

# CTP

# Criteria Guidance



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

# Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Criteria Guidance .....                       | 2  |
| PEB Scoring .....                             | 2  |
| <b>URBAN/RURAL Criteria</b> .....             | 2  |
| Economic Benefits.....                        | 2  |
| Health & Quality of Life.....                 | 4  |
| Safety .....                                  | 4  |
| Intermodal .....                              | 5  |
| Contribution .....                            | 5  |
| M&O Costs .....                               | 6  |
| Public Support.....                           | 7  |
| Environmental.....                            | 7  |
| Corrects Deficient Roadway.....               | 7  |
| Cost Effectiveness .....                      | 8  |
| Deficient Bridges .....                       | 9  |
| Functional Class.....                         | 9  |
| Other Factors .....                           | 9  |
| <b>REMOTE Criteria</b> .....                  | 11 |
| Economic Benefits.....                        | 11 |
| Health & Quality of Life.....                 | 11 |
| Safety .....                                  | 12 |
| Intermodal .....                              | 13 |
| Contribution .....                            | 13 |
| M&O Costs .....                               | 14 |
| Public Support.....                           | 14 |
| Environmental.....                            | 15 |
| Access.....                                   | 15 |
| System Preservation of Existing Facility..... | 15 |
| Joint Project .....                           | 16 |
| Cost Effectiveness .....                      | 17 |
| Other Factors .....                           | 17 |
| <b>Criteria Weights</b> .....                 | 18 |
| Urban/Rural .....                             | 18 |
| Remote.....                                   | 18 |

# Criteria Guidance

This document is intended for both the Project Evaluation Board (PEB) and the communities nominating a CTP project. Criteria is broken out by two main categories: Urban/Rural Criteria and Remote Criteria. 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 roads and/or bridges, each will be scored separately and then averaged for ONLY select criteria. For example, a project with three roads will get a single score for Economic Benefits but will receive a score for each road and then averaged for the Safety criteria. Criteria to be scored individually and then averaged for Urban/Rural Criteria include the following: Safety, Intermodal, M&O Costs, Environmental, Corrects Deficient Roadway and Deficient Bridges. Criteria to be scored individually and then averaged for Remote Criteria include the following: Safety, Intermodal, M&O Costs, Environmental, Access, and System Preservation.

## URBAN/RURAL Criteria

### Economic Benefits

Economic benefits analysis shall not consider benefits due to project construction.

A public plan may include an economic development plan, or other plans such as a comprehensive plan, transportation plan, or documented public testimony with language on economic development and must include documented public involvement. Economic benefits may be realized from new roads, road improvements (design additions or changes) or preservation/rehabilitation of existing infrastructure.

Source for disadvantaged and low income population may come from latest US Census Data.

Criteria Scoring

| Standard                    | (5)   | (3)  | (1)   | (0)  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| <b>1. Economic Benefits</b> | This project meets <b>two</b> of the following:<br>1) is supported in a public plan with a specific economic development section; 2) provides new accessibility and reduces transportation costs; 3) projects that include special consideration of economic development for disadvantaged and low income population. | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following:<br>1) is supported in a public plan with a specific economic development section; 2) provides improved accessibility and reduces transportation costs; 3) projects that include special consideration of economic development for disadvantaged and low income population. | This project meets one of the following:<br>1) supports minimal, speculative, or temporary economic opportunities; 2) benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity. | The project does not support economic development. |

## Health & Quality of Life

Health & Quality of Life is a 'holistic' focus in the following areas: improves 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.

A definition of a “measurable contribution” to health & quality of life may include: the number and type of facilities accessible by a new road or improved infrastructure, an estimated reduction in 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 road, a measure of demographically diverse or disadvantaged persons able to use the new or improved infrastructure, etc.

A “significant” contribution is one where it addresses three or more areas in the definition above. For example, a project that improve multiple modes of travel, provides access to key facilities and promotes active transportation is a significant contribution.

A “moderate” contribution is one where the project addresses two or less areas in the definition above.

