

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	0	General	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - The criteria should be geared towards an audience of applicants from the public/municipalities for them to submit strong project candidates. As written, many of the criteria appear to be geared to the scorer, rather than a community representative nominating a project.	6/26/2017	The criteria are intentionally written for the scorer. They are shared with the public in advance of a call for projects as an opportunity to influence the criteria by which projects will be scored. When the call for projects occurs, the Department will provide nomination materials geared to the applicants that clarify information needed from the project sponsor.
Urban/Rural and Remote	0	General	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Concern/Recommendation - Criteria do not support projects like signing, lighting, rehabilitation, reconstruction and other unique projects with benefits to a local community. Offer solution to have a couple of categories to rank more project appropriate criterion, such as weighting the "other factors" category higher to give scorers the opportunity to emphasize these unique projects.	6/26/2017	Signing, lighting, rehabilitation, and reconstruction potentially have elements that could improve safety, health and quality of life, and many other criteria that are meant to allocate points based on community benefit. These elements do not need to be specifically called out in the criteria for their benefits to be considered in those criteria that are most appropriate. Consideration is not limited to the "Other" criteria. The Department declines to provide a higher weight to the other factors standard.
Urban/Rural and Remote	0	General	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Use pavement condition data if the Department collects sufficient data for roads that would be under consideration for this CTP. If there is sufficient data to use, then recommend ranking roadways rated fair and poor higher than those rated good or failed. Commenter provides additional detail and examples.	6/22/2017	There is often not uniform statewide data available for lower functionally classed and/or locally owned roads, therefore the scoring of projects would be inconsistent. Also the Community Transportation Program is not meant to serve as a pavement management system and many of the nominated projects have traditionally had proposed scopes that are greater than simple repaving efforts. The Department declines to use pavement condition data for this program.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural	0	General	General	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Define Urban/Rural to ensure communities use correct criterion set	6/13/2017	17 AAC 05.175 (c) states that "communities not connected to the continental road network by road or ferry" will utilize the Remote Projects Criteria, all others will use the Urban and Rural Projects Criteria. This clarification will be included in the final draft of the criteria and in nomination materials.
Remote	0	General	General	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Define Remote to ensure communities use correct criterion set	6/13/2017	17 AAC 05.175 (c) states that "communities not connected to the continental road network by road or ferry" will utilize the Remote Projects Criteria, all others will use the Urban and Rural Projects Criteria. This clarification will be included in the final draft of the criteria and in nomination materials.
Urban/Rural and Remote	1	Economic Benefits	5, 3	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - Remove the statement "new direct access to a community resource". If not removed then define community resource. This should be broadened beyond "new direct access" to include improvements that can benefit important economic development generators, such as provide "new direct access" for modes that were not previously served.	6/26/2017	The analysis of what constitutes an adequate, unserved need, to be considered a "community resource" will need to be resolved on a case by case basis. Defining what could be considered a "community resource" would limit consideration to those items listed and not allow for vastly different needs in respective communities across the state. The nomination form will include examples of things that could be considered community resources. Department staff will evaluate and consider accordingly. In response to public comment the Department will add "improved access" to rank 5.
Urban/Rural and Remote	1	Economic Benefits	5, 3	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Modify the criteria to de-incentivize new lane miles or infrastructure, which would create ongoing burden for M&O. Provide 5 points to a project that improves existing infrastructure for access to a resource and provide 3 points for new infrastructure.	6/22/2017	Increases to state maintenance and operation costs are already "de-incentivized" by criteria 6b. This criteria is one of very few that will allocate top points for construction of a new route that has been documented in a plan as a priority for access to a community resource and for which the local sponsor is willing to assume management responsibility. In response to public comment the Department will add "improved access" to rank 5.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	1	Economic Benefits	5, 3	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Concern/Question - Requirement for project to be in an economic development plan may hurt communities that do not have stand-alone ED plans. Does the economic development section of a comprehensive plan count?	6/13/2017	This must be answered on a case by case basis. General comprehensive or other plan recommendations receive points in Criteria #7. However, a specific economic development section of a more general plan such as a comprehensive plan would be acceptable if focus is clearly on economic development including adequate analysis. Clarifying guidance will be added to the footnote for this criteria.
