



**NACOG
TRANSPORTATION POLICY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TPAC)**

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.02

Wednesday, May 12, 2021
1:00 PM – 2:30 PM

Videoconference Meeting

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/185741365>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: +1 (571) 317-3112
- One-touch: <tel:+15713173112,,185741365#>

Access Code: 185-741-365

- I. Call to Order and Introductions
- II. Approval of Minutes - April 14, 2021
- III. Decision re: Alternative Meeting Date and/or Time
- IV. Legislative Update - Federal and State Legislative Reports
- V. Project Prioritization Process
- VI. Next Meeting: June 9, 2021 – 1:00 – 2:30PM
- VII. Adjourn

Transportation Policy Advisory Committee

April 14, 2021 ♦ Telephonic Conference

MEMBER NAME	ENTITY	PRESENT	ABSENT	STAFF NAME	
Fern Benally	Navajo County	X		Chris Fetzer	
Brady Harris	Town of Tusayan	X		Jennifer O'Connor	
Michael Lomayaktewa	Hopi Tribe		X	Mandia Gonzales	
Mary Mallory	Yavapai County	X		Tod Morris	
Bill Regner	Town of Clarkdale	X		Cindy Binkley	
Matt Ryan	Coconino County		X		
Jerry Smith	Town of Pinetop-Lakeside		X		
Alton Shepherd	Apache County	X		GUEST/ALTERNATE NAME	ENTITY
				Kevin Adam	RTAC

I. Call to Order and Introductions

Vice Chairwoman Mary Mallory called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M. Self-introductions were made. A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes – March 10, 2021

Vice Chairwoman Mallory asked for any corrections to the March meeting minutes. Hearing none, she asked for a motion to approve.

Alton Shepherd moved to approve the March 10, 2021 meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Brady Harris. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Alternative Meeting Date/Time

Due to scheduling conflicts with another NACOG committee, one of the TPAC members has requested that the TPAC change its meeting date/time, if that would work for the other members. Staff asked for feedback from the committee members regarding their schedules and availability to participate with the TPAC.

Staff will look at the feedback collected today and compare it to the schedules of the various NACOG committees and will propose some potential alternatives to the TPAC using a Doodle poll.

IV. Transportation Funding and the Legislative Process Overview

Kevin Adam provided an overview of the legislative process.

At the federal level, there are two legislative chambers: the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House of Representatives has 435 members, who serve 2-year terms. The number of representatives from each state is proportional to its percentage of the national population. This gets adjusted after each Census.

The Senate has 100 members, which serve staggered 6-year terms. There are two senators elected from each state.

Surface transportation authorization legislation provides the blue print for federal highway and transit programs. It establishes program funding levels and the criteria for that funding. This legislation is typically enacted every five years. The primary committee oversight for the drafting of this legislation comes from the House Transportation/Infrastructure Committee and the Senate Environment/Public Works Committee. The House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee determine how to fund the legislation.

Arizona has some representation on these committees:

- House Transportation and Infrastructure: Representative Greg Stanton
- House Ways and Means: Representative David Schweikert
- Senate Environment and Public Works: Senator Mark Kelly

The annual federal appropriations session begins in January and the federal fiscal year begins on October 1. All federal spending is divided into 12 standard appropriation bills, which are passed each year. Transportation is included in the Transportation/Housing and Urban Development (HUD) bill. Funding is allocated through the budget resolution process, where the House and Senate Appropriations Committees decide how the funding will be divided between transportation and HUD, as well as how it will be distributed among the various federal transportation programs. Transportation is typically funded at 100% of its authorization levels, and also some supplemental funding.

