



# 2012 to 2015 Project Evaluation Criteria

Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities  
(ADOT&PF)

Division of Program Development  
Final

June 2010

Atigun Pass, Dalton Highway  
Donna Gardino, Alaska DOT & PF

## 2012 – 2015 STIP Project Scoring Criteria

Thank you to all Alaskans who commented on the 2012-2015 Project Evaluation Criteria. Many of the changes merely clarify the intent of existing criteria through minor changes to wording or formatting. Significant changes are elaborated on below.

### ***Local Contribution to Match***

In this current economic climate, community partnership is more important than ever in building and maintaining infrastructure. There are over six thousand projects on the state's need list, and it is important to stretch the federal dollar as far as possible. One extremely effective way to do this is to share capital costs with the community. As communities strive to balance local budgets, the willingness to contribute to capital costs of a project is an extremely strong indicator of the community's perceived value of the project.

**Projects will not advance unless the local community provides federally-required match.**

Two changes have been made to local match criterion to change the influence of locally-provided capital costs:

**WEIGHT:** The weight for local match was increased by two points, from 5 to 7. This was done by reducing the weight of other criteria, to keep over-all weighting at 50 points. In Urban/Rural criteria, one point was taken from surface rehabilitation (#9) and one from functional classification (#12). In Remote criteria, one point was taken from system preservation (#10) and one from joint project criterion (#11). The criteria chosen for reduction are those where communities have the least control over them. This was to insure that community input was not diluted.

**ALLOCATION OF POINTS:** It used to be that communities started with 4 points, even with no match. That has changed to start with one point. A community can gain a point for each 5% of capital funding provided – this is twice the rate as the old criteria, doubling the rate at which points can be earned.

### ***Local Ownership of Local Infrastructure***

Communities that own and maintain their own road infrastructure make a significant financial commitment. Some communities have declined to take on maintenance and ownership responsibility, and still enjoy state ownership and maintenance of roads that primarily serve the local population. These communities basically get a subsidy that other communities do not.

The Urban and Rural criteria and the Remote criteria have been adjusted to take into account when a community takes responsibility for local infrastructure, and recognize the benefits to the state.

Roads are classified based on their use, and range from roads that primarily access adjoining land, to roads that primarily move large amounts of traffic. These classifications include:

- Local
- Minor Collector
- Major Collector
- Minor Arterial
- Major Arterial

In keeping with the Long Range Transportation Plan "Let's Get Moving 2030," ("2030") the state will require communities to take ownership of state-owned **local roads** or **minor collectors**, or the project will not be forwarded to the Project Evaluation Board. This is in keeping with regulatory language that asks the Project Evaluation board to consider whether the municipality, another state agency, or a federal agency has made a contribution to finance capital costs and/or to take on ownership (17 AAC 05.175(b)(6-7), (c)(6-7)). "2030" also supports divestment of local roads (Action 3.7) and targeting state resources to higher functional class routes (Action 3.2).

Criteria regarding Maintenance and Operations contributions have also been adjusted to recognize the local community's commitment to local infrastructure. Since projects for local and minor collectors will be unable to receive points for acquisition, the proposal will receive points based on the percentage of local roads and minor collectors the community currently has ownership of. The source for this data will be the Highway Analysis System data, available to the public at: <http://www.dot.state.ak.us/hdpapp/forms/Reports.html>

## ***Economic Benefit***

The economic benefit criteria have been modified, and now both Urban/Rural and Remote have the same criteria. The project receives higher points if incorporated in a plan – economic development plan, comprehensive plan, system plan, corporate development plan, etc. Plans indicate some systemic thought being given to the project and how it fits in to community infrastructure. Plans also provide some context on costs and benefits for the community.

## ***Strategies***

RESOLUTIONS: A resolution of support from the local or tribal government is an extremely important aspect of garnering funds for incorporated communities. Make sure any resolution includes:

- Explicit support for the project. Be as specific as possible, but provide some qualifying language in case there are elements that are not feasible due to other concerns, such as environmental concerns of a certain route, or historical discoveries. Example verbiage might be, “Construction of a 2-lane gravel road from X to Y along ZZZ route, or similar given design or funding constraints.”
- Include support for match, either as a percentage of the project cost or as a fixed sum.
- Include language that acknowledges assumption of ownership, acquisition of a facility, or commitment to fund maintenance.

EXPLICIT V. NOMINAL: Criteria for economic impact ask for explicit or nominal call-out in a plan.

An explicit call-out will include scope details, such as mile points, route, infrastructure required. Nominal call-out is more high-level. For example:

*Explicit:* “Construct a 1-mile, two-lane, 36’ paved road between Carroll Crossing and Galliwampus Road, with alignment along the existing dirt path. Project will include culvert treatments for two anadromous fish streams, and guard-rail treatment. Aspects may be adjusted as necessary for design or funding concerns.”

*Nominal:* “Build a paved road from the grocery store to the shipping center.”