Urban/Rural	2	Health and Quality of Life	-3	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Any degradation should be negatively scored, not just "significant" degradation	6/13/2017	Any degradation is subjective, so adding significant, while also subjective, does at least suggest that a considerable case needs to be made. If the criteria is limited to any degradation, then even the most minor inconvenience (all projects), could be penalized regardless of degree of impact.
Urban/Rural and Remote	2	Health and Quality of Life	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - Consider splitting this criterion which uses a dissimilar set of evaluation criteria. Focus on criteria which are quantitative to allow applicants to conform submittals for a strong project pool. Define negative factor or provide examples.	6/26/2017	Evaluation criteria standards are set by legislation. For this standard, 17 AAC 05.175 (b)(2) and (c)(2) indicates projects will be scored on "the project's effect upon health and quality of life". While explicitly defining all types of facilities and circumstances or providing a quantitative indicator for points allocation would eliminate subjectivity, it would also limit consideration to those items and circumstances listed and not allow for vastly different needs in respective communities across the state.
Urban/Rural and Remote	2	Health and Quality of Life	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - divide this into two standards to allow for less qualitative criteria. (recommendations for each follow in next two lines)	6/22/2017	Evaluation criteria standards are set by legislation. For this standard, legislation 17 AAC 05.175 (b) 2 and (c)2 indicates projects will be scored on "the project's effect upon health and quality of life". See below for responses to recommendations related to health and quality of life, respectively.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	2	Health and Quality of Life	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - For Health - 5 points for co-located with a utility transmission corridor (for instance, a water or electrical transmission line, thus reducing maintenance and/or construction costs for a utility); direct, singular access to a primary utility facility (for example, a dam, sewer treatment facility, water treatment facility); direct, singular access to a hospital; direct, singular access to an existing landfill, a proposed landfill with ADEC approval, or sewage lagoon. 3 points for access within two miles of: a primary utility facility; a hospital; an existing landfill, a proposed landfill with ADEC approval, or sewage lagoon.	6/22/2017	While explicitly defining all types of facilities and circumstances for points allocation would eliminate subjectivity it would also limit consideration to those items and circumstances listed and not allow for vastly different needs in respective communities across the state. Also the community needs in a downtown urban area with many of the basic community needs already served, will not see the same degree of benefit from additional redundancy.
Urban/Rural and Remote	2	Health and Quality of Life	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - For Quality of Life - 5 points for direct, singular access to: a school; drug treatment facility; health rehabilitation center or long-term care facility; or subsistence resources. 3 points for access within two miles of the above listed locations. Negative points for proximity to sacred sites. However tricky to measure because location of some sacred sites is secret. Suggest negative .01 points for every ten feet closer.	6/22/2017	While explicitly defining all types of facilities and circumstances for points allocation would eliminate subjectivity it would also limit consideration to those items and circumstances listed and not allow for vastly different needs in respective communities across the state. For example, a downtown urban area with many of the basic community needs already served, will not see the same degree of benefit from additional redundancy.
Urban/Rural and Remote	3	Safety	Footnote	Irene Gallion	Correction - Revise footnote statement to say minimum latest available 5 year record. Currently states 10 year record which is inconsistent with the ranking criteria.	6/22/2017	Criteria footnote corrected to indicate that we will rely upon most recently available 5 year data.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	3	Safety	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - must all scoring category be met, or just one?	6/26/2017	There are multiple ways to obtain a given score, but only one subcategory must be met. Criteria will be clarified by incorporating "or" after each subcategory.
Urban/Rural and Remote	3	Safety	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - Is DOT going to provide the data (HSIP, crash rates, etc.) Recommend the criteria say "calculate rates and statistics with the assistance of DOT" or "DOT will calculate rates and statistics". Some communities will not be able to compile this data independently.	6/26/2017	Department staff will critically review the nomination and provide any numerical analysis required to ascertain the score. The nomination form will allow the project sponsor the opportunity to describe safety concerns, the project's anticipated safety outcome, and provide any supporting information they wish to have considered.