A “minor” contribution is one where the project addresses one area in the definition above.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                    | (5)  | (3)  | (1)  | (0)  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2. Health & Quality of Life | This project provides a <b>significant</b> (addresses 3 or more areas in the definition) measurable contribution to improved health & quality of life. | This project provides a <b>moderate</b> (addresses 2 areas in the definition) measurable contribution to improved health & quality of life | This project provides a <b>minor</b> (addresses 1 area in the definition) measurable contribution to health & quality of life. | This project provides no measureable contribution to health & quality of life. |

## Safety

Prior crash history may be used to support mitigating measures. Crash data is available from [Alaska Highway Safety Office](#), Crash Data Manager. Crash data can include crashes between all modes (vehicle to vehicle, vehicle to bicycle, bus to vehicle, etc.). 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 roads 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 installing a traffic signal, increasing the width of edge lines, and installing a median barrier.

For “new roads” 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

| Standard         | (4-5)   | (3)   | (0)  |
|------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>3. Safety</b> | This project meets <b>three</b> of the following (5 pts) or <b>two</b> 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 <b>one</b> 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 roads (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 by safety & design engineers to mitigate crashes. |

### Intermodal

Intermodal refers to roadways providing a connection between “major” intermodal facilities in order to reduce capital investment or reduce operating costs. Examples of intermodal facilities include roads airports, ports/harbors, bus feeder services, and rail or transit facilities. Bike/Pedestrian facilities are not considered “major” but may score up to 3 points if the project improves connection to or from a bike/pedestrian facility.

Reducing the burden on another mode or adjacent facility may include reducing the financial burden or capacity on another mode or facility.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard  | (5)   | (3)  | (1)  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>4. Improves intermodal transportation or lessens redundant facilities.</b> | This project meets <b>two</b> of the following: 1) improves connection between "major" modes for travelers or freight; 2) reduces the burden on another "major" mode(s) or adjacent facility. | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following: 1) improves or preserves the connection between "major" modes for travelers or freight; 2) reduces the burden on another "major" mode(s) or adjacent facility. Improves connection to/from a bike/pedestrian facility (Max 3pts) | This project has minimal impact or does not impact another "major" mode(s) or adjacent facility. |

### 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 \$745,000 or 21.6% of the total project cost (\$3,440,000). Contribution is 12.97% more than the federal aid match minimum (9.03%). Project nomination receives 4 points.

**Example 2:** City has committed to a contribution of \$550,000 or 11.57% of the total project cost (\$4,750,000). Contribution is 2.54% more than the federal aid match minimum (9.03%). Project nomination receives 2 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.

*Criteria Scoring*

| Standard  | (4-5)  | (2-3)   | (0)   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs.</b> | 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 <b>no</b> contribution beyond required federal aid match commitment of 9.03%. |

**M&O Costs**

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*

| Standard   | (5)  | (3)  | (0)  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>6a. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&amp;O costs (For non-DOT&amp;PF sponsored projects).</b> | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following: 1) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility <b>for 100%</b> of the proposed facility; 2) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility of another DOT&PF facility of <b>similar</b> M&O cost. | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following: 1) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility <b>for less than 100%</b> of the proposed facility; 2) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility of another DOT&PF facility <b>with lesser</b> M&O costs. | The local government <b>continues</b> ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility. No change. |

| Standard  | (5)  | (3)  | (0)   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>6b. Departmental M&amp;O costs and priority (For DOT&amp;PF sponsored projects).</b> | The project results in <b>significant</b> M&O priority, e.g., project results in a transfer of ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility to a local government. | The project results in a <b>moderate</b> M&O priority, e.g. local government assumes partial responsibility. | The local government does <b>not</b> assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility. |

## 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 for which the sponsor would like to have considered as a ‘plan’ must include documentation of public involvement.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                 | (5)  | (3)  | (1)   | (0)   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| <b>7. Public support</b> | This project meets <b>all</b> 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 <b>one</b> 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. |

## Environmental

Projects must include a recent environmental document where the project scope matches the environmental document.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                                   | (4-5)  | (3)   | (0)  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>8. Environmental approval readiness</b> | The projects meets <b>one</b> of the following: A) Environmental approval complete (5 pts); B) Environmental approval likely with a categorical exclusion (CE) document (4 pts). | The project meets <b>one</b> of the following: A) Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Assessment (EA); B) Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). | Environmental approval unlikely or not provided. |

## Corrects Deficient Roadway

This criteria refers to correction in width, grade and/or alignment (w/g/a). Projects that address a situation where there is a demonstrated traffic demand indicating the current number of lanes is



deficient for projected design year capacity, project should be scored as if having at least 2 of 3 substandard w/g/a features.

