A nighttime photograph of a cityscape. In the center, a large, modern building with a grid of windows is illuminated. To its right, a prominent domed capitol building is brightly lit. The background shows a hillside with residential houses and trees. The overall scene is dark, with city lights providing the primary illumination.

# ACHD Project Prioritization Stakeholder Meeting #2

FEHR & PEERS

Richard Brockmyer, AICP  
5/20/2022

# Scope of Work

## TASK 1: Existing Methodology & Process Review

- Memo Summarizing Existing Methodology and Problems / Improvements identified by Core Team and Stakeholders

## TASK 2: Best Practices Review

- Review of other agency processes and relevant national best practices
- Table comparing methodologies
- Memo summarizing best practices and recommendations for moving forward

## TASK 3: Development of Metrics

- Recommended project prioritization methodology
- Evaluation of recommended methodology compared to existing

## TASK 4: Implementation of Metrics

- Memo summarizing implementation strategy for full-incorporation into the IFYWP process

# What We Heard Last Time We Met








- Little understanding of current process
- Desire for more transparency
- Desire for simple and easy to understand process
- Interest in cross-modal prioritization
- Key Question that is not part of prioritization:
  - *How are funding levels determined for Roadways & Intersections vs. Community Programs*

# What We Reviewed

- Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC)
- Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)
- North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT)
- Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)
- Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
- Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)
- City of Tigard, OR
- Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
- Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
- NCHRP: Cross Mode Project Prioritization Report



# ACHD PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS COMPARATIVE TABLE

AGENCY	PROCESS / PROJECT	DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE ONLINE?	FREQUENCY OF PROJECT PRIORITIZATION	APPLICATION PROCESS	LEVEL OF COMPLEXITY	PROS	CONS	COMPARISON TO ACHD	WEBSITE
<b>Ada County Highway District</b>	IFYWP	✗	Annual	✗	 Medium-Low	Variables used are in-line with best practices, process and methodology is not overly complex	No documentation publicly available, list of variables used is long and much of the data is not accessible	N/A	N/A
<b>Wasatch Front Regional Council (UT)</b>	CMAQ, STP, & TAP	✓	Annual	✓	 Medium	Transparent process, clear documentation	Time consuming process, requires data development by applicants	Much more collaborative approach to developing prioritization. Uses a mix of quantitative and qualitative measures for prioritization	<a href="https://wfrc.org/programs/transportation-improvement-program/">https://wfrc.org/programs/transportation-improvement-program/</a>
<b>Utah Department of Transportation</b>	TIF, TTIF	✓	Annual	✓ (for some project types)	 Medium-High	Tied to overall transportation vision/goals, similar outcomes considered for all modes, transparent	Data intensive, relative ranking of projects can make projects score differently each time, complex weighting and many variables used	More complex and uses a long list of metrics framed around key outcomes. Requires applications for some project types and uses long-range plans to identify others.	<a href="https://udot.utah.gov/connect/about-us/commission/project-prioritization-process/">https://udot.utah.gov/connect/about-us/commission/project-prioritization-process/</a>
<b>North Carolina Department of Transportation</b>	TIP	✓	Annual	✓	 Medium-High	Uses a normalization process to put all projects on 1-100 scale. A small percentage of funding goes to projects that compete cross-modally	Data intensive, requires applicants to develop data, complex scoring methodology	Much more complex, but uses some similar measures	<a href="https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/pages/prioritizationresources.aspx">https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/pages/prioritizationresources.aspx</a>
<b>Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</b>	TIP	✓	4 years	✗	 Low	Allots bonus points for AT improvements "above and beyond", up to 10 extra points. Doesn't require extensive additional data	Roadway-focused (and predominantly quantitative) metrics tend to favor roadway projects	More simple and uses a shorter list of metrics.	<a href="https://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/Transportation/RegionalTIP2124.htm">https://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/Transportation/RegionalTIP2124.htm</a>
<b>Virginia Department of Transportation (Smart Scale)</b>	SYIP	✓	Annual	✓	 High	Cross-modal prioritization, transparent process and results	Data intensive, requires applicants to develop much of the data that is used, very complex process	Much more complex. Prioritizes project cross-modally. Requires a large amount of data development and analysis.	<a href="https://smartscale.org/">https://smartscale.org/</a>
<b>Minnesota Department of Transportation</b>	STIP, SHIP	✓	Annual	✗	 Medium-Low	Small number of variables considered makes the methodology easy to understand	Roadway and active transportation projects use very different metrics	More simple and uses a shorter list of metrics. Also separates roadway projects from active transportation projects	<a href="https://www.dot.state.mn.us/projectselection/categories/mobility-capacity-expansion.html">https://www.dot.state.mn.us/projectselection/categories/mobility-capacity-expansion.html</a>

# Key Takeaways

- Most agencies have a website presence explaining prioritization process and measures
- Processes inform decision making, but only one example where model outputs are only consideration in funding decisions
- Many agencies tie prioritization methodology to overarching goals or agency vision
- **Agencies use similar measures to what ACHD currently uses**
- Only one example where true cross-modal prioritization is done, but many examples of similar measures across all modes
- Wide variation in methodology (simple to complex)
  - Most agencies stressed keeping things simple

# Process and Methodology

- Focus on Increasing Transparency
  - Website
  - Application process
  - Posting documentation and results
  - Posting available datasets

# Process and Methodology

- Maintain Methodology but improve and simplify
  - Use consistent set of variables for Community Program prioritization
  - Incorporate Level of Traffic Stress metrics
  - Convert Roads & Intersections to a 100 point scale
  - Re-examine weighting
  - Separate out safety and congestion benefits
  - Separate out density and equity metrics



RECOMMENDATIONS

# Timeline

	June	July	August	September	October	November
Commission Meeting						
Categorize Metrics into Outcomes/Goals						
Simplify Community Programs Methodology						
Simplify Roads & Intersections Methodology						
Develop and Refine Application Process						
Create Website						