Urban/Rural and Remote	3	Safety	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Use Alaska Trauma Registry Data provided by the Alaska Department of Health and Human Services as "official data" for rural communities with no local law enforcement. My understanding is that official crash data is based on law enforcement reports. To require official crash data is to establish a policy that puts rural communities at a disadvantage. The AK Trauma Registry is divided by region and divides injury cause into motor vehicle occupant, airplane, ATV, bicycle, pedestrian, snow machine, and water transport without drowning. Recommend if the project addresses one of these factors, and the regional average is higher than the state average, it would be worthy of 5 points.	6/22/2017	Safety is a major priority of the Department and Department staff will consider all available data as per the footnote beneath the criteria. Severity, location, and accident date must be independently verifiable in order to obtain greatest consideration. Alaska Trauma Registry data may not be linked to a specific location and the regional vs. state averages may be difficult to determine; however, the Department encourages the project sponsor to include any and all available information related to safety concerns for consideration of points.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	3	Safety	General	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Concern - Scoring Criteria are too stringent for projects that are not on the National Highway System or funded by the Highway Safety Improvement Program	6/13/2017	The Department will revise the subcategory (D) "HSIP costs" downward in recognition of the lower speeds and traffic volumes on non-NHS. The 5 point score in subcategory (D) - "HSIP Cost" is revised to a threshold of greater than \$2.5 million per mile. The 3 points score in subcategory (D) for HSIP costs will now be between \$1.5 million and \$2.5 million. Subcategory (D) in the 0 points category is eliminated. ALSO subcategory (A) in points columns (5), (3), and (0) is being eliminated due to limited accurate data on accident rates by facility type; for column (3) subcategory (A) will be replaced with a long term pattern of minor injury or property damage crashes. Additionally, please note there are multiple options for achieving a score in each subcategory, so it is not necessary to try to obtain points based on the most stringent and analytical process (HSIP costs).
Urban/Rural and Remote	4	Intermodal transportation	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - Remove this category. This is nothing inherently beneficial about a project being "intermodal".	6/26/2017	Evaluation criteria standards are set by legislation. For this standard, 17 AAC 05.175 (b)(4) and (c)(4) indicates projects will be scored on "whether the project improves intermodal transportation or lessens redundant facilities". The criteria gives consideration to improved connectivity and/or reducing the need for capital investment in one or more modes. This standard will be updated with the following language: contributes to system network by substantially alleviating safety concerns, increasing efficiency, or decreasing operating costs of a nearby NHS route (+1) or interstate route (+2).

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	4	Intermodal transportation	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - Commenter wonders if the intent was to say "multi-modal" as "intermodal" typically refers to goods movements and "multi-modal" typically refers to people using multiple modes to complete a trip or a facility that supports use of a variety of modes. Requests clarification as the written explanation seems more geared towards "multi-modal". Also requests explanation of "lessen redundant facilities".	6/26/2017	The intent is 'inter-modal' per standard 17 AAC 05.175 (b)(4) and (c)(4) which indicates projects will be scored on "whether the project improves intermodal transportation or lessens redundant facilities". The State of Alaska is a vast area with many communities that are dependent, for movement of both people and goods, upon many different modes based on their remoteness, topography, and availability of connected infrastructure. The intent is to strengthen the connectivity between modes and improve coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems OR to reduce the need for investment in one facility by improving another facility. This standard will be updated with the following language: contributes to system network by substantially alleviating safety concerns, increasing efficiency, or decreasing operating costs of a nearby NHS route (+1) or interstate route (+2).
Urban/Rural and Remote	5	Contribution to fund capital costs	0	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question/Recommendation - Clarify project score if applicant contributes only the required 9.03%. Recommends that if applicant is contributing the required match it should be scored above contributes nothing.	6/26/2017	Providing matching funds is a requirement for every project sponsor and therefore will not be awarded additional points. This commitment is required to be demonstrated via resolution (17 AAC 175 (l)) and projects without an accompanying resolution committing matching funds will not be considered. The Department will make this requirement clear in the final nomination materials.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	5	Contribution to fund capital costs	0	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Clarify that communities that make only the minimum federal match get 0 points.	6/22/2017	The Department will make this requirement clear in the final nomination materials.
