

	PROJECT SCORING CRITERIA (MEASURES) (FY2007-2013 MTIP)	SCORE (points)
1	<i>Degree of Congestion</i>	
	V/C greater than 1.50	10
	V/C between 1.31 and 1.50	7
	V/C between 1.01 and 1.30	5
	V/C between 0.91 and 1.00	3
	V/C less than 0.91	0
2	<i>Safety (Highway, Transit, Non-motorized, TDM)</i>	
	Facility (or aggregate) accident rate greater than 750 ACC/100 million VMT)	10
	Facility (or aggregate) accident rate between 551 and 750 ACC/100 million VMT)	7
	Facility (or aggregate) accident rate between 401 and 550 ACC/100 million VMT)	5
	Facility (or aggregate) accident rate between 301 and 400 ACC/100 million VMT)	3
	Facility (or aggregate) accident rate less than 301 ACC/100 million VMT)	0
3	<i>Coordinate with National Highway System(NHS) or Intermodal Transportation System (Highway, Transit, Non-motorized)</i>	
	Part of NHS or key component of the Intermodal System on current/future NHS	5
	Not part of NHS or key component of the Intermodal System	0
4	<i>Reduces Use of Single-Occupant-Vehicles (SOV) (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit, or HOV)</i>	
	Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit or HOV Project	10
	Non Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit or HOV Project	0
5	<i>Expands Transportation Choices (Transit, Bicycle or Pedestrian Features)</i>	
	Transit, bicycle and pedestrian (all three modes)	10
	Any 2 modes (transit, bicycle or pedestrian)	7
	Any 1 mode (transit, bicycle or pedestrian)	3
	No modes (transit, bicycle or pedestrian)	0
6	<i>Addresses Air Quality Problem/Concerns (Highway, Transit, Non-motorized, TDM, ITS)</i>	
	VMT reduction greater than 6,000,000 VMT/year	10
	VMT reduction between 4,000,001 and 6,000,000 VMT/year	7
	VMT reduction between 2,000,001 and 4,000,000 VMT/year	5
	VMT reduction between 100,000 and 2,000,000 VMT/year	3
	VMT reduction less than 100,000 VMT/year	0

(13)

7	<i>Has Minimal Impacts on the Natural Environment</i>	
	Does not extend into, nor adversely impact, documented environmentally sensitive areas	10
	Extends into, or adversely impacts, documented environmentally sensitive areas	5
8	<i>Encourages Economic Development</i>	
	Primary purpose is economic development or redevelopment	10
	Primary purpose is <u>not</u> economic development or redevelopment	5
9	<i>Adverse Impacts Do Not Disproportionately Affect Low-Income Populations</i>	
	Does <u>not</u> adversely impact low-income groups disproportionately	10
	Adversely impact low-income groups disproportionately	5
10	<i>Funding Status in TIP</i>	
	Partially-funded in current TIP cycle (over 50% of total construction & ROW cost), or Transit project listed as "unfunded" in TIP	10
	Partially-funded in current TIP cycle (26% to 50% of total construction & ROW cost)	7
	Partially-funded in current TIP cycle (5% to 25% of total construction & ROW cost)	5
	Post year (construction & ROW)	3
	Not programmed in TIP	0

A RESOLUTION PROVIDING RECOMMENATIONS TO THE DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFT 2006-2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY LIST (2004-03-22/R-15)

WHEREAS, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Transportation Advisory Committee has prepared a draft 2006-2012 Regional Transportation Priority List; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee has opened a public comment period on the Draft Priority List;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the following comments be submitted to the Transportation Advisory Committee on the Draft 2006-2012 Regional Priority List.

- Chapel Hill Signal System should be given points for congestions relief, expanding transportation choices and impacting the National Highway System.
- The ranking criteria should be revised to reflect the Urban Area's and Chapel Hill's emphasis on alternative modes of transportation and give higher priority to public transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects, and sprawl reduction.
- The ranking criteria should require a quantitative evaluation of the ability of roadway projects to reduce congestion and improve air quality, using the Regional Transportation Model.
- Bicycle and pedestrian enhancements should receive more favorable weighting with additional points for factors such as:
 - Connectivity to other existing facilities/routes and
 - Locations which have higher concentrations/density of population
 - Locations on road corridors experiencing g the highest rates of traffic increase

This the 22nd day of March, 2004.