

# 2012 – 2015 STIP Project Scoring Criteria

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria			
Scoring Criteria			
Standards	9	7	4
<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>normally</b> called out in a plan.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Health and quality of life</p> <p>(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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.</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>1</p> <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>			

2012 – 2015 STIP Project Scoring Criteria

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria			
Standards	9	7	4
Standards	Scoring Criteria		
<p>3. <b>Safety.</b> Meets goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</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>Weighting: 5 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.</p>			
<p>4. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.</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>Weighting: 4 Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund capital costs.</b></p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds, design, and/or materials: 1 pt per each 5% of project cost.</p>		
<p>Weighting: 7</p>	<p>Will increase demand on another mode requiring additional capital expenditure.</p>		
<p>5. Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund capital costs.</b></p>	<p>Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.</p>		

**2012 – 2015 STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Urban and Rural Projects Criteria</b>				
<b>Standards</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Scoring Criteria</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 could be divested, major collector and above.</li> </ul>	<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>Weighting: 0 or 6</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>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

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria			
Standards	9	7	4
	Scoring Criteria		
7. Public support?  Weighting: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preponderance 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>Majority 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>
<i>Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body.</i>			
8. Environmental approval 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.</li> </ul>
9a. Surface rehabilitation  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>
OR			
9b. Deficient width/grade/alignment (w/g/a).  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.

**2012 – 2015 STIP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Urban and Rural Projects Criteria</b>			
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
<b>Standards</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>
<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
<b>Stand alone bridge projects use assumed length of 1 mile; stand alone intersection projects use assumed length of 1/2 mile.</b>			
<b>11. Deficient bridges?</b> Weighting: 2	Deficient bridge(s) needing replacement*	Deficient bridge(s) eligible for rehabilitation**	No bridge deficiencies  N/A
* Eligible for replacement 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.			
** Eligible for rehabilitation 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 not specified.</b>	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.		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.

Total Weight = 50