Urban/Rural and Remote	5	Contribution to fund capital costs	5,3	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Given the fiscal climate, communities should be given fewer points if their match is coming from any state-funded sources	6/13/2017	The Department is responsible for managing those state funds for which it controls. If other departments or the state legislature identify a benefit that they support with resources they control, then our Department will recognize this funding support.
Urban/Rural and Remote	5	Contribution to fund capital costs	General	City of Wasilla	Recommendation - This criterion should have a greater point value per each 1% of project cost in excess of the required federal aid match. This rewards communities willing to be a financial stakeholder in a project.	3/15/2018 (submitted with 2018-21 STIP comments)	The Department declines to raise the point value for project capital contributions. The Department is interested in financial partnerships and is looking to communities to financially support projects, but we also recognize that some communities will have difficulties providing even the base federal match requirement. The Department does not want the point value and weighting of capital contributions to overshadow high quality projects that provide significant benefits to the area transportation system.
Urban/Rural and Remote	5	Contribution to fund capital costs	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Clarify that communities that do not provide any match will not be considered.	6/22/2017	The Department will make this requirement clear in the criteria and the final nomination materials.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	5	Contribution to fund capital costs	General	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	Concern - Criteria indicates higher score to matching fund contributions to projects without addressing Boroughs without areawide road powers. Criteria does not include in-kind contributions such as land donations and staff support.	6/21/2017	Borough powers are decided by the borough residents at the time of incorporation and can be amended thereafter. The Department is not responsible for the local decision to preclude the local governing body from investing in transportation infrastructure. Federal funding requirements make the anticipated contribution of land impossible to ascertain ahead of time and contribution itself somewhat difficult. Similarly staff time is often difficult to quantify in manners acceptable to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Using contributions of land and local government staff time is not practical and prior unsuccessful attempts have often been a source of aggravation to local government officials.
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 a	Contribution to fund M&O costs	5, 3	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - Remove the criteria language for criterion rank 5 and the language after "and" for criterion rank 3 as it has nothing to do with the merits of the project.	6/26/2017	The Department declines to remove this language as it is a priority for the Department to divest routes that primarily serve local needs to local communities in an effort to both reduce Department M&O costs and more equitably distribute transportation services and funding statewide.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 a	Contribution to fund M&O costs	Footnote	Alaska Tribal Transportation Services Inc.	Concern - Because the State of Alaska's Administration and Legislature have not politically recognized federally recognized tribal governments, ADOT&PF must require a waiver of sovereign immunity for transportation related Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) required by FHWA Tribal Transportation Program Agreements. Without this waiver tribes cannot provide local tribal matching funds for projects or maintenance operations. Recommendation - In those locations that no longer have a physical ADOT&PF presence, state public facilities be transferred from state owned to tribally owned for full responsibility of maintenance, ownership, and financial burdens.	6/23/2017	The recognition of federally recognized tribal governments by the Department of Administration and the Legislature is beyond the scope of the Community Transportation Program, however, there are ongoing discussions on this topic within the Governor's Tribal Advisory Council (GTAC). Per 17 AAC 05.175(l) municipalities are required to "authorize, by resolution or ordinance, the execution of an agreement with the state promising to perform the specified act" whereby the specified act is the commitment to provide matching funds and/or transfer of ownership. The match and associated commitments in writing must remain in place. There may be cases where partnerships with municipalities, local community governments, or the BIA allow for more flexible agreements. Specific project cases would need to be discussed with your local planner and the DOT&PF Tribal Liaison to determine what flexibilities may be allowed.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 a	Contribution to fund M&O costs	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Concern/Recommendation - The criteria should relate back to the M&O costs of the facility itself, not DOT's M&O costs and willingness to take on M&O activities in support of DOT facilities. According to Alaska DOT&PF the CTP was created "to fund surface transportation projects at the local level." Biasing projects that directly reduce DOT&PF's M&O cost absolutely should not be a factor in scoring these projects. Projects with the greatest overall benefit should be chosen. If M&O costs are to remain a criterion, it should be overall M&O cost reduction and not just for the DOT&PF.	6/26/2017	The continued ownership and maintenance of a locally owned route for which a project is nominated is a requirement for every project sponsor and therefore will not be awarded additional points. Evaluation criteria standards are set by legislation. 17 AAC 05.175 (b) (6) and (c )(6) state projects will be scored on "whether a municipality, another state agency, or a federal agency has made a commitment to assume ownership or to finance maintenance and operations costs" and 17 AAC 05.175 (b) (7) and (c ) (7) state projects will be scored on "whether the project will lower state maintenance and operation costs". The Department owns several routes that primarily serve local interests and do not serve statewide interests. The Department is interested in divesting these routes to local communities to aid in providing equitable distribution of transportation services and funding statewide.
