WILMAPCO

Amended May 12, 2016

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

WILMAPCO has created a Prioritization process to evaluate transportation projects using measurable criteria based on the goals of our long-range plan. It provides a quantitative method to compare projects proposed for our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

STEP 1: APPLY SCREENING CRITERIA

Is project consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and local, county and state transportation plans and land use plans? If not, project should not be ranked or plan amendments should be made prior to ranking.

STEP 2: STAFF CALCULATES TECHNICAL SCORE

Using available technical data, WILMAPCO Staff calculates a technical score for each project based on the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan. Each goal has a similar point value, with the maximum for each project of 36 points.

STEP 3: WILMAPCO'S TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REVIEWS TECHNICAL SCORING FOR ACCURACY AND CONSIDERS:

WILMAPCO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviews technical scoring for accuracy and considers:

- Technical score developed by staff
- Urgency of project
- Cost effectiveness/ life cycle costs
- Private/local funding match provided
- Project recommended in adopted transportation plan
- Submitting agency rankings by ensuring that top local priorities receive higher WILMAPCO ranking than lower local priorities
- Other issues not included in ranking
- Additional "special considerations" to break ties and serve as a reality check

STEP 4: WILMAPCO COUNCIL RANKS SUBMISSIONS

Council ranks submissions considering:

- Technical score developed by staff and reviewed by TAC
- Urgency of project
- Cost effectiveness/ life cycle costs
- Private/local funding match provided
- Project recommended in adopted transportation plan
- Submitting agency rankings by ensuring that top local priorities receive higher WILMAPCO ranking than lower local priorities
- Other issues not included in ranking
- Additional "special considerations" to break ties and serve as a reality check

GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

- 6 – 10 points

Criteria:

- Protect public health and safety
- Promote active transportation
- Preserve natural and cultural resources
- Ensure transportation choice and equity

AIR QUALITY: Expected to impact air quality, based on project types:

3	Project expected to moderately or significantly improve air quality. Project types include: a. fixed-route bus and train service expansions b. public transit technology improvements c. major non-recreational nonmotorized system expansion (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity) d. diesel engine replacements e. alternative fueling stations f. park-and-ride lot expansions g. carpooling schemes
1	Project expected to slightly improve air quality. Project types include: a. fixed-route bus and train service replacements b. minor non-recreational nonmotorized system expansions (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity) c. major non-recreational nonmotorized system maintenance (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity)
0	Project not expected to impact air quality. Project types include: a. roadway projects which do not add capacity b. park-and-ride lot maintenance c. rail preservation d. paratransit expansion and maintenance e. recreational nonmotorized system expansion/maintenance f. minor non-recreational nonmotorized system maintenance (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity)
-1	Project expected to slightly worsen air quality. Project types include: a. roadway projects which add capacity but are non-regionally significant, including those with a non-recreational nonmotorized system expansion component
-3	Project expected to moderately or significantly worsen air quality. Project types include: a. roadway projects which add capacity and are regionally significant, including those with a non-recreational nonmotorized system expansion component

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: Project enhances environment in locations with a high percentage of low-income and/or minority residents. Supportive projects reduce risk of accidents, and/or enhance neighborhoods. Negative impacts include increased accident risk for vehicular and/or non-motorized traffic, displacement of homes or businesses, and/or increased traffic through neighborhoods.

3	Project supports environmental justice in area with high low-income or minority population
1	Project supports environmental justice in area with above average low-income or minority population
0	Project does not impact environmental justice
-1	Project negatively impacts area with above average low-income or minority population
-3	Project negatively impacts area with high low-income or minority population

SAFETY: Intersections scored using a composite of average annual crash frequency, manner of impact (i.e. Head-on, sideswipe, etc.), and severity (fatality, injury, property damage, etc.). Analysis includes a 3-year average of crashes at signalized and non-signalized intersections that average 10 or more crashes per year. Score is based on the highest scoring intersection within the project limits.