Arizona's apportionment for FY2021 is \$800,971,474. This is categorized as follows:

- National Highway Performance Program: \$441,990,474
- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG): \$221,573,735. STBG funds can be used for state highways, and is also authorized for use by local governments. 55% of the block is distributed to the planning regions, who decide how to utilize.
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): \$45,384,486. HSIP funding is also provided to the local regions to be used for projects that improve safety such as reflectivity and signage.
- Railway Highway Crossings Program: \$2,986,674. The purpose of the Railway Highway Crossings Program is to improve safety at railroad crossings.
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program: \$55,283,905. In Arizona, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds are provided to the MAG region.
- Metropolitan Program: \$6,272,087. The Metropolitan Program provides funding for the MPOs. This funding comprises 50% of the Metro Plan and CYMPO allocations.
- National Highway Freight Program: \$27,480,113. The National Highway Freight Program provides funding for projects that are located on the national freight network.

Kevin continued on to discuss the Highway Trust Fund. Most federal transportation programs were designed to be "user pay". The primary funding sources are the 18.4 cents/gallon fuel and 24.4 cents/gallon

diesel taxes, both of which were last adjusted in 1993. For over a decade, revenues streaming into the Highway Trust Fund are inadequate to cover expenditures, requiring one-time deposits from the general fund. Because current revenue levels cover 2/3 of expenditures, this is likely to happen again in the next year.

At the state level, there are also two legislative chambers: the State House of Representatives and the State Senate. Arizona is divided into 30 legislative districts, which each have two representatives and one senator. The State House has 60 members, who serve 2-year terms. The State Senate has 30 members, who serve 2-year terms.

The state legislative session starts in January and the state fiscal year begins on July 1. The House, Senate, and Governor tend to develop their own budget proposals. Then legislative leadership negotiates with each other and the Governor to arrive at a final budget proposal. The state budget and most other bills require 16 votes in the Senate and 31 votes in the House to pass, regardless of how many members vote. Bills to increase state revenues, or bills that require immediate enactment require a supermajority in both chambers.

The primary funding sources for the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) are the state fuel/diesel and vehicle license (VLT) taxes. Currently, the state fuel tax is 18 cents/gallon and the state diesel tax is 26 cents/gallon, which have not been adjusted since 1990. Because there is no index mechanism for inflation, fuel/diesel taxes have diminished as revenue sources while VLT has grown.

HURF is distributed as follows:

- State Highway System – 42.9%
- MAG and PAG – 7.6%
- Cities and Towns – 27.5%
- Cities with population over 300,000 – 3%
- Counties – 19%

The State Highway Fund (SHF), which is ADOT's portion of HURF, is combined with federal transportation funding to develop the state's Five-Year Construction Program. The Five-Year Program is updated annually. Public hearings take place April-June. The State Transportation Board adopts the updated plan prior to July 1. By policy set through the Casa Grande Resolves, ADOT allocates its state and federal discretionary funding for the state highway system in the following manner:

- Maricopa County – 37%
- Pima County – 13%
- Greater Arizona – 50%

V. Legislative Update

Kevin Adam provided a legislative update.

State Update

Current state budget estimates are showing a \$2 billion surplus. In addition, the last round of federal COVID relief funding provided \$12.3 billion to the state government, to be used through 2024. While this did not include direct assistance for highways, the ripple effect may provide opportunities for transportation funding. Legislative leadership has mentioned setting aside \$200 million in one-time funding for projects across the state. During the current session, there were 31 bills introduced to fund \$400 million in projects across the state. Funding is likely to go to earmarks across the state, which is a trend that could potentially continue for the next couple of years.

Chris Fetzer noted that there is strong interest among the Governor and the Legislature to pass tax cuts. With the additional funding brought in from the relief package, this could be a possibility.

Federal Update

Federal lawmakers are focused on a multi-trillion-dollar infrastructure package. This process might also see earmarking, increases in formula funding, increases in competitive grants, or a combination of all these things. It would be in the region's best interest to be prepared for engagement and have list of projects ready to pursue this funding.

Kevin Adam answered questions from the TPAC members.

VI. Project Prioritization Process

Chris Fetzer noted that in previous meetings, the TPAC has had conversations about state funding provided for infrastructure projects, and the development of a list of regional priorities to present to the State Legislature for potential surplus funding. A list of draft project prioritization criteria was included with today's meeting materials, and is the purpose of today's discussion. Once the prioritization criteria have been finalized, the TPAC will work toward the goal of compiling a list of project priorities to present to the Regional Council for endorsement in August.