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 a	Contribution to fund M&O costs	General	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Base points on a percentage of ownership rather than requiring all of a certain asset class be owned. Supplement the five points for assuming ownership of a state facility or three points for maintaining ownership with points for .5 points for each 10% of ownership of all community roadways, for up to 5 additional points for road ownership. Commenter provided additional examples of current ownership levels.	6/22/2017	The Department agrees to adjust the points for ownership of locally managed and functionally classified minor collector or local routes to a percentage of routes owned (in miles) rather than requiring all of a certain asset class, however, the adjustment does not mirror the commenter's recommendation.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 a	Contribution to fund M&O costs	General	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	Concern - The draft criteria indicates that a higher score will be provided to local government contributions to fund maintenance and operation costs. This criterion also includes local ownership and management of the facility, which negatively affects Boroughs without areawide road powers.	6/21/2017	Borough powers are decided by the borough residents at the time of incorporation and can be amended thereafter. The Department is not responsible for the local decision to preclude the local governing body from investing in transportation infrastructure. The Department owns several routes that primarily serve local interests and do not serve statewide interests. The Department is interested in divesting these routes to local communities to aid in
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 a	Contribution to fund M&O costs	Weighting	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Correction - revise weighting from '5' to '0 or 5' to recognize that some projects will use 6b standard.	6/13/2017	Corrected
Remote	6 b	M&O Costs	General	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Correction - use periods consistently	6/13/2017	Corrected
Urban/Rural and Remote	6 b	M&O Costs	Weighting	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - why is the proposed weighting 0-5?	6/26/2017	Some projects will use 6a for scoring rather than 6b. 6a will be corrected to also say 0 or 5.
Urban/Rural and Remote	7	Public Support	5	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - delete "located in an area not represented by a locally elected body"	6/26/2017	The purpose of the language "located in an area not represented by a locally elected body" is to recognize there are some communities that cannot provide a formal resolution and, in lieu, must provide a public record of support. This language will be moved to the footnote to improve clarity.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	7	Public Support	5, 3	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Question - Does local plans include annual CIP lists adopted by municipalities	6/13/2017	CIP lists are often adopted by resolution with far less public outreach than a planning process. The intent of providing additional points to projects identified in plans is to have some indication that the project concept has been vetted by those in the community, particularly those most impacted. CIP lists, if adopted by resolution, will generally be considered as a resolution of support. If there is sufficient supporting documentation that adoption of the CIP list included significant public involvement, then the evaluation team may consider it as a local plan.
