

CITY OF UNALASKA  
UNALASKA, ALASKA

RESOLUTION 2019-15

A RESOLUTION OF THE UNALASKA CITY COUNCIL DECLARING THE CAPTAINS BAY ROAD PAVING AND UTILITY EXTENSION PROJECT AS THE CITY OF UNALASKA'S NUMBER ONE STATE FUNDING PRIORITY

WHEREAS, the City of Unalaska is eligible to submit an application to the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) for the Community Transportation Program for the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project in Unalaska, Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Unalaska authorizes the City Manager to sign the application and future Project Agreements; and

WHEREAS, the City of Unalaska has received a request from the ADOT&PF to nominate projects for inclusion in the Alaska Community Transportation Program funds as outlined in ADOT&PF's application packet for 2020-2023; and

WHEREAS, the City of Unalaska is participating as an eligible project sponsor in the ADOT&PF Community Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, Federal monies are available under a Community Transportation Program, administered by ADOT&PF, for the purpose of creating and promoting the planning and development of transportation projects in Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the City of Unalaska acknowledges availability of the required match of no less than 9.03%; and

WHEREAS, after appropriate public input and due consideration, the City Council of the City of Unalaska has recommended that an application be submitted to the State of Alaska for the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Unalaska that:

The City of Unalaska hereby declares the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project as their number one State Funding Priority; and

The City Council of the City of Unalaska does hereby authorize the City Manager to sign and submit an application to the ADOT&PF for Community Transportation Program funds on behalf of the citizens of the City of Unalaska; and

The City of Unalaska hereby assures the ADOT&PF that sufficient funding for the City of Unalaska's matching contribution for the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project is available; and

The City of Unalaska hereby assures the ADOT&PF that the City of Unalaska will commit to ownership, maintenance, and operations responsibilities and that sufficient funding for the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project will be available for the life of the project; and

The City Council of the City of Unalaska supports the project entitled Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project and agrees, subject to available Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding and programming by ADOT&PF, to enter into a memorandum of agreement with the State of Alaska DOT&PF, in accordance with 17 AAC 05.175(l), for the design, construction, transfer, or maintenance of a STIP project pertaining to the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by a duly constituted quorum of the Unalaska City Council on April 9, 2019.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Dennis M. Robinson  
Vice Mayor

ATTEST:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Roxanna Winters  
Acting City Clerk



---

---

## MEMORANDUM TO COUNCIL

---

---

To: Mayor and City Council Members  
From: Tom Cohenour, Director, Department of Public Works  
Through: Thomas Thomas, City Manager  
Date: April 9, 2019  
Re: Resolution 2019-15: Declaring the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project as the City of Unalaska's Number One State Funding Priority

---

---

**SUMMARY:** Resolution 2019-15 will publicly declare the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project as the City's number one state funding priority. The resolution will be included with the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) application, which is due by May 15, 2019, and increase our chances of receiving a State grant.

**PREVIOUS COUNCIL ACTION:** Council authorized the FY2019 Capital & Operating Budget Ordinance 2018-04, approved and adopted on May 22, 2018. Council funded the initial design portion of this project via resolution 2018-48 on July 10, 2018.

**BACKGROUND:** A subset of the STIP is the Community Transportation Program (CTP). The last project nomination opportunity for the CTP occurred in 2011 for the 2012-2015 STIP. Even as the statewide backlog of nominated projects dwindles and additional funding has become available, fiscal uncertainty affecting both the federal-aid program and state funding continue to drive the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) to make very conservative funding projections into the near future and narrow the focus of the CTP. Therefore, the upcoming project nomination opportunity will again be solicited with uncertainty regarding the amount of funding available.

**DISCUSSION:** The CTP project nomination opportunity will have two sets of criteria: Urban and Rural, and Remote. Communities not connected to the continental road network by road or ferry will use the Remote Projects Criteria. The 17 page CTP Project Scoring Criteria guide has very specific language that must be included in the resolution. The attached Resolution 2019-15 utilizes the template provided by ADOT&PF which contains the specific language they require.