Jennifer O'Connor added that staff is building on the efforts previously made in 2017 and 2018, when there was potential for infrastructure legislation under the Trump Administration. Today, staff is asking for feedback on the draft criteria. The input received today will be presented to a committee that has been designated by the Technical Subcommittee for the purpose of formalizing the criteria, ranking the submitted projects and developing the final list.

Once the prioritization criteria have been finalized, staff will ask NACOG jurisdictions to submit projects, highlighting how their projects meet the prioritization criteria. The committee will review and rate the projects, which will then be presented at sub-regional meetings for review and additional input. The end product will be a prioritized project list for the NACOG region.

Proposed criteria include:

- Safety
- Project Cost

- Demand/Project Need
- Past Agency Maintenance Expense
- Connectivity
- Economic Benefits
- Social Benefits
- Alternate Modes
- Projects that have consistently ranked highly as BUILD, FLAP or other discretionary grant projects but haven't been awarded funding
- Projects that have been included in a state, regional or local study

Jennifer asked the TPAC members if there are any criteria that should be added to/removed from the list. She also asked if any of the proposed criteria are particularly important and should receive weighted consideration in the ranking process.

Bill Regner commented that Clarkdale doesn't seem to score well on these criteria. It has a small population and is a former mining-related community that has lost its economic generator. It has also been affected by the building of SR 89A, which bypasses historic downtown. Clarkdale doesn't have a lot of the things that the proposed criteria would seek to enhance.

The industrial area in Clarkdale, where the smelter was, is connected to the rest of town by a single-lane bridge over Bitter Creek Wash. The site has three-phase power, as well as land to be utilized and could potentially house an industrial park. However, access to the site is limited by the bridge. To make it viable, another form of access would need to be constructed.

Mr. Regner asked if criteria could be added to include communities in the region that have lost industry and have leftover infrastructure, which would need addition resources to revive/regenerate.

Chris Fetzer told the TPAC members to contact staff with any additional comments.

VII. Review of FY22 Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) Assessments

The Regional Council considers two community assessments annually. One for its designation as an Economic Development District (EDD) and one for NACOG's portion of funding RTAC's Rural Transportation Liaison program. Both are calculated using per capita funding formulas.

A list of the current assessment amounts was included with today's meeting materials. There is no expected increase to either assessment for FY22. Pending Regional Council approval, staff will submit invoices to the NACOG communities for payment.

VIII. Next Meeting: May 12, 2021 – 1:00 – 2:30 PM

Committee members that do not currently receive Kevin's RTAC email updates should contact Cindy Binkley to be added to the distribution list.

The next TPAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for 1-2:30PM on Wednesday, 5/12. Staff will send an outlook invitation to determine if there will be a quorum.

VIII. Adjourn

Vice Chairwoman Mallory asked for any final questions or comments. Hearing none, she adjourned the meeting.

Vice Chairwoman Mary Mallory adjourned the April 14, 2021 meeting of the NACOG Transportation Policy Advisory Committee at 2:30 P.M.



Northern Arizona Council of Governments

119 E. Aspen Avenue
Flagstaff, AZ 86001-5222
(928) 774-1895, FAX: (928) 773-1135

Memorandum:

Date: May 10, 2021

To: NACOG Transportation Policy Advisory Committee

From: Jennifer O'Connor, Acting Planning Director

Subject: Transportation Program Update

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION FOR POTENTIAL FUTURE FUNDING

Background

In response to a request from the Rural Transportation Advisory Council (RTAC) Advisory Committee, NACOG is developing a list of projects for potential future state funding. RTAC is collecting project lists from all of the COG's and MPO's in Greater Arizona (outside of the MAG and PAG regions) in order to create a unified list of projects, valued at \$40 million, that it will submit as a single piece of legislation for consideration in the 2022 state legislative session.