Urban/Rural and Remote	7	Public Support	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - A local area should get at least one point for having a resolution of support from a local elected body. Also recommend a role for community petitions from affected persons within a project area boundary.	6/26/2017	Providing a resolution of support is a requirement for every project sponsor and therefore will not be awarded additional points. A lack of a resolution is considered a high risk toward the ability to implement a project and therefore will be awarded negative points. However, in the interest of reducing administrative delay, the Department will award one point to those project sponsors that specifically include language required by 17 AAC 05.175 to <b>"authorize, by resolution or ordinance, the execution of an agreement with the state</b> promising to perform the specified act(s)". The specified acts are those specified acts for which the project is expected to be awarded points under standards five (funding contributions) and six (M&O contributions). Including this language will enable the Department and the sponsor to execute an agreement upon award of funds.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	7	Public Support	General	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	Concern - More points are provided for projects that have a resolution and are identified as a high priority in a state, tribal, or local plan. Zero points are given to a project supported by a resolution alone and negative three points to those projects not supported by a resolution. The Borough is concerned that this negatively affects remote and rural communities where there is insufficient funds for local studies.	6/21/2017	<p>Providing a resolution of support is a requirement for every project sponsor and therefore will not be awarded additional points. A lack of a resolution is considered a high risk toward the ability to implement a project and therefore will be awarded negative points. However, in the interest of reducing administrative delay, the Department will award one point to those project sponsors that specifically include language required by 17 AAC 05.175 to <b>"authorize, by resolution or ordinance, the execution of an agreement with the state</b> promising to perform the specified act(s)". The specified acts are those specified acts for which the project sponsor is seeking points under standards five (funding contributions) and six (ownership and management responsibility). Including this language will enable the Department and the sponsor to efficiently execute an agreement upon award of funds.</p> <p>In regard to local studies, the Department does not require plans to be large, expensive, or professionally completed by a consultant. An effort that had a high level of public involvement and clear recommendations in support of a project will be considered for points. Project sponsors should provide sufficient documentation of public involvement process.</p>
Urban/Rural and Remote	8	Environmental approval	Footnote	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Clarify who can determine environmental readiness - ADOT&PF Environmental staff <i>and</i> environmental analyst consultants? If only ADOT&PF environmental staff can, then make sure they have availability and budget - both challenging in these fiscal times.	6/22/2017	The Department will determine or approve the sponsor's determination of environmental document readiness. The Department's environmental staff are skilled at making this determination and will not require significant time or resources to do so.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural and Remote	8	Environmental approval	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - A project with a completed environmental document should receive extra point. Remove the type of NEPA process from the criteria as this attempts to predetermine the NEPA outcome. For example, if a project goes through an Environmental Assessment the outcome is a FONSI or an EIS, which absolutely could not be determined at the project scoring level.	6/26/2017	Environmental documents with approval are already eligible to receive maximum points. The Department declines to provide an additional point. Approved documents often need to be updated due to time lapsed or to meet FHWA requirements and therefore may not be more 'ready' than a document that is likely to require a categorical exclusion document. Using the 'likely' type of document is not pre-determining an outcome as all projects begin with a Class of Action determination based on the expected impacts. If a project is expected to begin as an Environmental Assessment then it will receive points as such with no determination regarding whether the next step will be a FONSI or an EIS.
Urban/Rural	9	System Reliability or deficient width/grade/alignment	5	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - remove "4 points if not State owned" because this is the Community Transportation Program with a purpose to fund surface transportation projects at the local level.	6/26/2017	The Department agrees to remove language "4 points if not State owned," however re-iterates that State sponsored projects will be considered for improvements to non-NHS and non-AHS routes that primarily serve local needs and therefore meet the purpose of this program. Ultimately, the Department desires to transfer routes that primarily serve local needs to local communities. Project sponsors are encouraged to collaborate with the State to provide nominations for projects that will ultimately result in transfer of a "local" route to the community.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural	9	System Reliability or deficient width/grade/alignment	5	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Concern/Question - For statement "state route with significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards impacting system reliability and congestion reduction" can the "and" be replaced with "or"? Many rural communities are more significantly impacted by reliability than congestion. The "and" gives preference to Anc, fbks, Mat-su, and Juneau. No one else has real congestion on a consistent basis. System reliability in terms of interruption caused by w/g/a deficiencies is much more common for AK communities.	6/13/2017	Impacts to system reliability are the key focus of the intent to address deficiencies in width/grade/alignment (w/g/a). Congestion may be considered one impact. The Department will remove the phrase "and congestion reduction". Supporting information should be provided by the project sponsor for any w/g/a deficiencies that impact system reliability.