## ***Thoughts for the Future***

The current federal funding regime, known as “SAFETEA-LU,” expired last year, and has been extended to December of 2010. As congress looks at rewriting transportation law and funding distribution, there is more consideration given to issues such as greenhouse gasses, transit, rail, and road systems that serve electric vehicles and bikes. This creates some uncertainty in the sort of projects we will be able to fund in the future, and how much money we will have to fund them. While challenging, it is also a great opportunity for the citizenry who prepare and anticipate.

Federal transportation funding has traditionally come mostly from the “Highway Trust Fund,” which is funded through our gasoline taxes. The recent economic downturn has resulted in less driving, thus less revenue. Additionally, the tax has not been increased to keep pace with inflation. This dwindling pot of money will now be expected to pay for enhancements to not only roads, but pedestrian and transit enhancements. There will be more projects competing for a smaller amount of money.

The state’s long range transportation plan, “Let’s Get Moving 2030,” provides a framework for the state’s strategy as we head into the future.

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Remote and Trail Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>1. Economic Benefit</p> <p>Weighting: 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project supports development of an energy resource through <b>new direct access</b> AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> <li>Project supports resource development through <b>new direct access</b> AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project supports development of an energy resource through <b>improved access or increased capacity</b>, AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> <li>Project supports resource development through <b>improved access or increased capacity</b>, AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> <li>Project provides <b>new direct access</b> to industrial or commercial development AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project provides <b>increased capacity or improved access</b> to an industrial or commercial development.</li> <li>Project <b>nominally</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No documented support in a plan, OR</li> <li>Minimal or speculative benefit to the economy.</li> </ul>
<p>For <b>incorporated community in an organized borough</b>, the plan is required to be a governmental plan. A governmental plan is a plan commissioned and accepted/approved by a local or tribal government, such as an economic development plan, system plan, comprehensive plan, or the like. For an <b>unincorporated community in an unorganized borough</b>, the project must be called out in a plan presented by a development agency, business, community association or tribal government. A project is “explicitly” called out if by name or scope. “Nominal” call-out means the project in the plan lacks specifics such as end points, standards, or specific work to be done. Any plan must include consideration of costs and benefits via an analysis. Any economic benefits analysis shall not consider benefits due to project construction.</p>				
<p>2. Health and quality of life (Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities)</p> <p>Weighting: 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life, or</li> <li>Reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life, or</li> <li>Reduces or removes an existing negative factor.</li> </ul>	<p>Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.</p>	<p>This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.</p>
<p><i>Examples: Access to basic sanitation = 9; dust control = 8; access to medical facility = 7.</i></p>				

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria				
	Scoring Criteria			
Standards	9	7	4	1
<p><b>3. Safety.</b> Meets one of the goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</p> <p>Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in the SHSP to address: A) A major portion of crashes on a segment or intersection, with a 5-year crash rate exceeding the Critical Rate defined in the HSIP Program, OR B) Historical crash patterns identified from 3 or more crashes, at least two of which involve deaths or major injuries, OR C) Documented high accident potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic, OR D) Documented high accident potential or risk for existing mode to be replaced by the project being scored, OR E) Addresses two or more of the strategies in the SHSP</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in the SHSP to address: A) A major portion of crashes on a segment or intersection with a crash rate above the statewide average, OR B) Historical crash patterns identified from 3 or more crashes per year, OR C) Traffic conflicts between a primary non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic, OR D) Documented moderate accident potential risk for existing mode to be replaced by the project being scored, OR E) Address one of the strategies in the SHSP.</p>	<p>No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential in other categories: A) Crashes on the project's segments or intersections have a crash rate below the statewide average, OR B) Historical crash patterns identified are less than 3 or more crashes per year, OR C) There are no demonstrated traffic conflicts between a non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic, OR D) There is no current mode of travel to be replaced.</p>	<p>Proposes features which are recognized in practice to worsen: A) A major portion of crashes on a segment or intersection with a crash rate exceeding the Critical Rate defined in the HSIP Program, OR B) Historical crash patterns identified from 3 or more crashes, at least two of which involve deaths or major injuries, OR C) Documented high accident potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic.</p>
<p><i>Minimum latest available 5-year record. When using anecdotal crash information from first hand (EMS, Fire, Police, M&amp;O - on-scene responsibility) = maximum score is 8 points. When using anecdotal safety information from second-hand sources (not on-scene responsibility) or data not recognized in practice = maximum score 6 points.</i></p>				