Reference: [Alaska DOT&PF Highway Preconstruction Manual, Chapter 11](#)

Prior coordination with Alaska DOT&PF, Regional Design & Engineering Services will help determine if a project corrects w/g/a.

For bridge widening projects may be included if improving capacity (max 3 pts).

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard   | (5)  | (3)  | (0)  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>9. Corrects deficient roadway width/grade/alignment (w/g/a)</b> | This project corrects a route with at least 2 substandard w/g/a. | This project corrects a route with at least 1 substandard w/g/a. For new roads (max 3pts), the w/g/a must meet design standards. Bridge widening projects that improve capacity (3 pts). | Does not correct deficiency. For new roads the design standards are not met. |

### Cost Effectiveness

The cost effectiveness uses the following algorithm:

$$\text{Cost (in thousands)/Route Length (miles)/Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)}$$

Example:

- Project cost = 8,500,000; Route length = 2.5 miles; AADT = 545
- $8500/2.5/545 = \$6.23$
- Score = 3 pts

Example:

- Project cost = 5,200,000; Route length = 1.2 miles; AADT = 250
- $5,200/1.2/250 = \$17.33$
- Score = 0 pts

The Alaska DOT&PF, [Transportation Data Programs](#) section will provide an actual or estimated Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) for current and new roads. In addition, the Alaska DOT&PF will calculate the cost effectiveness.

If the project includes only bridge work, the bridge will have an assumed length of 1 mile.

If the project includes only an intersection, the intersection will have an assumed length of .5 mile.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard   | (4-5)                                   | (2-3)                                       | (0-1)                                |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| <b>10. Cost Effectiveness (Cost divided by length divided by AADT)</b> | \$0 - \$3.50 = 5<br>\$3.51 - \$5.00 = 4 | \$ 5.01 - \$6.50 = 3<br>\$6.51 - \$8.00 = 2 | \$8.01 - \$10.00 = 1<br>>\$10.00 = 0 |

## Deficient Bridges

A 'deficient bridge' is a bridge that has at least one bridge condition rating of the deck, superstructure, or substructure in poor condition (rating is 4 or less).

The Alaska DOT&PF, Design & Engineering Services, Bridge Section maintains a database of bridges and condition information. The Bridge Section can check the bridge management system (BMS) if the nomination includes a bridge in the BMS. If the bridge is not in the BMS, the Project Sponsor shall coordinate with the Bridge Section (via Alaska DOT&PF Regional Planner) on the condition rating prior to submitting their nomination.

**Example:** A bridge is fracture critical and it has at least one bridge condition rating in poor condition rating, the project receives 4 points (3 points + Extra Point).

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                     | (5)   | (4)   | (3)  | (2)   |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| <b>11. Deficient Bridges</b> | 5 pts- All <b>three</b> bridge condition ratings (deck, superstructure, substructure) are in poor condition (Rating 4 or less). | 4 pts- If <b>two</b> bridge condition ratings (deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert) in poor condition (Rating is 4 or less). <b>Extra point</b> if bridge is functionally obsolete, fracture critical or has hydraulic issues. | At least <b>one</b> bridge condition rating (deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert) is in poor condition (Rating is 4 or less). <b>Extra point</b> if bridge is functionally obsolete, fracture critical or has hydraulic issues. | Bridge or culvert that has inadequate lane or shoulder widths, is load posted, are fracture critical, or has hydraulic issues (scour, overtopping), has inadequate vertical or horizontal clearances, is poorly aligned with the roadway. |

## Functional Class

Functional classification is the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide. All public roads in Alaska are functional classified. Functional classification can be verified in Alaska DOT&PF's Geographic Information System maps, see: [Functional Class Maps](#)

If project nominations include a new road, the functional class assignment will need to be recommended by an Alaska DOT&PF Regional Planner based on the Alaska DOT&PF functional classification criteria.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                              | (4-5)                                     | (2-3)                                       | (0) |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----|
| <b>12. Functional classification.</b> | Arterial (5 pts); Major Collector (4 pts) | Minor Collector (3 pts); Local Road (2 pts) | N/A |

## Other Factors

Other factors include projects that include unique, innovative or creative ways to accelerate project delivery, fund, or meet its intended purpose. Some examples include local bond package to support funding, partnerships to support funding and/or infrastructure improvements, or access to other grants and funding sources, or creative ways to ensure access for low income or disadvantaged populations.