For the purposes of this planning process, each Greater AZ COG/MPO has been allocated an amount proportional to their population. Because the NACOG region makes up 22.5% of the state's population, NACOG is planning for approximately \$8.9 million in projects across the four sub-regions. In order to create a comprehensive list of regional projects, NACOG's project list will have two sections – one that is fiscally constrained to be called the High Priority Project List (valued at \$8.9 million) and the other which will contain all eligible projects to be called the Regionally Significant Projects List (no value limit). For more information about the project list, please see the attached draft Supplemental Funding FAQ.

Process Update

Since the last TPAC meeting, NACOG staff has met twice with the Supplemental Funding Planning Committee (SFPC), made of up members of the Transportation Technical Subcommittee, to create a comprehensive list of scoring criteria based on feedback provided by the TPAC. The proposed Scoring Criteria Table is attached and available for comment at the May 12th TPAC meeting. Once TPAC feedback has been incorporated, NACOG hopes to release the formal Call for Projects as soon as Friday, May 15th with an application due date of June 11. The Call for Projects will include additional background information, the application, the FAQ, and the Scoring Criteria Table.

A Project Scoring Committee, made up of one TSC representative from each of the NACOG sub-regions (Apache, Coconino, Navajo and Yavapai), will score and rank all of the applications (while recusing themselves from scoring their own application) in late June. In July, NACOG will hold sub-regional meetings with the TSC members to give them an opportunity to review the ranked list of projects for

their sub-region and provide any additional input. NACOG will provide the final project list to TSC and Regional Council for their approval in August.

Attachments: 1) Supplemental Funding FAQ; 2) Scoring Criteria Table

X	Information Only
	Motion to Approve

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FAQ

BACKGROUND/PURPOSE

The purpose of this FAQ is to provide information on the NACOG Regional Project Prioritization process and application as it relates to the potential State surplus funding for the 2022 legislative session. With State revenue projections for the fiscal year 2021 trending toward a \$2 billion surplus, earmarks for infrastructure projects are anticipated to continue into the fiscal year 2022. Moreover, at the federal level, the nation is anticipating a new transportation bill that could bring additional funding into the state.

It is NACOG's goal to identify and prioritize projects of regional significance that will then be added to the "Projects for Greater AZ" list, which will include projects from the Councils of Government and small Metropolitan Planning Organizations. This statewide list will be compiled by the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) totaling \$40 million and will be introduced to state legislators as a single piece of legislation (bill).

With many unknowns in projected State and Federal funding amounts, and the reinstatement of "earmarks", the information below may change over time as new information becomes available. NACOG staff will update this document and inform elected officials and agency staff of any changes through NACOG's committees that may significantly impact this process.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING PLANNING COMMITTEE

WHY CREATE A NEW SUBCOMMITTEE?

The Supplemental Funding Planning Committee was created to assist in the development of the Regional Project Prioritization process and to develop the scoring criteria for the application. Additionally, the subcommittee will assist NACOG staff in reviewing project submissions and ranking projects/plans for inclusion on the High Priority Project List and the Regionally Significant List. The committee is made up of volunteers from the Transportation Technical Subcommittee (TSC) - jurisdiction staff – with representation coming from each of the four sub-regions.

HIGH PRIORITY LIST VS. REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT LIST

RTAC proposes to develop a list of regional priorities consisting of the top projects put forward by all of the COG/MPOs in Greater AZ. When selecting projects to propose for funding consideration, legislators will be able to draw from this list of rural regional priorities or recommend the full list in its entirety.

WHAT IS THE "HIGH PRIORITY" LIST?

The High Priority Project List is a fiscally constrained list that will be **submitted to RTAC for consideration by state legislators**. This list will contain the highest-ranked projects within the NACOG region.

WHAT IS THE “REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT” LIST?

The Regionally Significant Project List will contain all eligible projects for the NACOG region. This list will be reviewed and updated regularly as new or future funding becomes available. This list can also be used to identify potential projects for the Transportation Investment Plan (TIP) and other future federal, state and regional planning efforts.

SCORING CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The scoring criteria were developed in conjunction with the Supplemental Funding Planning Committee. Additional comments from elected officials, agency staff, members of TPAC and TSC were also incorporated to create a holistic approach to scoring potential projects and plans. The list and weights for each category can be found in the attached Scoring Criteria Table.