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Remote and Trail Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>4. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.</p> <p align="center">Weighting: 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatly improves the connectivity between modes AND</li> <li>Improves coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and services, OR</li> <li>Would clearly reduce the need for significant capital investment in another mode.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderately improves the connectivity between modes AND</li> <li>Enhances coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems OR</li> <li>Would clearly reduce the need for moderate capital investment in another mode.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal or no effect on transportation system connectivity, OR</li> <li>Minimal or no effect on coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and services, OR</li> <li>Does not change the requirement for investment in other modes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatly decreases the connectivity between modes or decreases coordination, OR</li> <li>Greatly decreases integration of passenger and freight systems, OR</li> <li>Clearly require the need for significant capital investment in another mode.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund capital costs.</b></p> <p align="center">Weighting: 7</p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds, design, and/or materials: 1 pt per each 5% of project cost.</p>			<p>Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.</p>
<p><i>All financial commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned. All work in lieu of match must be accompanied by a Tapered Match Agreement – contact your planner for details. A Match Waiver signed by the Commissioner = 2 points. Match waiver signed by the commissioner and a commitment to take ownership of the facility = 7 points. The state will not provide match for local projects unless a Match Waiver has been approved by the commissioner, match us usually 9.03%, but can be as much as 20%, depending on the program.</i></p>				
<p>6a. Maintenance for state-owned roads, major collector and above. State has an interest in maintaining ownership and M&amp;O.</p> <p align="center">Weighting: 0 or 6</p>	<p>Very high M&amp;O priority.</p>	<p>Moderate M&amp;O priority.</p>	<p>Not an M&amp;O priority; little effect on M&amp;O costs.</p>	<p>Not an M&amp;O priority; would increase M&amp;O costs significantly.</p>

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria				
Standards	Scoring Criteria			
	9	7	4	1
<p>6b. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&amp;O costs for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-DOT roads functionally classified as a Major Collector or above.</li> <li>• DOT roads that <i>could</i> be divested, major collector and above.</li> </ul> <p>Weighting: 0 or 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&amp;PF facility, OR</li> <li>• Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O Cost AND the exchange is a very high M&amp;O priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O responsibility if currently a DOT facility unsuited to long-term ownership = 7</li> <li>• Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O cost AND the exchange is a moderate M&amp;O priority = 7</li> <li>• Sponsor will assume partial M&amp;O of DOT&amp;PF facility or like facility = 6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor's M&amp;O costs realize significant maintenance savings = 6</li> <li>• Continued sponsor ownership &amp; operation of locally owned facility with commitment to long-term M&amp;O = 5</li> <li>• Sponsor contributes nothing to M&amp;O of DOT&amp;PF facility = 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would increase M&amp;O costs significantly, OR</li> <li>• Sponsor unwilling to commit to long-term M&amp;O of a facility they now own.</li> </ul>
<p><i>STIP commitment must be in writing and approved by the governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned.</i></p>				
<p>6c. Local or minor collectors, owned by or transferred to community.</p> <p>Weighting: 0 or 6</p>	<p>Based on percent of public local road miles and public minor collector miles owned by the community, as represented in HAS:</p>	<p>100-90% = 9 89-80% = 8 79-70% = 7 69-60% = 6</p>	<p>59-50% = 5 49-40% = 4 39-30% = 3 29-20% = 2</p>	<p>Less than 20%= 1</p>
<p><i>STIP commitment must be in writing and approved by the governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned.</i></p>				
<p>7. <b>Public support.</b></p> <p>Weighting: 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Preponderance</b> of public record shows support for the project, AND</li> <li>• A resolution from the local elected body shows support for project AND</li> <li>• Project is <b>fully supported</b> in state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Majority</b> of public record shows support for project, AND</li> <li>• A resolution of support from local elected body shows support for the project, AND</li> <li>• Project is <b>nominally supported</b> in official state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has resolution of support from local elected body, OR</li> <li>• There is a public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in an unorganized borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No resolution of support from Local elected body, OR</li> <li>• There is no public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Remote and Trail Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i>				
<b>8. Environmental approval</b> readiness  Weighting: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Approval complete = 9</li> <li>Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion = 8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment = 7</li> <li>Environmental approval likely with draft documents circulated = 7</li> </ul>	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval unlikely.
<b>9. New and/or improved access</b> to the noted uses: ferry terminals, airports, subsistence sites, or river/ocean access? Weighting: 2	<b>New access</b> to two or more uses = 9.	<b>New access</b> to one = 7; <b>Improved access</b> to two or more = 6; <b>Improved access</b> to one of listed uses = 5.	No new or improved access to facilities listed.	N/A
<b>10. System preservation.</b>  Weighting: 4	Major purpose of project is to extend the life of existing facility by 10 or more years.	Secondary purpose of project is to extend life of existing facility by 10 or more years.	Preservation is not significant purpose of the project.	N/A
<b>11. Is this a joint project</b> coordinated with ADEC, BIA, ANTHC, Denali Commission, or similar? Weighting: 3	N/A	Yes	No.	N/A
<b>12. Cost Effectiveness:</b> Project cost/persons whom facility provides essential services & benefits described in Criteria 1,2,3,4 or 9. Weighting: 3	\$5,000 per capita or less	\$10,000 per capita or less	\$20,000 per capita or less	More than \$20,000 per capita.
<b>13. Other factors</b> not specified.  Weighting: 2	<i>Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.</i>		<i>Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest. If negative points assigned; 4 or more PEB members must jointly agree and identify the reasons for this decision.</i>	