Criteria Scoring

| Standard          | (5)  | (3)  | (1)   | (0)   |
|-------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 13. Other Factors | This project includes <b>more than two</b> innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. | This project includes <b>two</b> innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. | This project includes <b>one</b> innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefit not otherwise rated. | Project exhibits no innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. |

## REMOTE Criteria

### Economic Benefits

Economic benefits analysis shall not consider benefits due to project construction.

A public plan may include an economic development plan, or other plans such as a comprehensive plan, transportation plan, or documented public testimony with language on economic development and must include documented public involvement. Economic benefits may be realized from new roads, road improvements (design additions or changes) or preservation/rehabilitation of existing infrastructure.

Source for disadvantaged and low income population may come from the Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool, <https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/>.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                    | (5)   | (3)  | (1)   | (0)  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| <b>1. Economic Benefits</b> | This project meets <b>two</b> of the following:<br>1) is supported in a public plan with a specific economic development section; 2) provides new accessibility and reduces transportation costs; 3) projects that include special consideration of economic development for disadvantaged and low income population. | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following:<br>1) is supported in a public plan with a specific economic development section; 2) provides improved accessibility and reduces transportation costs; 3) projects that include special consideration of economic development for disadvantaged and low income population. | This project meets one of the following:<br>1) supports minimal, speculative, or temporary economic opportunities; 2) benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity. | The project does not support economic development. |

### Health & Quality of Life

Health & Quality of Life is a 'holistic' focus in the following areas: improves 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.

A definition of a “measurable contribution” to health & quality of life may include: the number and type of facilities accessible by a new road or improved infrastructure, an estimated reduction in 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 road, a measure of demographically diverse or disadvantaged persons able to use the new or improved infrastructure, etc.

A “significant” contribution is one where it addresses three or more areas in the definition above. For example, a project that improve multiple modes of travel, provides access to key facilities and promotes active transportation is a significant contribution.

A “moderate” contribution is one where the project addresses two or less areas in the definition above.

A “minor” contribution is one where the project addresses one area in the definition above.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                               | (5)   | (3)  | (1)  | (0)   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>2. Health &amp; Quality of Life</b> | This project provides a <b>significant</b> (addresses 3 more areas in the definition) measurable contribution to improved health & quality of life. | This project provides a <b>moderate</b> (addresses 2 areas in the definition) measurable contribution to improved health & quality of life | This project provides a <b>minor</b> (addresses 1 area in the definition) measurable contribution to health & quality of life. | This project provides no measurable contribution to health & quality of life. |

### Safety

Prior crash history may be used to support mitigating measures. Crash data is available from [Alaska Highway Safety Office](#), Crash Data Manager. Crash data can include crashes between all modes (vehicle to vehicle, vehicle to bicycle, bus to vehicle, etc.). 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 roads 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 installing a traffic signal, increasing the width of edge lines, and installing a median barrier.

For “new roads” 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

| Standard         | (4-5)   | (3)   | (0)  |
|------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>3. Safety</b> | This project meets <b>three</b> of the following (5 pts) or <b>two</b> 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 <b>one</b> 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 roads (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 by safety & design engineers to mitigate crashes. |

## Intermodal

Intermodal refers to roadways providing a connection between “major” intermodal facilities in order to reduce capital investment or reduce operating costs. Examples of intermodal facilities include roads airports, ports/harbors, bus feeder services, and rail or transit facilities. Bike/Pedestrian facilities are not considered “major” but may score up to 3 points if the project improves connection to or from a bike/pedestrian facility.