Urban/Rural	9	Improved access	General	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - New and improved access to ferry terminals, airports, subsistence sites and river/ocean access is important to many communities, even if they're not remote. Recommend adding this criteria to U&R or combining it with intermodal transportation connections.	6/13/2017	Evaluation criteria standards are set by legislation. For remote, 17 AAC 05.175 (c)(9) indicates projects will be scored on "whether the project improves access to water sources, landfills, sewage lagoons, sanitary waste disposal sites, health care, airports, subsistence harvest sites, or a river or ocean." There is not a similar standard for the urban and rural evaluation criteria. If an urban/rural project nomination proposes to make a significant improvement related to access to a resource and such improvement did not qualify for points on any other standard, then this benefit may be appropriately scored under "other benefits".
Urban/Rural and Remote	10	Cost Effectiveness	Footnote	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Allow cost estimates provided by an engineering firm. Suggest the estimate should include a scope that outlines project extents and purpose and need, and must recognize project development costs including planning, environmental analysis, right-of-way analysis and acquisition, permitting, design, geotechnical analysis, utility accommodations, and construction costs.	6/22/2017	Project sponsors may develop initial cost estimates with support from an engineering firm, however the Department will review all estimates, revise as necessary and provide final approval. For statewide consistency, project scores will be based on these approved estimates.

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural	10	Cost Effectiveness	Footnote	Irene Gallion	Correction - stand along should be stand alone	6/22/2017	Corrected
Urban/Rural	10	Cost Effectiveness	Footnote	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Correction - stand along should be stand alone	6/13/2017	Corrected
Urban/Rural	10	Cost Effectiveness	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Concern - This category biases 3-R type projects because they are linear and relatively inexpensive per mile of roadway. Spot improvements, including intersection improvements, may be better use of limited funding, with potentially greater benefits over cheaper linear projects.	6/26/2017	Cost effective projects enable the Department to more widely distribute transportation improvement funds and therefore are worthy of additional points. Additionally, while preservation and rehabilitation projects may score higher on this standard, they may score low relative to other projects for standards such as economic benefits or safety. Finally, intersection and bridge projects are provided with a minimum assumed length (1/2 mile and 1 mile, respectively) to help address the discrepancy in costs for these types of projects.
Remote	10	System Preservation and Bridges	Weighting	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Increase weighting from 4 to 5	6/13/2017	The Department supports this recommendation to place a higher weight value on addressing system preservation and bridges in remote areas, particularly because the Urban/Rural criteria set has a stand-alone standard for deficient bridges. An increased weighting here should help to increase equitability with the Urban/Rural criteria set.
Urban/Rural	11	Deficient Bridges	Weighting	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Increase weighting from 4 to 5	6/13/2017	The Department declines to increase the weighting for deficient bridges under the Urban/Rural criteria because this standard is specific to only projects that address bridge deficiencies. Projects that do not address bridge deficiencies are not eligible for any points on this standard.

## Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural	11	Deficient Bridges	General	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - Is an applicant penalized if there are no bridges in the project limits. Recommend clarifying how projects with no bridges would score.	6/26/2017	A project without an improvement to a deficient bridge will not receive any points for this standard; but it is not considered a penalty. The criteria are all intended to work together and bridge improvement projects may receive lower points on several other standards. It is a Department priority to address bridge deficiencies.
Urban/Rural	11	Deficient Bridges	General	Irene Gallion	Question - Bridge ratings is unclear. Does this mean functionally obsolete, structural deficiency, or bridge inspection element deficiency.	6/22/2017	Bridge ratings are for structural deficiency unless otherwise noted. It is not anticipated that project sponsors will provide detailed bridge condition data as the Department's bridge evaluation data will be used to score this section. Project sponsors can work with their local planners to obtain data for specific bridges for planning purposes, if desired. Project sponsors are encouraged to provide any supplemental information or concerns they have regarding a bridge. Project nomination materials will clearly identify information needed.
Urban and Rural	11	Joint Project	General	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	Recommendation - This Standard should be included in the Urban and Rural Criteria because many of the road projects include joint projects related to utilities with assistance from other agencies.	6/21/2017	Evaluation criteria standards are set by legislation. For remote, 17 AAC 05.175 (c)(11) states projects will be scored on "whether the project is a joint project with (A) the Department of Environmental Conservation; (B) The United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs; (C) the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service; (D) a tribal entity; (E) a federal or state agency other than one identified in (A) - (C)." There is not a similar standard for the urban and rural evaluation criteria. If an urban/rural project nomination has a significant joint project benefit and such benefit did not qualify for points under another standard, then this benefit may be appropriately scored under "other benefits".