Total Weight = 50



Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
Standards	Scoring Criteria			
	9	7	4	1
<p>1. Economic Benefit</p> <p>Weighting: 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project supports development of an energy resource through <b>new direct access</b> AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> <li>Project supports resource development through <b>new direct access</b> AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project supports development of an energy resource through <b>improved access or increased capacity</b>, AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> <li>Project supports resource development through <b>improved access or increased capacity</b>, AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> <li>Project provides <b>new direct access</b> to industrial or commercial development AND is <b>explicitly</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project provides <b>increased capacity or improved access</b> to an industrial or commercial development.</li> <li>Project <b>nominally</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No documented support in a plan, OR</li> <li>Minimal or speculative benefit to the economy.</li> </ul>
<p>For <b>incorporated community in an organized borough</b>, the plan is required to be a governmental plan. A governmental plan is a plan commissioned and accepted/approved by a local or tribal government, such as an economic development plan, system plan, comprehensive plan, or the like. For an <b>unincorporated community in an unorganized borough</b>, the project must be called out in a plan presented by a development agency, business, community association or tribal government. A project is “explicitly” called out if by name or scope. “Nominal” call-out means the project in the plan lacks specifics such as end points, standards, or specific work to be done. Any plan must include consideration of costs and benefits via an analysis. Any economic benefits analysis shall not consider benefits due to project construction.</p>				
<p>2. <b>Health and quality of life</b> (Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities, sanitation, dust control, access to medical)</p> <p>Weighting: 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life, OR</li> <li>Reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life, OR</li> <li>Reduces or removes an existing negative factor.</li> </ul>	<p>Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.</p>	<p>This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.</p>

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Urban and Rural Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>3. Safety.</b> Meets goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</p> <p align="right">Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address: A) A major portion of severe crashes on a segment or intersection with a 5-year crash rate exceeding the statewide average and a long term pattern of fatal or major (incapacitating) injury accidents, OR B) A documented high accident potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic, OR C) Addresses two or more of the strategies in the SHSP.</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address: A) A major portion of crashes on a segment or intersection with a crash rate above the statewide average, or B) Traffic conflicts between a primary non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic, or C) Addresses one of the strategies in the SHSP.</p>	<p>No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential in other categories: A) Crashes on the project's segments or intersections have a crash rate below the statewide average, OR B) Historical crash patterns identified are less than 3 or more crashes per year, OR C) No demonstrated traffic conflicts between a non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic.</p>	<p>Proposes features which are recognized in practice to worsen highway safety such as a project that: A) Would exacerbate a strategy of the SHSP in a significant manner, OR B) Proposes other work that is viewed as contrary to producing a safer roadway environment for motorized or non-motorized users.</p>
<p><i>Minimum latest available 10 year record. When using anecdotal crash information from first hand (EMS, Fire, Police, M&amp;O - on-scene responsibility) = maximum score is 8 points. When using anecdotal safety information from second-hand sources (not on-scene responsibility) or data not recognized in practice = maximum score 6 points.</i></p>				
<p><b>4. Improves intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.</p> <p align="right">Weighting: 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode AND</li> <li>• Reduces operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system, OR</li> <li>• Greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May reduce the need for capital investment in another mode AND</li> <li>• Result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system, OR</li> <li>• Would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</li> </ul>	<p>Does not impact other mode requirements.</p>	<p>Will increase demand on another mode requiring additional capital expenditure.</p>
<p><b>5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs.</b> Weighting: 7</p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds, design, and/or materials: 1 pt per each 5% of project cost.</p>			<p>Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.</p>

<b>Urban and Rural Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><i>All financial commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned. All work in lieu of match must be accompanied by a Tapered Match Agreement – contact your planner for details. A Match Waiver signed by the Commissioner = 2 points. Match waiver signed by the commissioner and a commitment to take ownership of the facility = 7 points. The state will not provide match for local projects unless a Match Waiver has been approved by the commissioner, match us usually 9.03%, but can be as much as 20%, depending on the program.</i></p>				
<p>6a. Maintenance for state-owned roads, major collector and above. State has an interest in maintaining ownership and M&amp;O. Weighting: 0 or 6</p>	<p>Very high M&amp;O priority.</p>	<p>Moderate M&amp;O priority.</p>	<p>Not an M&amp;O priority; little effect on M&amp;O costs.</p>	<p>Not an M&amp;O priority; would increase M&amp;O costs significantly.</p>
<p>6b. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&amp;O costs for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-DOT roads functionally classified as a Major Collector or above.</li> <li>• DOT roads that <i>could</i> be divested, major collector and above.</li> </ul> <p>Weighting: 0 or 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&amp;PF facility, OR</li> <li>• Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O Cost AND the exchange is a very high M&amp;O priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O responsibility if currently a DOT facility unsuited to long-term ownership = 7</li> <li>• Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O cost AND the exchange is a moderate M&amp;O priority = 7</li> <li>• Sponsor will assume partial M&amp;O of DOT&amp;PF facility or like facility = 6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor's M&amp;O costs realize significant maintenance savings = 6</li> <li>• Continued sponsor ownership &amp; operation of locally owned facility with commitment to long-term M&amp;O = 5</li> <li>• Sponsor contributes nothing to M&amp;O of DOT&amp;PF facility = 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would increase M&amp;O costs significantly, OR</li> <li>• Sponsor unwilling to commit to long-term M&amp;O of a facility they now own.</li> </ul>
<p><i>STIP commitment must be in writing and approved by the governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned.</i></p>				
<p>6c. Local or minor collectors, owned by or transferred to community. Weighting: 0 or 6</p>	<p>Based on percent of public local road miles and public minor collector miles owned by the community, as represented in HAS:</p>	<p>100-90% = 9 89-80% = 8 79-70% = 7 69-60% = 6</p>	<p>59-50% = 5 49-40% = 4 39-30% = 3 29-20% = 2</p>	<p>Less than 20%= 1</p>