4	20% highest crash scores
3	20-40% worst crash scores
2	40-60% worst crash scores
1	60-80% worst crash scores
0	20% lowest crash scores

GOAL: EFFICIENTLY TRANSPORT PEOPLE

0 – 15 points

Criteria:

- Improve system performance
- Promote accessibility and connectivity
- Engage the public via an open involvement process

CONGESTION: Corridor improvement recommended in Congestion Management System (CMS) or location with level of service (LOS) E or F. If recommended in CMS or LOS E/F*:

2	Project within a CMS corridor identified by the CMS Subcommittee
1	Road segment with LOS E or F but outside of identified CMS corridors
0	Road segment is neither in CMS nor LOS E or F

*If project meets the above CMS criteria, then the following two criteria will be calculated in addition to the points awarded above.

\+

Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)	
4	Greater than 60,000 AADT
3	40,000 – 60,000 AADT
2	20,000 – 40,000 AADT
0	Less than 20,000 AADT

\+

Transit Usage—Transit Load Factor by segment based on average # of riders vs. # of available seats.	
3	Greater than 35% capacity
2	25 – 35% capacity
1	15 – 25% capacity
0	Less than 15% capacity

TRANSPORTATION JUSTICE: Use percentage of zero-car households, elderly & persons with disabilities instead of low-income/minority (thresholds as determined by EJ report, phase ii), identify projects that support non-motorized or transit alternatives.

3	Supportive project within an area of high concentrations of mobility-constrained populations
1	Supportive project within an area of moderate concentrations of mobility-constrained populations
0	Does not improve mobility or ease access to transportation choices

PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY: Project supports pedestrian improvement based on pedestrian priority area scoring. Scores are based upon the highest pedestrian network score in which the project passes.

3	Top 90th percentile of pedestrian network scores
1	Top 70th – 90th percentile of pedestrian network scores
0	Bottom 70th percentile of pedestrian network scores

GOAL: SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOODS MOVEMENT

0 – 11 points

Criteria:

- Maximize our investments
- Develop effective transportation networks
- Plan for energy security and climate change

FREIGHT: Scores using the three-tiered scoring defined in the WILMAPCO freight & goods movement analysis.

Bottlenecks are identified using high truck trip generating traffic zones, areas of high truck crash frequencies and travel time delays which hamper the efficient movement of truck traffic which can effect economic growth and competitiveness.

4	"Significant Bottleneck" – Refers to segments with multiple failing criteria, and generally includes roadways which carry the highest traffic volumes and experience heaviest congestion.
3	"Moderate Bottleneck" – Refers to segments that are experiencing some failing, or nearly failing, criteria. There is more variation in scoring across the criteria, with some criteria demonstrating failure and others at more modest levels.
2	"Minor Bottleneck" – Refers to segments that experience one or more criteria that are near failing. While most have only a few criteria showing near failure, others are at acceptable levels.
0	All other road segments

SUPPORT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES: Projects that support economic development state and local policies.

Those include adding or improving access to brownfield locations; an existing or planned site used for employment, tourism, manufacturing, commercial or industrial purposes; or addresses an issue identified through regional economic development planning. For New Castle County, use DE Office of State Planning Policies and Spending map, Investment Level 1 and Investment Level 2: For Cecil County, use the State Priority Funding Areas and County Certified Areas.

3	Project located in Delaware Investment Level 1 area or Maryland Priority Funding Area
1	Project located in Delaware Investment Level 2 area or Cecil County Certified Area
0	Project not located in either of the above areas

PRIVATE OR LOCAL FUNDING CONTRIBUTION: Local and/or private commitment demonstrated by funding contribution.

4	Greater than 80% through private/local funds
3	60-80% funded through private/local funds
2	40-60% funded through private/local funds
1	20-40% funded through private/local funds
0	Less than 20% through private/local fund