**ALTERNATIVES:** Council could choose to postpone support for this resolution, however, that will significantly reduce our chances at State funding for the Captains Bay Road Paving and Utility Extension Project.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:** There are no costs or fees to submit the STIP application other than staff time.

**LEGAL:** There are no legal issues.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approving this resolution of support and feels it is very prudent to do so.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move to approve Resolution 2019-15.

**CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:** I recommend Council adopt Resolution 2019-15.

**ATTACHMENTS:** 2020-2023 CTP Project Evaluation Criteria

Resolution 2019-15  
Exhibit A



## **2020-2023 Community Transportation Program Project Evaluation Criteria**

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

## 2020-2023 CTP Project Scoring Criteria

Thank you to all Alaskans who commented on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) project scoring criteria. A Comment-Response Matrix has been created to provide a summary of comments, responses, and changes made to the criteria. The Matrix can be found at our website [http://www.dot.state.ak.us/stwdplng/cip/stip/projects/2023\\_ctp\\_peb.shtml](http://www.dot.state.ak.us/stwdplng/cip/stip/projects/2023_ctp_peb.shtml). Many of the changes merely clarify the intent of existing criteria through minor changes to wording and formatting; however, there are some significant changes to the criteria. Applicants interested in submitting project nominations are encouraged to review the Comment-Response Matrix as it provides details related to changes made and further describes the Department's intent relative to criteria that were commented upon.

Additional key considerations for applicants are discussed below, including a discussion regarding the delay to the Community Transportation Program timeline.

### ***Community Transportation Program Timeline***

The last project nomination opportunity for the Community Transportation Program (CTP) occurred in 2011 for the 2012-2015 STIP. When the criteria were developed for that project nomination opportunity the federal funding bill, known as SAFETEA-LU, had expired and federal transportation funding was provided through extensions of SAFETEA-LU. These extensions continued until a new two year federal funding bill, MAP-21, was enacted in July 2012. Federal funding continued under MAP-21, and extensions of MAP-21, until the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act was enacted in December 2015. In summary, the last project nomination opportunity was initiated during a time of extensions and with recognition of uncertainty regarding future funding.

The projects included in the 2012-2015 STIP were primarily funded under MAP-21. While MAP-21 brought some funding certainty, it was a short term bill that also came with many significant changes. These changes included a focus on asset management and performance measures for the National Highway System (NHS). To help states achieve these goals, more funds were dedicated to the NHS,

leaving fewer funds available for other needs funded under the Surface Transportation Program (STP). The CTP program falls under these 'other needs' using STP funds. As a result the Department continues to fund a backlog of CTP projects and has been unable to provide another project nomination opportunity.

These criteria are expected to be used for a project nomination opportunity for the 2020-2023 STIP.

Fiscal uncertainty affecting both the federal-aid program and state funding continue to drive the ADOT&PF to make very conservative funding projections into the near future and narrow the focus of the CTP. The FAST Act expires in 2020, therefore the upcoming project nomination opportunity will again be solicited with uncertainty regarding the amount of funding available. The Department is hopeful that federal-aid funding will continue to remain at stable levels; however, we will continue to proceed cautiously and analyze funding availability as the project nomination opportunity approaches and as projects are selected and funded.

### ***Sets of criteria***

This CTP project nomination opportunity will have two sets of criteria: Urban and Rural; and Remote.

Per 17 AAC 05.175 (c), Communities not connected to the continental road network by road or ferry will use the Remote Projects Criteria. All other communities will use the Urban and Rural Projects Criteria.

### ***Local contribution to match***

In the current fiscal climate, community partnership is more important than ever in building and maintaining infrastructure. Federal funds are limited and demand is high. An effective way of distributing federal dollars fairly and widely 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.**

The DOT&PF Match Policy may allow for a reduced match amount for routes with a higher functional classification.

