a categorical exclusion document.	Environmental approval likely with Assessment	or Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval unlikely.
Environmental documentation must follow FHWA guidelines as explained in explained in federal regulations.				
9. System Reliability. or deficient width/grade/alignment (w/g/a). Weighting: 4	Primarily an Asset Management Rehabilitation project on a state route; or a state route with significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards impacting system reliability and congestion reduction. 4 points if not state owned.	A portion of the project rehabilitates subgrade, appurtenances or other infrastructure such as sidewalks, etc.; or moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Primarily major reconstruction; addresses long-range rehabilitation and No w/g/a deficiencies.	N/A
<i>For projects which address a situation where there is a traffic demand that is significantly (or moderately) in excess of the number of existing lanes will be considered to have significantly (or moderately) deficient w/g/a relative to standards.</i>				

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
	Scoring Criteria			
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
10. Cost Effectiveness using Cost, length, AADT evaluation. Divide project cost (in thousands) by length (miles) and further divide result by Average Annual Daily Traffic. Weighting: 5	\$0 - \$1.50 = 5 \$ 1.50 - \$ 3.00 = 4	\$ 3.00 - \$ 4.50 = 3 \$ 4.50 - \$6.00 = 2 \$ 6.00 - 8.00 = 1	\$ 8.00 - \$ 10.00 = 0	\$10.00 - \$20.00 = -1 \$20.00 – 40.00 = -2 >\$40.00 = -3
<i>Stand along bridge projects use assumed length of 1 mile; stand alone intersection projects use assumed length of ½ mile.</i>				
11. Deficient bridges? Weighting: 4	Bridge needs to be replaced. At the end of service life and structurally deficient. Two or more bridge ratings are deficient (4 or less).	Structurally deficient. At least one bridge rating is deficient (4 or less).	+1 point if project addresses a functionally obsolete bridge.	N/A
12. Functional class. Weighting: 5	Minor Arterial = 5 +1 point if Principle Arterial, NHPP, or Interstate +1 point if located on designated freight route.	Major Collector =3 Minor Collector =2	Local Roads/Streets or Unclassified	
13. Other factors not specified. Weighting: 2	Project exhibits significant innovation creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation creativity or unique benefits not otherwise noted.	Project exhibits no innovation creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	

**2018 – 2021
STIP Project Scoring Criteria Draft**

Remote Projects Criteria				
Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
1. Economic benefits Weighting: 2	Endorsed in an economic development plan by a public entity and provides new direct access to a community resource.	Identified in an economic development plan by a public entity; or provides new or improved access to an important community resource.	Supports minimal, speculative, or temporary economic opportunities; or benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity.	N/A
<i>Economic benefits analysis in 1 shall not consider benefits due to project construction.</i>				
2. Health and quality of life (for example Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities) Weighting: 4	This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life; or reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.	This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life; or reduces or removes an existing negative factor.	Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.	This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
<i>Examples: Access to basic sanitation = 5; dust control = 4; access to medical facility = 3.</i>				

Remote Projects Criteria				
Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
<p>3. Safety. Meets goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</p> <p>5 Year Safety Historical Concentrations</p> <p>Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) severe crashes on a segment or intersection with a 5-year crash rate exceeding the statewide average; B) a long term pattern of fatal or major (incapacitating) injury accidents; C) a documented high accident potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic; or D) HSIP* costs/mile of project length within top 15% concentration of all crash sites based on HSIP costs.</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) A minor injury or property damage crashes on a segment or intersection with a 5-year crash rate exceeding the statewide average; B) Anecdotal evidence of traffic conflicts between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic; or C) HSIP costs/mile of project length within top 25% of concentration of all crash sites based on HSIP costs.</p>	<p>No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential in other categories:</p> <p>A) crashes on the project's segments or intersections have a crash rate below the statewide average. B) Historical crash patterns identified are less than 3 or more crashes per year. C) No demonstrated traffic conflicts between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic. D) HSIP costs/mile of project length is above average concentration of all crash sites based on HSIP costs.</p>	<p>Proposes features which are recognized in practice to worsen highway safety such as a project that:</p> <p>A) would be contrary to a strategy of the SHSP in a significant manner; or B) Proposes other work that is viewed as contrary to producing a safer roadway environment for motorized or non-motorized users.</p>
<p><i>Minimum latest available 10 year record. When using anecdotal crash information from first hand (EMS, Fire, Police, M&O - on-scene responsibility) = maximum score is 4 points. When using anecdotal safety information from second-hand sources (not on-scene responsibility) or data not recognized in practice = maximum score 2 points.</i></p> <p><i>*Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</i></p>				