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Urban and Rural Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>7. Public support?</b>  Weighting: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Preponderance</b> of public record shows support for project, AND</li> <li>• A resolution from the local elected body shows support for project , AND</li> <li>• Project is <b>fully supported</b> in state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Majority</b> of public record shows support for project, AND</li> <li>• A resolution from the local elected body shows support for project , AND</li> <li>• Project is <b>nominally supported</b> in official state, tribal, or local plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has resolution of support from local elected body, OR</li> <li>• There is a public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No resolution of support from Local elected body, OR</li> <li>• There is no public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>
<i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i>				
<b>8. Environmental approval</b> readiness?  Weighting: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental approval complete = 9</li> <li>• Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion = 8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment = 7</li> <li>• Environmental approval likely with draft documents circulated = 7</li> </ul>	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval unlikely.
<b>9a. Surface rehabilitation</b>  Weighting: 5 or 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily surface refurbishment and a PMS recommendation for rehab within 2 years, OR</li> <li>• A gravel surface badly deteriorated or serious surface deformation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily resurfacing, restoration or rehabilitation of an existing roadway on the same or similar alignment, OR</li> <li>• A portion of the project addresses serious foundation problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project would be better served by a major reconstruction or longer-term project</li> </ul>	N/A
OR				
<b>9b. Deficient width/grade/alignment (w/g/a).</b>  Weighting: 5 or 0	Significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	No w/g/a deficiencies.	N/A

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria				
Standards	Scoring Criteria			
	9	7	4	1
<b>10. Cost Effectiveness</b> using Cost, length, AADT evaluation. Divide project cost (in thousands) by length (miles) and further divide result by Average Annual Daily Traffic. Weighting: 5	\$0 - \$1.50 = 9 \$ 1.50 - \$ 3.00 = 8	\$ 3.00 - \$ 4.50 = 7 \$ 4.50 - \$6.00 = 6 \$ 6.00 - 8.00 = 5	\$ 8.00 - \$ 10.00 = 4	\$10.00 - \$20.00 = 3 \$20.00 – 40.00 = 2 >\$40.00 = 1
<i>Stand alone bridge projects use assumed length of 1 mile; stand alone intersection projects use assumed length of ½ mile.</i>				
<b>11. Deficient bridges?</b> Weighting: 2	Deficient bridge(s) needing replacement*.	Deficient bridge(s) eligible for rehabilitation**.	No bridge deficiencies	N/A
“ <i>Eligible for replacement</i> ” means the bridge has a sufficiency rating of less than 50 points and has been determined to be eligible for replacement by ADOT&PF Bridge section. ** “ <i>Eligible for rehabilitation</i> ” means the bridge has a sufficiency rating between 50 and 80 points and has been determined to be eligible for rehabilitation by ADOT&PF Bridge section.				
<b>12. Functional class.</b> Weighting: 4	Major Arterial = 9 Minor Arterial = 8	Major Collector or Urban Collector = 7	Minor Collector = 4	Local Roads/Streets or Unclassified 1
<b>13. Other factors</b> not specified.      Weighting: 2	Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.			<i>Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest. <u>If negative points assigned; 4 or more PEB members must jointly agree and identify the reasons for this decision.</u></i>

Total Weight = 50

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>TRAAK Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>1. Health and quality of life</b> Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, enhanced recreational opportunities, enhanced understanding of natural and manmade environment. Weighting: 5</p>	<p>This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction or removal of existing negative factor, OR</li> <li>• Provision of a new facility that improves quality of life.</li> </ul>	<p>This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction or removal of existing negative factor, OR</li> <li>• Provision of a new facility that improves quality of life.</li> </ul>	<p>Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.</p>	<p>This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.</p>
<p><b>2. Safety.</b> Addresses the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) goal of reducing the number of bicyclists and pedestrians killed or injured in vehicular crashes .  Weighting: 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project provides a significant contribution to improved pedestrian and/or bicyclist's safety, OR</li> <li>• Reduction or removal of existing negative factor, OR</li> <li>• Fulfillment of a SHSP goal toward bike and pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project provides a moderate contribution to improved pedestrian and/or bicyclist's safety, OR</li> <li>• Reduction or removal of existing negative factor, OR</li> <li>• Fulfillment of a SHSP goal toward bike and pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>	<p>Project does not have a safety component.</p>	<p>Project will have a major adverse effect on safety of pedestrians or bicyclists.</p>
<p><b>3. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs</b> excluding land (in excess of required match). Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds, design, and/or materials: 1 pt per each 5% of project cost.</p>			<p>Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.</p>
<p><i>Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required contribution shall be considered. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Required match may vary by program, and be as much as 20%. All match commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned. All work in lieu of match must be accompanied by a Tapered Match Agreement – contact your planner for details. A Match Waiver signed by the Commissioner = 9 points.</i></p>				