Matching contributions will be calculated as a percent of the total project cost, using a DOT&PF approved project cost estimate. The federal aid match requirement is officially 9.03%. Each additional 1% of additional contribution will be awarded 0.2 pts. This means that a 5% additional contribution (above the required matching funds) will receive 1 point before weighting and 5 points with weighting. The purpose for using 0.2pts for each 1% is so that additional contributions do not need to be in 5% increments as in previous nomination cycles. See examples below.

Total committed contribution (including required match)	Additional contribution beyond required match (Total minus 9%)	Points without weighting (0.2 pt for each 1%)	Points with weighting (times 5)
9.03%	0	0	0
14%	5%	1	5
25%	16%	3.2	16

All financial commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before project will be considered for funding.

## 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 essentially get a subsidy that other communities do not.

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. Functional classification, from least to highest, is as follows:

- Local
- Minor Collector
- Major Collector
- Minor Arterial
- Principal Arterial
- Interstate

The Long Range Transportation Plan "Let's Get Moving 2036" requires communities to take ownership of state-owned local and minor collectors; supports divestment of local roads (Action 7.2); and encourages targeting state resources to higher functional class routes (Action 1.1). Additional regulatory language asks the Project Evaluation Board (PEB) to consider whether the municipality, another state agency, or a federal agency has made a contribution to finance capital costs and/or to take ownership (17 AAC 05.175(b)(6-7), (c)(6-7).

The Urban and Rural criteria and the Remote criteria reward communities that make a commitment to take on new responsibility of local infrastructure or that have already taken responsibility for a large share of their local infrastructure (primarily those local and minor collector routes). The Department will calculate the percentage of local and minor collectors for which the community has assumed ownership and/or management responsibility.

Any commitment to assume new ownership or management responsibility of a route or to maintain current ownership must be in

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before the project is considered for funding.

commitments for maintenance and match must be committed at the time of nomination and provided in full prior to initiation of the project.

## **Resolutions**

A resolution of support from the local or tribal government is extremely important. Every resolution must include:

- 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 or funding constraints. Example language might be: "Construction of a two lane gravel road from X to Y along Z route, or similar given design or funding constraints."
- Acknowledgement of financial contribution commitments including required match.
- Acknowledgement of new or continued ownership, management, and/or maintenance responsibility.
- Explicit language **authorizing the execution of an agreement with the State** to perform the specified acts.\*  
The specified acts include monetary commitments for which the project is expected to be awarded points under standards five (funding contributions) and six (M&O contributions). Including this language will enable the Department and the sponsor to execute an agreement upon award of funds.

## **Let's Keep Moving**

The Department is not alone in feeling uncertainty related to long term funding projections. The State's fiscal crisis, along with federal aid funding uncertainty, have left the Department and many communities feeling pressure to do more with less. The Department expects with limited funds available, and a conservative approach, that this project nomination opportunity will be highly competitive. Project sponsors that are willing to provide additional funding contributions and/or take on additional maintenance responsibility will be rewarded. The Department appreciates the willingness of communities to participate in the ownership, funding, and maintenance of transportation systems in Alaska.

\*This last bullet is not a mandatory requirement for project nominations; however, it is highly recommended. Each project that is awarded funds will be required to have a project agreement in place before any project related work can begin. For an incorporated community to enter into and sign this agreement, there must be a resolution authorizing the execution of the agreement. Therefore, it is in the best interest of each project sponsor to obtain these permissions as part of the resolution of support for the project.

For unincorporated communities a public record of support is required in lieu of a resolution. Additionally, all monetary