FUNDING AVAILABILITY

WHAT IS RURAL TRANSPORTATION ADVOCACY COUNCIL (RTAC) ROLE IN THE FUNDING ALLOCATIONS?

As earmarking appears to be the most viable option for securing additional infrastructure funding, the RTAC Advisory Committee, consisting of the Greater AZ COG/MPO directors, developed an approach that would meet the diverse needs of communities and planning organizations across the state.

The Directors agreed to the following guidelines:

1. The total list value will be \$40 million.
2. Each Greater AZ COG/MPO will be allocated an amount proportional to their population.
3. No COG/MPO or local jurisdiction would be precluded from pursuing separate earmarks for other projects.

HOW MUCH FUNDING IS ALLOCATED TO THE NACOG REGION?

While funding has not yet been set aside for these projects, the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) has proposed planning for potential funding amounts based on a population formula. The anticipated funding available to the NACOG region is estimated at **\$8,986,801**.

HOW MUCH FUNDING IS ALLOCATED TO THE NACOG SUB-REGIONS?

Using the same population data/formula as RTAC, the Supplemental Funding Planning Committee agreed to the following allocations for the NACOG sub-regions.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING (JULY 2019 CENSUS ESTIMATES)			
SUB-REGION (1)	Census Population (July 2019 Est.)	Percent of Sub-regional Population	Funding Allocation
Apache	71,887	21.47%	\$1,929,497
Coconino ⁽²⁾	52,409	15.65%	\$1,406,694
Navajo	110,924	33.13%	\$2,977,277
Yavapai ⁽³⁾	99,600	29.75%	\$2,673,333
TOTAL	334,820	100.00%	\$8,986,801

(1)- Sub-Region is defined as all NACOG members (county, municipal, tribal) within the designated NACOG planning boundary. Members are further grouped per county territory. Jurisdictions will only be eligible to receive funding by actively participating in NACOG Planning activities within respective sub-regions.

(2) - The Coconino Sub-Region population reflects the total population within Coconino County minus the estimated Flagstaff MPO population.

(3) - The Yavapai Sub-Region population reflects the total population within Yavapai County minus the estimated Central Yavapai MPO population.

FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION AS A LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCY

IS A LOCAL FUNDING MATCH REQUIRED?

No local funding match is required. However, additional local funds may increase the probability of a project making the list and being supported by local legislators. It is strongly recommended that proposed projects or plans demonstrate some local fund contributions to enhance the attractiveness of the application.

ARE THESE STATE OR FEDERAL FUNDS?

Projects on the NACOG High Priority List will be recommended for funding from the Arizona state general fund, and therefore would not be subject to Federal regulations.

OUR PROJECT HAS BEEN AWARDED FEDERAL FUNDS, CAN WE USE THE STATE FUNDS TO SUPPORT THIS PROJECT?

Yes, state funds can be used to support a federally funded project. However, in this circumstance, the state funds will become subject to all federal regulations.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING A PROJECT OR PLAN?

Awarded project will be self-administered by the grantee. Grantees are responsible for all aspects of project/planning implementation.

ELIGIBILITY

- NACOG is accepting applications for both capital improvement projects (bridges and roadways) and planning projects. Projects must meet the definition of **Regionally Significant**, which is defined as "*projects that enhance connectivity between communities and/or increase access to regional services or employers.*"
- Funding requests should not exceed the total funding amount within the sub-region.
- Infrastructure projects may include Design-Bid-Build, Design-Build, and Construction Only.
- Infrastructure projects must include a cost estimate as part of the submittal process.
- FY2022 – 2026 NACOG TIP Projects may apply.
- Tribal partners may apply.
- Project sponsors may submit more than one project/plan.