TRAAK Projects Criteria				
Standards	Scoring Criteria			
	9	7	4	1
4a. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>assume ownership, including operations &amp; maintenance costs</b> (DOT facilities).  Weighting: 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sponsor will assume ownership of DOT&amp;PF facility, OR</li> <li>Sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O cost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O responsibility of DOT&amp;PF facility, OR</li> <li>Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O cost.</li> </ul>	Sponsor contributes nothing.	N/A
<i>Commitment must be in writing and approved by legislative body before points will be assigned.</i>				
4b. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund operations and maintenance</b> (O&M) costs. (Use for non-DOT facilities).  Weighting: 4	Sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance responsibility for new facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O responsibility (but not ownership), OR</li> <li>Sponsor will assume full M&amp;O of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O cost.</li> </ul>	Project results in significant local maintenance savings for owner of local facility = 6  Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility = 5	Sponsor assumes neither ownership nor M&O responsibility
5. <b>Public support.</b>  Weighting: 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Preponderance</b> of public record shows support for project, AND</li> <li>A resolution from the local elected body shows support for project , AND</li> <li>Project is <b>fully supported</b> in state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Majority</b> of public record shows support for project including resolution of support from local elected body, AND</li> <li>A resolution of support from local elected body, AND</li> <li>Project is <b>nominally supported</b> in official state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project has resolution of support from local elected body, OR</li> <li>There is a public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No resolution of support from Local elected body, OR</li> <li>There is no public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>
<i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i>				
6. <b>Project bridges gap or removes barrier</b> between existing trail systems or provides interpretive center or rest area continuity.  Weighting: 6	Project provides an important connection (bridges gap, removes barrier or provides interp. or rest area continuity).	Project provides a modest connection (bridges gap, removes barrier or provides interp. or rest area continuity).	Project does connect existing networks, but no gaps bridged or barriers removed.	Project creates barrier or displaces existing non-motorized uses.

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>TRAAK Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>7. Project is tied to an annual recreational, educational or tourism <b>event or activity</b>. Does this project strongly support/sustain this event/?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Event or activity is of statewide or regional significance.</li> <li>• Event or activity is well known/long standing.</li> </ul> <p>Yes to both = 9 Yes to one = 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Event or activity is local and well known.</li> <li>• Event or activity is long standing.</li> </ul> <p>Yes to both = 7 Yes to one = 6</p> <p>Event is new but growing in importance = 5</p>	<p>Event is minor and local.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>8. Any of the six <b>intrinsic qualities</b>: scenic, historic, cultural, natural, archaeological, recreational.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 6</p>	<p>One point for each quality; maximum 5. Project must include <i>interpretation</i> of historic, cultural, natural and archaeological attributes for points.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>9. Project includes <b>Stabilization or renovation of a historic property</b> related to transportation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 4</p>	<p>Nomination includes letter or other documentation of inclusion of the renovated property on the National Historic Register.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nomination includes letter of support from Office of History &amp; Archeology that declares the property to be of significant historical importance = 7,</li> <li>• Nomination includes letter of support from Office of History &amp; Archeology that declares the property to be of moderate historical importance = 6</li> </ul>	<p>Project does not include stabilization or renovation of a historic property.</p>	<p>Project will harm or reduce in value an historic property.</p>



<b>TRAAK Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>10. Cost Effectiveness:</b></p> <p>Project cost/persons whom facility provides essential services &amp; benefits described in Criteria 1,2,6, or 7</p> <p>Weighting: 3</p>	<p>\$100 per capita or less</p> <p>For example: \$1 million project serves 10,000 persons</p>	<p>\$300 per capita or less</p> <p>For example: \$1.5 million project serves 5,000 persons</p>	<p>\$1,000 per capita or less</p> <p>For example: \$5 million project serves 5,000 persons</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>These calculations assume that most benefits for TRAAK projects are not "transportation" savings, and are non-quantifiable for TRAAK type projects</p>
<p><b>11. Capital cost:</b></p> <p>Weighting: 3</p>	<p>Total project cost (all phases): \$ 500,000 or less = 5</p>	<p>Total project cost (all phases): \$ 500,000-\$1,000,000 = 3</p>	<p>Total project cost (all phases): \$ 1,000,000- \$1,500,000 = 1 &gt;\$ 1,500,000 = 0</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>12. Other factors</b> not specified.</p> <p>Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.</p>		<p><i>Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest. If negative points assigned; 4 or more PEB members must jointly agree and identify the reasons for this decision.</i></p>	