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

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria		Scoring Criteria	
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)
<p><b>3. Safety</b> Meets goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</p> <p>5 Year Safety Historical Concentrations.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) a long term pattern of fatal or major (incapacitating) injury crashes; or</p> <p>B) a documented high crash potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic; or</p> <p>C) HSIP* costs/mile of project length greater than \$2.5 million per mile**.</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) a long term pattern of minor injury or property damage crashes; or</p> <p>B) a documented moderate crash potential or risk between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic; or</p> <p>C) HSIP costs/mile of project length between \$1.5 and \$2.5 million per mile.**</p>	<p>No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential in other categories:</p> <p>A) historical crash patterns identified are less than 3 or more crashes per year.</p> <p>B) no demonstrated traffic conflicts between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic.</p>
			<p>Proposes features which are recognized in practice to worsen highway safety such as a project that:</p> <p>A) would be contrary to a strategy of the SHSP in a significant manner; or</p> <p>B) proposes other work that is viewed as contrary to producing a safer roadway environment for motorized or non-motorized users.</p>
<p><i>Most recently available five year official ADOT&amp;PF data. When using anecdotal crash information from first hand (EMS, Fire, Police, M&amp;O - on-scene responsibility) = maximum score is 4 points. When using anecdotal safety information from second-hand sources (not on-scene responsibility) or data not recognized in practice = maximum score 2 points.</i></p> <p>*Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</p> <p>**The Department will provide the numerical analysis in (C) for project nominations that include a qualifying safety improvement.</p>			

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria		Scoring Criteria	
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)
<p>4. Improves intermodal transportation or lessens redundant facilities.</p> <p>Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment or significantly reduce operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or significantly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p> <p>Contributes to system network by substantially alleviating safety concerns, increasing efficiency, or decreasing operating costs of a nearby NHS route (+1) or interstate route (+2).</p>	<p>May reduce the need for capital investments and / or result in a reduction in operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p>	<p>Does not impact other mode or adjacent facility requirements or connections.</p>
<p>5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs.</p> <p>Weighting: 5</p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds: .2 pt per each 1% of project cost in excess of the required federal aid match.</p>	<p>Contribution covers no capital costs beyond required federal aid match commitment of 9.03%.</p>	<p>Will increase demand on another mode or facility requiring additional capital expenditure; or a new increase in operating cost.</p>
<p>Only contributions that exceed the required match per DOT&amp;PF match policy 09.01.040 shall be considered for additional points. All financial commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before project will be considered for funding. Cost estimates must be prepared or approved by DOT&amp;PF.</p>		<p>N/A</p> <p>Commitment to provide matching funds is required for all project nominations</p>	

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria		Scoring Criteria	
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)
6a. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&O costs (For non-DOT&PF sponsored projects).  Weighting: 0 or 5	Sponsor will assume ownership and management responsibility if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Continued sponsor ownership and management responsibility of locally owned facility and community currently assumes management responsibility for: - 90% or greater of routes (in miles) functionally classified minor collector or local (3pts); or - 60-90% of routes (in miles) functionally classified as minor collector or local (2pts).	Sponsor assumes ownership and management responsibility of proposed or existing locally owned facility.  (-3) Project would increase M&O costs significantly.
6b. Departmental M&O costs and priority (For DOT&PF sponsored projects). Weighting: 0 or 5	<i>Sponsor commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned.</i> Significant M&O priority. A project that results in a transfer of management responsibility to a local government will be considered a significant priority.	Moderate M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs.  Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria		Scoring Criteria	
<b>Standards</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(0)</b>
<b>7. Public support.</b>	Project has a resolution of support from the local elected body* and is identified as a high priority project in state, tribal, or local plans*.	Project has a resolution of support from local elected body*; and supported in official state, tribal, or local plans.	Project has resolution of support from local elected body*.  Project has resolution of support and resolution includes language authorizing the execution of an agreement with the State promising to perform the specified act(s) for which the sponsor is seeking points under standard 5 (funding contributions) and standard 6 (ownership and management responsibility). (1 point)
Weighting: 3			N/A  Resolution* is required for all project nominations.
*Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body. For those communities not represented by a locally elected body, a public record of support is required and any monetary commitments for maintenance or match will need to be committed to at the time of nomination. 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.			
<b>8. Environmental approval readiness.</b>	Environmental approval complete; or Environmental approval likely with a categorical exclusion (CE) document.	Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Assessment (EA).	Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
Weighting: 2			Environmental approval unlikely.
Environmental documentation must follow FHWA guidelines as explained in federal regulations. Sponsor should submit any completed environmental documents with their application package.			