TIMELINE

This section provides the timeline for the High Priority Project List development process:

Date	Who	What
May 3	Supplemental Funding Planning Committee	Meeting to select criteria, develop metric, review process.
May 10	Supplemental Funding Planning Committee	Meeting to set weights for criteria, provide input on materials, and approve project submission form/process
May 12	Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC)	Review criteria and process
May 17 & 18	NACOG Staff and Technical Subcommittee (TSC) Members	Sub-regional meetings to discuss process, criteria, and timeline.
May 13	NACOG Staff	Call for Projects is released (online form)
June 11	ALL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	PROJECT SUBMISSIONS DUE
June 14 – 18	NACOG Staff	Preliminary review of applications
June 21 – July 2	Supplemental Funding Planning Committee	Application-review for projects in their sub-region
TBD	NACOG Staff	Sub-regional meetings to discuss application scores and final ranking of projects
July 15 – 25	NACOG Staff	Provide draft High Priority Project List to elected officials and regional transportation committees
July 26	NACOG Staff	Finalize ranked list based on feedback
August 4	Transportation Technical Subcommittee (TSC)	Review and approve final lists
August 26	Regional Council	Review and approve final lists
August	NACOG Staff	Submit final list to RTAC for 2022 Legislative session

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer O’Connor at joconnor@nacog.org or 928-543-9144.

NACOG Scoring Criteria for High Priority Project List – Updated 5.10.2021

Category	Description	Potential Specific Scoring Criteria	Weight (High/Low)	Score Value (Number of Points out of 100)
Safety	<p>Please describe how the project or plan improves the safety of the transportation system. If applicable, describe how the project implements one of the FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures or recommendations from the NACOG Rural Strategic Transportation Safety Plan.</p> <p>Example data includes: Number of incidents, number of injuries, number of fatalities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Project or plan addresses a specific location with identified safety deficiencies. (Yes or No) 2) Project or plan implements safety countermeasures to enhance safety for system users. (Yes or No) 	High	<p>Category Points = 10</p> <p>Sub-points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points 2) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points
Demand/Project Need	<p>Provide a brief description below that demonstrates the project or plan’s need based on usage and/or demand.</p> <p>Example data includes: Average daily traffic, vehicle-miles traveled, average daily truck traffic, truck-miles traveled, pavement condition.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Project is listed in state, regional, or local plan/study(ies). Project has consistently ranked highly as BUILD grant application or other discretionary grant application, but hasn't been awarded funding? (Yes or No) 2) Travel demand on the roadway is higher than nearby routes or other high-stress factors exist on the roadway (Yes or No) 3) Project or plan provides an alternate route or increased emergency access to an isolated or rural area. (Yes or No) 4) Provide context for how this project or plan rises to the level of a priority need within the community and region. (Descriptive Response) 	High	<p>Category Points = 20</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points 2) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points 3) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points
Connectivity	<p>Provide a description of how the project or plan will improve access to industry, employment centers, agriculture; links between towns and cities; link for travel across the region and/or state; access to state and national parks, monuments and recreation areas, wildlife</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Will roadway improve interstate, state, region and/or county highway connection? (Yes or No) 2) Will project or plan result in greater through traffic service? (Complete a 	High	<p>Category Points = 20</p> <p>Sub-points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points 2) Yes = 5 points

NACOG Scoring Criteria for High Priority Project List – Updated 5.10.2021

Category	Description	Potential Specific Scoring Criteria	Weight (High/Low)	Score Value (Number of Points out of 100)
	and recreational opportunities; access to schools, colleges and universities.	corridor or fill a gap in the road network) (Yes or No) 3) Will the project or plan tie together or span across towns, communities, or sub-regions where either no or limited connections exist? (Yes/No) 4) Will roadway be on or become a regionally significant roadway for a community/ies or developed areas. e.g., parkway, alternate route, collector, etc. (Yes or No)		No = 2.5 points 3) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points 4) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points
Economic and Social Benefits	Describe how the project or plan serves or improves connections to existing or planned public, county and regional economic areas or government facilities, e.g., post office, school, landfill, library, recreation area, park, central business district, airport/industrial complex, job/housing centers, etc. Describe how the project or plan serves economically challenged communities and/or is intended to be an economic generator. Example data includes: Number of industrial or manufacturing centers or rural shippers served; Potential to expand existing businesses or attract new businesses and jobs; Reducing impacts of tourism-based congestion on local communities; Number of schools, Number of hospitals/urgent cares, Number of churches, Number of parks served.	1) Will the project or plan serve an existing or planned public, county or regional economic area or government facility? (Yes or No) 2) Project or plan compatible with local growth/development policies? (Yes or No) 3) Project or plan supports the revitalization of dormant economic generators (past or potential) that have been idled due to challenges such as changes in technology, market conditions, environmental concerns, access disconnection, etc. (Yes or No) 4) Will project or plan provide or increase access to critical community destinations or social service locations (schools, hospitals/urgent cares, mental health providers, churches, parks)? (Yes or No)	High	Category Points = 20 Sub-points: 1) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points 2) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points 3) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points 4) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points