Maximum Weight: 50

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

Transit Projects Criteria				
Standards	Scoring Criteria			
	9	7	4	1
1. <b>Health and quality of life</b> (access to basic necessities) Weighting: 3	Project provides significant contribution to improved health or quality of life.	Project provides moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life.	Project will have no effect, either positive or negative, on quality of life issues.	Project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
2. <b>Safety.</b>  Weighting: 2	Strongly addresses a significant and existing safety problem.	Addresses demonstrated existing safety problem of moderate nature.	No record of safety issues addressed by project or it is not primary purpose of project.	N/A
<b><i>10 year record: 2 or more deaths or major injuries = 9; 1 major injury = 7; speculative or anecdotal safety problem = maximum points 4.</i></b>				
3. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or reduces redundant facilities.  Weighting: 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Greatly</b> improves connectivity between modes and coordination and integration of passenger systems, OR</li> <li>• Would clearly reduce the need for <b>significant</b> capital investment in another mode.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Moderately</b> improves connectivity between modes and coordination and integration of passenger systems, OR</li> <li>• Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal to no effect on transportation system connectivity, or</li> <li>• Minimal to no effect on coordination and integration of passenger systems and services, AND</li> </ul> <p>Does not change the requirement for investment in other modes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greatly decreases the connectivity between modes, OR</li> <li>• Greatly decreases coordination and integration of passenger systems, OR</li> <li>• Results in redundant investments.</li> </ul>
4. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund capital costs.</b> Weighting: 5	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 pt per each 8% of project cost <i>exceeding required match.</i>			Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.
<i>Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required contribution shall be considered. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered. Required match may vary by program, and be as much as 20% - a 9.03% match will be assumed for scoring purposes. All match commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before points will be assigned. All work in lieu of match must be accompanied by a Tapered Match Agreement – contact your planner for details. A Match Waiver signed by the Commissioner = 9 points.</i>				
5. Local contribution to <b>fund operations and maintenance</b> (O&M) costs. Weighting: 4	Local contributions cover 100% of O&M costs, and include ownership of facility.	One point for each 20% of local support of O&M costs over required match.		

<b>Transit Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>If O&amp;M is not fully funded through a combination of local contributions and Federal funds, this project is disqualified from consideration.</i>				
<b>6. Public support.</b>  Weighting: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Preponderance</b> of public record shows support for project, and</li> <li>• A resolution from the local elected body shows support for project, and</li> <li>• <b>Fully supported</b> in state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Majority</b> of public record shows support for project, AND</li> <li>• Resolution of support from local elected body shows support for project, AND</li> <li>• Project is <b>nominally supported</b> in official state, tribal, or local plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has resolution of support from local elected body, OR</li> <li>• There is a public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No resolution of support from Local elected body, OR</li> <li>• There is no public record of support if project is located in unincorporated community in unorganized borough.</li> </ul>
<i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i>				
<b>7. Environmental approval</b> readiness.  Weighting: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental approval complete = 9</li> <li>• Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion = 8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment = 7</li> <li>• Environmental approval likely with draft documents circulated = 7</li> </ul>	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval unlikely.
<b>8. System continuity</b> and maintenance (vehicles).  Weighting: 4	Project replaces currently operating vehicles that are at or beyond FTA replacement standards.	Project provides vehicles to expand service.	Vehicles will neither replace currently operating vehicles nor expand service.	N/A
<b>9. Is the project listed in State Air Quality Implementation Plan?</b>  Weighting: 4	Yes, a required element.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, a contingency element = 7</li> <li>• No, but qualifies for CMAQ funds = 6-5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not listed in plan;</li> <li>• Does not qualify for CMAQ funds;</li> <li>• No significant air quality impacts.</li> </ul>	No, and project will have significant negative air quality impacts.
<b>10. Has local agency exhausted FTA/ other funding sources?</b> Weighting: 3	Yes, including filing of FTA 5309 application.	Yes, excluding FTA 5309 funding.	No, but FTA funding unlikely.	No, and FTA funding a strong possibility.
<b>11. Does project support private-non-profit (PNP) providers?</b> Weighting: 4	Yes, will replace existing PNP agency vehicle, which scored above 90 on FTA 5310 ranking.	Yes, new vehicle for PNP provider that scored above 90 on FTA 5310 ranking.	No.	N/A

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Transit Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>12. Will project support <b>coordinated service or brokerage</b>?</p> <p>Weighting: 6</p>	Yes, with 5 or more agencies in residence.	Yes, with 3 agencies in residence, or Yes, with 5 agents participating but not on site.	Yes, with three or more agencies participating but not on site.	No
<i>If this is a facility, rides to other agencies do not count as coordinated services.</i>				
<p>13. <b>Cost effectiveness</b></p> <p>Transportation related savings during project's life minus project's cost divided by population served.</p> <p>Weighting: 1</p>	Net transportation savings greater than \$1,000 per capita.	Net transportation savings between than \$1,000 per capita and negative \$1,000 per capita.	Net transportation savings lower than negative \$1,000 per capita (\$1,000 per capita net increase in transportation costs)	N/A
<p>14. <b>Increased mobility</b> for the disadvantaged.</p> <p>Weighting: 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased mobility for elderly, persons with disabilities, or economically disadvantaged is major benefit of project, OR</li> <li>Necessary for existing facility or system to comply with ADA.</li> </ul>	Increased mobility for elderly, persons with disabilities, or economically disadvantaged is moderate benefit of project.	Meets ADA requirements, but has limited benefits for mobility disadvantaged.	No intention/ impossible to meet ADA requirements.
<p>15. <b>Other factors</b> not specified.</p> <p>Weighting: 2</p>	Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Transit, Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.		<i>Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest. <u>If negative points assigned; 4 or more PEB members must jointly agree and identify the reasons for this decision.</u></i>	