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Urban and Rural Projects Criteria</b>		<b>Scoring Criteria</b>	
<b>Standards</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(0)</b>
<b>9. System Reliability or deficient width/grade/alignment (w/g/a).</b>	Primarily an Asset Management preservation project; or a route with significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards impacting system reliability.	A portion of the project rehabilitates subgrade, appurtenances or other infrastructure such as sidewalks, etc.; or moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Primarily major reconstruction; addresses long-range rehabilitation <b>And</b> no w/g/a deficiencies.
Weighting: 4  For projects which address a situation where there is a traffic demand that is significantly (or moderately) deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	\$0 - \$1.50 = 5 \$ 1.50 - \$ 3.00 = 4	\$ 3.00 - \$ 4.50 = 3 \$ 4.50 - \$6.00 = 2 \$ 6.00 - 8.00 = 1	\$ 8.00 - \$ 10.00 = 0 \$10.00 - \$20.00 = -1 \$20.00 - 40.00 = -2 >\$40.00 = -3
<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 (AADT). Weighting: 5	Standalone bridge projects use assumed length of 1 mile; standalone intersection projects use assumed length of ½ mile. The Department will prepare or approve (possibly with revision) all cost estimates for consistency statewide.		
<b>11. Deficient bridges.</b>  Weighting: 4	Bridge needs to be replaced. At the end of service life and structurally deficient. Two or more bridge ratings (deck, superstructure, substructure) are deficient (rating 4 or less).	Structurally deficient. At least one bridge rating (deck, superstructure, or substructure) is deficient (rating is 4 or less).	+1 point if project addresses a functionally obsolete bridge.

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria		Scoring Criteria	
		(5)	(-3)
<b>Standards</b>		(3)	(0)
12. Functional classification.	Minor Arterial = 5	Major Collector =3 Minor Collector =2	Local Roads / Streets or Unclassified
Weighting: 4			
<i>If local government agrees to take over ownership of state owned road – lowest functional class score is "4"</i> .			
13. Other factors not specified.	Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity, or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity, or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits no innovation, creativity, or unique benefits not otherwise rated.
Weighting: 2			

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

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



## Remote Projects Criteria

Scoring Criteria			
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)
<p><b>3. Safety</b> (Meets goals or strategies listed in the Alaska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).</p> <p><b>5 Year Safety Historical Concentrations.</b></p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) a long term pattern of fatal or major (incapacitating) injury crashes;</p> <p>B) a documented high crash potential or risk between a major non-motorized use facility and vehicular traffic; or</p> <p>C) HSIP* costs/mile of project length greater than \$2.5 million per mile**.</p>	<p>Proposes mitigation which is recognized in practice to address safety issues for a route that qualifies based on:</p> <p>A) a long term pattern of minor injury or property damage crashes;</p> <p>B) a documented moderate crash potential or risk between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic;-or</p> <p>C) HSIP costs/mile of project length between \$1.5 and \$2.5 million per mile. **.</p>	<p>No mitigation is demonstrated to address a crash problem or potential in other categories:</p> <p>A) historical crash patterns identified are less than 3 or more crashes per year; or</p> <p>B) no demonstrated traffic conflicts between non-motorized users and vehicular traffic.</p>
			<p>Proposes features which are recognized in practice to worsen highway safety such as a project that:</p> <p>A) would be contrary to a strategy of the SHSP in a significant manner; or</p> <p>B) proposes other work that is viewed as contrary to producing a safer roadway environment for motorized or non-motorized users.</p>
<p><b>Weighting: 5</b></p>	<p><i>Most recently available five year official ADOT&amp;PF data. When using anecdotal crash information from first hand (EMS, Fire, Police, M&amp;O - on-scene responsibility) = maximum score is 4 points. When using anecdotal safety information from second-hand sources (not on-scene responsibility) or data not recognized in practice = maximum score 2 points.</i></p> <p><i>*Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</i></p> <p><i>**The Department will provide the numerical analysis in (C) for project nominations that include a qualifying safety improvement.</i></p>		