NACOG Scoring Criteria for High Priority Project List – Updated 5.10.2021

Category	Description	Potential Specific Scoring Criteria	Weight (High/Low)	Score Value (Number of Points out of 100)
Local Participation and Leveraging	Legislators tend to favor projects that can show local financial contributions or “local skin in the game”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project or plan demonstrates local commitment and financial leveraging in the form of cash contributions and/or grant funding (awarded) Amount of local contribution (optional): _____ Local contribution as a percentage of the total project (required): Offer three check-boxes: 15% or higher, 10%, 5.7% _____ 	Low	Category Points = 10 15% or higher = 10 points 10% = 5 points 5.7% = 2.5 points None = 0 points
Alternate Modes	Describe how the project or plan contains pedestrian, bicycle, transit treatments beyond existing facilities; enhances connectivity between modes or gaps in existing facilities; and/or supports facility or transit upgrades to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Proposed elements must be integral to the broader infrastructure project to expand use to all system users.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project or plan provides tangible improvement to, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, safety, mobility, or convenience. <i>And/or (10 points can go to item 1 if no transit elements involved and vice versa)</i> Project provides tangible improvement to bus facilities, safety, mobility or convenience 	Low	Category Points = 10 1) Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points 2) Yes = 5 points No = 2.5 points
Past Agency Maintenance Expense (For Design/Construction Projects Only. Do Not Include for Planning Projects)	Please provide a narrative that demonstrates the total cost, cost per vehicle mile, and/or cost per mile. Example data: Total maintenance cost, cost per vehicle mile, cost per mile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do roadway maintenance costs exceed the State average maintenance costs, and/or exceed local or regional maintenance costs for comparable roadways? (Yes or No) 	Low	(Do Not Include for Planning Projects) Category Points = 5 Yes = 5 points; No = 2.5 points
Project Readiness (For Design/Construction Projects Only. Do	As it applies to impacting the project’s scope, schedule or budget	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project include/require ROW acquisition? Will project include/require utility relocation by project sponsor? 	Low	(Do Not Include for Planning Projects) Category Points = 5 1) Yes = 0 points;

NACOG Scoring Criteria for High Priority Project List – Updated 5.10.2021

Category	Description	Potential Specific Scoring Criteria	Weight (High/Low)	Score Value (Number of Points out of 100)
Not Include for Planning Projects)		3) Will project include/require environmental clearances? 4) Provide description of other impacts/risks below		No = 1.5 points 2) Yes = 0 points No = 1.5 points 3) Yes = 0 points No = 1 points 4) Yes = 0 points No = 1 points
Support for Planning Project (For Planning Projects Only. Do Not Include for Design/Construction Projects.) This category will be scored for Planning Projects in lieu of Project Readiness and Past Agency Maintenance Expense.	Please describe and/or demonstrate support for the proposed planning project. This can include letters of support, formal action by the local board/council, other documentation of community support. You may provide links in Section 5, or email documents directly to Mandia Gonzales at mgonzales@nacog.org	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has demonstrated local planning support to indicate that, though conceptual or in the planning phases, this project has local support and that a planning study could move forward, if funded. (Yes or No) 		Planning Projects Only Category Points = 10 Yes = 10 points; No = 5 points