**2018 – 2021
STIP Project Scoring Criteria Draft**

Remote Projects Criteria				
Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
<p>4. Improves intermodal transportation or lessens redundant facilities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment or significantly reduce operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or significantly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p>	<p>May reduce the need for capital investments and /or result in a reduction in operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p>	<p>Does not impact other mode or adjacent facility requirements.</p>	<p>Will increase demand on another mode or facility requiring additional capital expenditure; or a new increase in operating cost</p>
<p>5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds: .2 pt per each 1% of project cost in excess of the required federal aid match.</p>		<p>Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. An official DOT cost estimate is required. DOT sponsored projects will not exceed the minimum match. See official match policy.</i></p>				

**2018 – 2021
STIP Project Scoring Criteria Draft**

Remote Projects Criteria				
Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
<p>7. Public support.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 3</p>	<p>Project has a resolution of support from the local elected body or a public record of support for a project located in an area not represented by a locally elected body and is identified as a high priority project in state, tribal, or local plans.</p>	<p>Project has a resolution of support from local elected body a public record of support for a project located in an area not represented by a locally elected body and nominally supported in official state, tribal, or local plans.</p>	<p>Project has resolution of support from local elected body or there is a public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</p>	<p>No resolution of support from Local elected body and no public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough</p>
<p><i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i></p>				
<p>8. Environmental approval readiness</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Environmental approval complete; or Environmental approval likely with a categorical exclusion document.</p>	<p>Environmental approval likely with Assessment</p>	<p>or Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Environmental approval unlikely.</p>
<p>Environmental documentation must follow FHWA guidelines as explained in explained in federal regulations.</p>				
<p>9. Will project provide new and/or improved access to the noted uses: ferry terminals, airports, subsistence sites, or river/ocean access? Weighting: 2</p>	<p>New access to two or more uses = 5.</p>	<p>New access to one = 3; Improved access to two or more = 2; Improved access to one of listed uses = 1.</p>	<p>None of uses listed.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Remote Projects Criteria				
Scoring Criteria				
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)
10. System preservation and Bridges Weighting: 4	Major purpose of project is to extend the life of existing facility by 10 or more years. Bridge needs to be replaced. At the end of service life and structurally deficient. Two or more bridge ratings are deficient (4 or less).	Secondary purpose of project is to extend life of existing facility by 10 or more years. Structurally deficient. At least one bridge rating is deficient (4 or less).	Preservation is not significant purpose of the project. +1 point if project addresses a functionally obsolete bridge.	N/A
11. Is this a joint project coordinated with ADEC, BIA, ANTHC, or similar state or federal agency? Weighting: 4	N/A	Yes	No.	N/A
Must provide written letter or MOU showing commitment and coordination.				
12. Cost Effectiveness: Total project cost/persons whom facility provides essential services & benefits described in Criteria 1,2,3,4 or 9 Weighting: 5	5pts – If per capita cost is \$5,000 or less 4pts – If per capita cost is \$5,001-\$7,500	3pts – If per capita cost is \$7,501 - \$10,000 2pts – If per capita cost \$10,001 - \$12,500 1pt – If per capita cost is \$12,501 - \$15,000	0pt – If per capita cost is \$15,001 - \$20,000	-1pt – If per capita cost is \$20,001 - \$25,000 -2pts – If per capita cost is \$25,001 - \$30,000 -3pts – If per capita cost is \$30,001 or more
13. Other factors not specified. Weighting: 2	Project exhibits significant innovation creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation creativity or unique benefits not otherwise noted.	Project exhibits no innovation creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	