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

<b>Remote Projects Criteria</b>			
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>			
	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(0)</b>
<p><b>Standards</b></p> <p>4. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.</p> <p>Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment or significantly reduce operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or significantly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p> <p>Contributes to system network by substantially alleviating safety concerns, increasing efficiency, or decreasing operating costs of a nearby NHS route (+1) or interstate route (+2).</p>	<p>May reduce the need for capital investments and / or result in a reduction in operating costs in another mode or on an adjacent facility; or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.</p>	<p>Does not impact other mode or adjacent facility requirements or connections.</p>
<p>5. Local, other agency, or user contribution to <b>fund capital costs.</b></p> <p>Weighting: 5</p> <p><i>Only contributions that exceed the required match per DOT&amp;PF match policy 09.01.040 shall be considered for additional points. All financial commitments must be in writing and approved by the local governing body of the community or tribal government before project will be considered for funding. Cost estimates must be prepared or approved by DOT&amp;PF.</i></p>	<p>Contribution of cash matching funds: .2 pt per each 1% of project cost in excess of the required federal aid match.</p>	<p>Contribution covers no capital costs Beyond required match commitment.</p>	<p>Will increase demand on another mode or facility requiring additional capital expenditure; or a new increase in operating cost.</p>

Remote Projects Criteria			
Scoring Criteria			
	(5)	(3)	(0)
<p>6a. Local, other agency, or user contribution to fund M&amp;O costs (For non-DOT&amp;PF sponsored projects).</p> <p>Weighting: 0 or 5</p>	<p>Sponsor will assume ownership and management responsibility if currently a DOT&amp;PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&amp;PF facility of similar M&amp;O cost.</p>	<p>Continued sponsor ownership and management responsibility of locally owned facility and community currently assumes management responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 90% or greater of routes (in miles) functionally classified minor collector or local (3pts); or</li> <li>- 60-90% of routes (in miles) functionally classified as minor collector or local (2pts).</li> </ul>	<p>Sponsor assumes ownership and management responsibility of proposed or existing locally owned facility.</p> <p>(-3)</p> <p>Project would increase M&amp;O costs significantly.</p>
<p>6b. Departmental M&amp;O costs and priority (For DOT&amp;PF sponsored projects).</p> <p>Weighting: 0 or 5</p>	<p>Significant M&amp;O priority. A project that results in a transfer of management responsibility to a local government will be considered a significant 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>

**2020-2023  
CTP Project Scoring Criteria**

Remote Projects Criteria			
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)
<p><b>7. Public support.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Weighting: 3</p>	<p>Project has a resolution of support from the local elected body* and is identified as a high priority project in state, tribal, or local plans.</p>	<p>Project has a resolution of support from local elected body* and nominally supported in official state, tribal, or local plans.</p>	<p>Project has resolution of support from local elected body*.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p> <p>Resolution* is required for all project nominations</p>
<p><i>*Resolution is only required in areas/communities represented by locally elected body. For those communities not represented by a locally elected body, a public record of support is required and any monetary commitments for maintenance or match will need to be committed to at the time of nomination. 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.</i></p>			
<p><b>8. Environmental approval readiness.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Weighting: 2</p>	<p>Environmental approval complete; or Environmental approval likely with a categorical exclusion (CE) document.</p>	<p>Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment (EA).</p>	<p>Environmental approval likely with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental approval unlikely.</p>
<p>Environmental documentation must follow FHWA guidelines as explained in federal regulations.</p>			
<p><b>9. Will project provide new and/or improved access to the noted uses: ferry terminals, airports, subsistence sites, or river/ocean access?</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Weighting: 2</p>	<p>New access to two or more uses = 5. Improved access to two or more = 2. Improved access to one of listed uses = 1.</p>	<p>New access to one = 3; Improved access to two or more = 2. Improved access to one of listed uses = 1.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>

**Remote Projects Criteria**

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