Maximum Weight: 50

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Pre-Screening Criteria		
Standards	Yes	No
A. Clear and complete project and operational plan definition? Yes/No	Project implementation and operation plan clearly defined. <b>(Yes; project may proceed to B.)</b>	Project implementation and operation plan inadequate. <b>(No; project not eligible for consideration.)</b>
B. Project fulfills Alaska and National ITS Architecture? Yes/No	Project is clearly defined to fully conform to Alaska and National ITS architecture. <b>(Yes; project may proceed to C.)</b>	Project not defined to meet Alaska and National ITS architecture. <b>(No; project not eligible for consideration.)</b>
C. Project adheres to NTCIP* requirements? (Unless legacy systems prevent such requirement.) Yes/No	Project documentation clearly identifies all NTCIP requirements and is designed to meet them. <b>(Yes; project may proceed to scoring.)</b>	Vague identification of NTCIP requirements or no indication that they will be conformed to. <b>(No; project not eligible for consideration.)</b>

\*NTCIP = "National Transportation Communication for ITS Protocols."

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria				
Button Standards	Scoring Criteria			
	9 (5)	7 (3)	4 (0)	1 (-3)
1. Fosters department's ITS Program Areas defined in Alaska Iways Architecture (AKIA). Weighting: 7	Strongly supports the functional needs of 3 or more ITS Program Areas as defined in AKIA.	Strongly supports the functional needs of 1 or 2 ITS Program Areas as defined in AKIA.	Support of ITS Program Areas is minimal, speculative or temporary.	N/A
<i>A/I2 Program Areas: Commercial Vehicle Operations, Snow &amp; Ice Control, Multimodal Information, Internal Operations, Traveler Safety and Security, Traveler Communications. See Chapter 4, Concept of Operations.</i>				
2. Enhances the department's operating budget. Weighting: 5	Project provides a significant contribution to department operating budget (>250,000)	Project provides a moderate contribution to department operating budget (\$150,000)	Project will have no or minimal effect on department budget. (\$50,000)	This project will cause the department to incur significant new costs not offset by savings, revenue or avoided costs.
3. Integration with Departments' ITS plan, i.e. Alaska Iways Architecture (AKIA) Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS Program Areas within department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other ITS Program Areas within department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS Program Areas within department.	N/A
4. Integration external to department including other agencies and/or private sector. Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS applications external to department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other ITS applications external to department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other ITS applications external to department.	N/A

**2012 – 2015  
STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria</b>				
	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
<b>Button Standards</b>	<b>9 (5)</b>	<b>7 (3)</b>	<b>4 (0)</b>	<b>1 (-3)</b>
5. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund project development</b> .  Weighting: 3	Contribution of state match, design, right-of -way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 8% of project cost. Maximum= 5.	Contribution of state match, design, right-of -way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 8% of project cost.	Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A
6. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund M&amp;O costs</b> . (For non- DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership).  Weighting: 3	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing. Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A
<i>Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered.</i>				
7. Magnitude of <b>project costs</b> including capital and operating. (Include allied projects in cost calculation.) Weighting: 6	Project cost of less than \$1 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$3 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$5 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$10 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.
8. <b>Sustainability</b> of technology involved.  Weighting: 5	Project relies on technology proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of long-term project success is very high.	Project relies on technology used but not considered proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project long-term project success is moderately high.	Project relies on technology yet unproven in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project success unknown.	N/A
9. <b>Multi-use potential</b> .  Weighting: 6	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project significantly.	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project moderately.	Little or no ITS expansion potential offered by this project.	N/A
10. <b>Time to completion</b> . Weighting: 3	Project implementation likely <18 months.	Project implementation >18 months, but <36 months.	Project implementation >36 months.	N/A
11. <b>Cost effectiveness</b>  Transportation related savings during project's life minus project's cost divided by population served. Weighting: 3	Net transportation savings greater than \$1,000 per capita	Net transportation savings between than \$1,000 per capita and negative \$1000 per capita	Net transportation savings lower than negative \$1,000 per capita (\$1,000 per capita net increase in transportation costs)	N/A
<i>Use ADT x 2 if population served is not easily quantifiable.</i>				

<b>Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria</b>				
	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
<b>Button Standards</b>	<b>9 (5)</b>	<b>7 (3)</b>	<b>4 (0)</b>	<b>1 (-3)</b>
12. <b>Geographic extent.</b>  Weighting: 3	Project beneficiaries in all three regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in at least two regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in only one region or community.	N/A

Maximum weight = 50