Reducing the burden on another mode or adjacent facility may include reducing the financial burden or capacity on another mode or facility.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                            | (5)   | (3)  | (1)  |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>4. Intermodal transportation</b> | This project meets <b>two</b> of the following: 1) improves connection between "major" modes for travelers or freight; 2) reduces the burden on another "major" mode(s) or adjacent facility. | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following: 1) improves or preserves the connection between "major" modes for travelers or freight; 2) reduces the burden on another "major" mode(s) or adjacent facility. Improves connection to/from a bike/pedestrian facility (Max 3pts) | This project has minimal impact or does not impact another "major" mode(s) or adjacent facility. |

## 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 \$745,000 or 21.6% of the total project cost (\$3,440,000). Contribution is 12.97% more than the federal aid match minimum (9.03%). Project nomination receives 4 points.

**Example 2:** City has committed to a contribution of \$550,000 or 11.57% of the total project cost (\$4,750,000). Contribution is 2.54% more than the federal aid match minimum (9.03%). Project nomination receives 2 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.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard  | (4-5)  | (2-3)  | (0)   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs.</b> | 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 <b>no</b> contribution beyond required federal aid match commitment of 9.03%. |

### M&O Costs

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

| Standard   | (5)  | (3)  | (0)  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>6a. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&amp;O costs (For non-DOT&amp;PF sponsored projects).</b> | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following: 1) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility <b>for 100%</b> of the proposed facility; 2) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility of another DOT&PF facility of <b>similar</b> M&O cost. | This project meets <b>one</b> of the following: 1) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility <b>for less than 100%</b> of the proposed facility; 2) project sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility of another DOT&PF facility <b>with lesser</b> M&O costs. | The local government <b>continues</b> ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility. No change. |

| Standard  | (5)  | (3)   | (0)  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>6b. Departmental M&amp;O costs and priority (For DOT&amp;PF sponsored projects).</b> | The project results in significant M&O priority, e.g., project results in a transfer of ownership of and maintenance and operations to a local government. | The project results in a moderate M&O priority, e.g. local government assumes partial responsibility. | The local government does not assume ownership of and maintenance and operations responsibility. |

### 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 for which the sponsor would like to have considered as a 'plan' must include documentation of public involvement.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                 | (5)  | (3)  | (1)   | (0)   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| <b>7. Public support</b> | This project meets <b>all</b> 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 <b>one</b> 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. |

## Environmental

Projects must include a recent environmental document where the project scope matches the environmental document.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                                   | (4-5)  | (3)   | (0)  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>8. Environmental approval readiness</b> | The projects meets <b>one</b> of the following: A) Environmental approval complete (5 pts); B) Environmental approval likely with a categorical exclusion (CE) document (4 pts). | The project meets <b>one</b> of the following: A) Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Assessment (EA); B) Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). | Environmental approval unlikely or not provided. |

## Access

Access refers to people's ability to reach desired services and activities, which is the ultimate goal of most transport activity. Project nominations that address improved access to water sources, landfills, sewage lagoons, sanitary waste disposal sites, health care, airports, subsistence harvest sites, or a river or ocean access shall be considered for points.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard         | (5)  | (3)  | (0)  |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>9. Access</b> | The project includes 'new' access to two or more uses; OR 'improves' access to two or more services or activities. | The project includes 'new' access to one use; OR 'improves' access to one service or activity. | The project includes no access or no new access. |

## System Preservation of Existing Facility

System preservation consists of work that is planned and performed to improve, restore or sustain the condition of the transportation facility in a state of good repair. Preservation activities generally do not add capacity or structural value, but do restore the overall condition of the transportation facility. This may include pavement and bridge preservation, including unpaved roads that need preservation treatment.

5pts- Major resurfacing, restoration and rehabilitation or reconstruction work to completely restore the road or bridge to an improved or restored condition includes:



**Pavement:** restore structural integrity, repaving, overlays, reclamation, drainage improvements, improve deficient geometry, truck climbing lanes, passing lanes, adding turnouts. Also includes gravel to pavement (hard surfacing).

**Bridge:** partial or complete deck replacement, superstructure replacement, substructure/culvert strengthening or partial/full replacement.

3pts-Preventative maintenance and minor rehabilitation work to sustain the road or bridge in its current condition, such as:

**Pavement:** patching and surface seals, crack sealing, filling pot holes, area wide striping, rumble strips, systematic sign replacement, systematic replacement or upgrade of light and signal poles, provide resurfacing & restoration but does not alter roadway geometry, repair drainage, installing guardrail,

**Bridge:** painting, deck seals (sealing cracks), thin deck overlays, rehab/replace joints, scour countermeasure (riprap), wash bridge deck and clean deck drains, protective coat, replace timber running planks, steel member repair, repair/replace approach slabs, seismic retrofit, bridge rail retrofit or replacement.