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural	11	Deficient Bridges	Weighting	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - Projects that restore/rehab/replace deficient bridges should be weighted as a 5	6/26/2017	The Department declines to increase the weighting for deficient bridges because this standard is specific to only projects that address bridge deficiencies. Projects without bridge improvements are not eligible for any points on this standard.
Urban/Rural	11	Deficient Bridges	Weighting	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Increase weighting from 4 to 5	6/13/2017	The Department declines to increase the weighting for deficient bridges because this standard is specific to only projects that address bridge deficiencies. Projects without bridge improvements are not eligible for any points on this standard.
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	5	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Recommendation - Remove the +1 point for project on NHPP and interstate highways.	6/26/2017	In response to comments, the Department will remove the +1 point for project on NHPP and interstate highways. This necessitates also removing the +1 point for designated freight route as all designated routes in the State's Long Range Transportation Plan are on the National Highway system.
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	5	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - Are NHPP or interstate highway projects eligible to use CTP funds? Recommend if they are not to remove the NHPP reference.	6/26/2017	NHPP and interstate projects do not need to be scored through the Community Transportation Program, though there are a few community owned routes that are on the NHPP and would be eligible for this program. These are rare and in response to comments, the Department will remove the reference to NHPP. This necessitates also removing the +1 point for designated freight route as all designated routes in the State's Long Range Transportation Plan are on the National Highway system.
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	5	Irene Gallion	Correction - change principle to principal	6/22/2017	Reference deleted

**Community Transportation Program Criteria Review - Comment Response Matrix**

Some comments are paraphrased. Sorted by "Standard Number".

Criteria Set	Standard Number	Standard Name	Scoring Rank	Commenter	Comment	Comment Date	Response
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	5	Irene Gallion	Recommendation - Clarify the arbiter of "designated freight route" Is this determined per FHWA National Highway Freight Network. Also, given the FAST Act emphasis on freight, maybe there should be more emphasis on it.	6/22/2017	The Department agrees these routes are important especially given the FAST Act's emphasis on freight. The designated freight route system, as identified in the Department's Long Range Transportation Plan, is entirely on the National Highway System and therefore does not need to be included in the Community Transportation Program. The reference to freight routes will be removed.
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	5	Kodiak Island Borough Community Development Department	Recommendation - Functional classification that is low shouldn't hurt communities willing to take ownership. NHPP routes shouldn't be included in CTP program because they don't need to be scored	6/13/2017	Placing a high weight on Functional Classification awards points to projects that serve an important role in a community. In response to comments, the Department will decrease the weighting from 5 to 4. The reference to NHPP will be removed. A footnote will also be added to provide additional support for communities willing to take ownership: If local government agrees to take over ownership of state owned road – lowest functional class score is "4".
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	General	City of Wasilla	Recommendation - This criterion should have a greater value for local roads/streets that help alleviate congestion and reduce pavement wear and tear on the National Highway system. The City of Wasilla supports the development of a local grid system of roads and streets that allows travelers to use local routes without having to get on the National Highway System to make their trips.	3/15/2018 (submitted with 2018-21 STIP comments)	The Department supports this recommendation, however will place the increased value within standard 4 (Intermodal Transportation) as recognition that the project assists at a system network level. Contributes to system network by substantially alleviating safety concerns, increasing efficiency, or decreasing operating costs of a nearby NHS route (+1) or interstate route (+2).
Urban/Rural	12	Functional class	Weighting	Fairbanks North Star Borough	Question - Why is this criteria weighted so highly?	6/26/2017	Functional classification is an important indicator of the purpose and importance of a route to a community. Placing a high weight on Functional Classification awards points to projects that serve an important role in a community. In response to comments, the Department will decrease the weighting from 5 to 4.