1 pt- New roads or bridges receive maximum 1 point. Project nominations should include discussion on preserving the life of the infrastructure.

*Criteria Scoring*

| Standard                                  | (5)   | (3)  | (1)  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>10. Preserves an existing facility</b> | Rehabilitation or reconstruction work to completely restore the road or bridge to an <b>improved</b> (strengthened) or <b>restored</b> condition. | Preventive maintenance work to <b>sustain</b> the road or bridge in its current condition. | New paved or gravel roads and bridges (Max 1 pt) |

*Joint Project*

Project nominations that include a joint project with other entities will receive additional points. Projects must include a commitment from the other entity or entities by a letter of agreement or other formal plan in order to receive points.

Partners may include a federal, state or local government entity.

*Criteria Scoring*

| Standard   | (5)   | (3) | (1)  |
|--|---|-----|--|
| <b>11. Joint Project</b><br>The project is coordinated with another federal, state or local government entity. | Yes - includes letter of agreement or other formal document showing commitment from joint entity. | N/A | No - does not have a joint entity to support project. Does not have a letter of agreement or other formal document showing commitment from joint entity. |

## Cost Effectiveness

The Cost Effectiveness uses the following algorithm:

Cost/persons whom facility provides essential services

Example:

- Project cost = 8,078,514; Population = 2,382
- $8,078,514/2382 = \$3,391.48$
- Score = 4 pts

Population is available on the State of Alaska Commerce, Community and Economic Development, [Certified Population Counts](#) or going to the [U.S. Census Bureau](#)

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard  | (4-5)  | (2-3)  | (0-1)  | (-1)                            |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>12. Cost Effectiveness</b><br>Total project cost/persons whom facility provides essential services and benefits. | 5pts – If per capita cost is \$3,000 or less.<br>4pts – If per capita cost is \$3,001-\$6,000. | 3pts – If per capita cost is \$5,001 - \$8,000.<br>2pts – If per capita cost \$8,001 - \$11,000. | 1pt – If per capita cost is \$11,001 - \$14,000.<br>0pt – If per capita cost is \$14,000 - \$25,000. | If per capita cost is >\$25,000 |

## Other Factors

Other factors include projects that contain unique, innovative or creative ways to accelerate project delivery, fund, or meet its intended purpose. Some examples include local bond package to support funding, partnerships to support funding and/or infrastructure improvements, or access to other grants and funding sources.

### Criteria Scoring

| Standard                 | (5)  | (3)  | (1)   | (0)   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| <b>13. Other Factors</b> | This project includes <b>more than two</b> innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. | This project includes <b>two</b> innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. | This project includes <b>one</b> innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefit not otherwise rated. | Project exhibits no innovative, resilient, creative or unique benefits not otherwise rated. |

## Criteria Weights

### Urban/Rural

| URBAN/RURAL STANDARD             | WEIGHT |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Other Factors                    | 2%     |
| Economic Benefits                | 2%     |
| Health & Quality of Life         | 3%     |
| Public Support                   | 5%     |
| Intermodal                       | 5%     |
| Functional Class                 | 5%     |
| Environmental Approval Readiness | 10%    |
| Corrects Deficient Roadway       | 10%    |
| Deficient Bridges                | 10%    |
| Cost Effectiveness               | 12%    |
| Contributing Funds               | 12%    |
| M&O Costs                        | 12%    |
| Safety                           | 12%    |

### Remote

| REMOTE STANDARD                  | FINAL |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| Public Support                   | 3%    |
| Access                           | 3%    |
| System Preservation              | 3%    |
| Other Factors                    | 3%    |
| Economic Benefits                | 3%    |
| Environmental Approval Readiness | 5%    |
| Contributing Funds               | 10%   |
| Joint Project                    | 10%   |
| Cost Effectiveness               | 12%   |
| Intermodal                       | 12%   |
| M&O Costs                        | 12%   |
| Health & Quality of Life         | 12%   |
| Safety                           | 12%   |