



connections

regional mobility plan **2045**

NOVEMBER 2020



Capital Region Transportation
Planning Agency





Project Evaluation & Prioritization

Chapter 4

“Determining the priority of projects requires the identification of several criteria based on significant input from stakeholders and a thorough evaluation of available data.”

Project Evaluation and Prioritization

Prioritization Process for Capital Roadway Projects

Major roadway projects from the Needs Plan were evaluated through a three-part process. The first step in the process used a set of four evaluation criteria to determine the viability of a project. The second step included a robust prioritization process, where remaining projects were evaluated against twelve additional metrics. The final round of evaluation considered whether each project was on the CRTPA's adopted Priority Project List. Projects that were either currently under construction or committed to be constructed in the next five-year time period were removed from the Needs Plan and were not evaluated or prioritized. These projects include those listed in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1: Existing Plus Committed Projects

Project Name	From	To	Project Details
Bannerman Road	Thomasville Road	Preservation Road	Widen to 4 lanes
Capital Circle SW	Orange Avenue	Springhill Road	Widen to 6 lanes with 10-ft multi-use path and 5-ft sidewalk
Capital Circle SW	Springhill Road	Crawfordville Road	Widen to 6 lanes with 10-ft multi-use path and 5-ft sidewalk
Crawfordville Road	Leon County Line	Bloxham Cutoff	Widen to 4 lanes
Crawfordville Road	Bloxham Cutoff	East Ivan Road	Widen to 4 lanes
Orange Avenue	S. Lake Bradford Road	FSU Nursery Road (Blueprint Airport Gateway)	Widen to 4 lanes with median, 6-ft sidewalk, and 12-ft multi-use path
Welaunee Boulevard	Fleischmann Road	Roberts Road	Widen to 4 lanes
Welaunee Extension	Shamrock Street	Welaunee Boulevard	New 4 lane road

The metrics used as part of the evaluation criteria and prioritization criteria were developed in close coordination with the CRTPA Board, Technical Advisory Committee, and the Citizens Multimodal Advisory Committee. The criteria respond to the *RMP* goals and objectives and the federal FAST Act planning factors. The sections that follow detail each of the three steps in the evaluation and prioritization process.

Evaluation Criteria

The first step in the process was assessing the remaining projects against a set of evaluation criteria that was used as a screening process to determine the viability and utility of a project. This screening process helps to determine projects with prior phases complete or included in adopted plans that should definitely progress to full prioritization, or to flag projects with significant natural or social environmental concerns that may not be viable. The evaluation criteria for this plan are identified in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2: Evaluation Criteria

Roadway Evaluation Criteria	Weighting
Project Phases Completed	100
Part of an Adopted Plan	50
Natural Environment	20
Social Environment	20
Total Potential Points	190

Once projects satisfied the evaluation criteria screening process, they continued through the remainder of the project prioritization process using additional criteria to determine their prioritization ranking.

Prioritization Criteria

Projects were ranked on a yes/somewhat/no scale for the applicability of the prioritization criteria to each project. Though each criterion had its own scale, projects were ranked between 1.0 representing the highest applicability to the criterion and 0 representing the lowest. The prioritization of the projects was based on available information and data from the sources listed within Appendix D: Project Prioritization. The prioritization criteria for this plan are identified in Table 4-3.

Each project's total prioritization score is calculated by combining the evaluation criteria and prioritization criteria, for a total possible point value of 486. The combination of both evaluation and prioritization criteria allows for a holistic scoring process that best responds to the goals of the *RMP*.

Table 4-3: Prioritization Criteria

Prioritization Criteria	Weighting
Safety Improvement	75
Universal Accessibility	60
Growth Center/Economic Development	30
Existing Congestion Reduction	25
Supportive of Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility and Accessibility	20
Supportive of Transit Priorities and Accessibility	20
Future Congestion Reduction	15
Supportive of Freight Priorities	15
Supportive of Transportation Technology	15
Resilience	10
Evacuation Route	5
Travel and Tourism	5
Tiebreaker: Funding Commitment	1
Total Potential Points	296

Priority Project List Process

Each year CRTPA creates a Priority Project List (PPL) – a prioritized listing of transportation projects adopted annually for TIP funding consideration. Roadway projects on this list were considered first for receiving funding in the cost feasible plan, followed by the projects scoring highest through the prioritization process.

Prioritization for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

An independent prioritization process was not completed for standalone multimodal projects. Each of the identified multimodal projects originated from local planning efforts, and the prioritization in those documents along with local needs at the time of funding availability and their inclusion on the Priority Project List will determine the order in which projects are considered for funding.

Prioritization for Transit Projects

StarMetro will lead the identification and prioritization of capital and operational transit projects through their Transit Development Plan (TDP). Funding availability will be considered alongside the findings of this plan and the content of the Priority Project List to determine how transit projects are funded and implemented.

Performance Measures

CRTPA is required to use a performance-based approach to develop the RMP. This involves setting performance goals, or measures, and using a strategic approach that uses system information to make key decisions in meeting those goals. There are five main performance areas that must be incorporated into the RMP: Safety Performance Management (PM1), Infrastructure Condition (PM2), System Performance (PM3), Transit Asset Management (TAM), and Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP). To establish specific performance targets, CRTPA had to coordinate with a variety of federal, state, and local agencies including FHWA, FTA, FDOT, and StarMetro. CRTPA is also required to continue to coordinate with the federal, state, and local agencies to track progress towards achieving the targets and update the targets when appropriate. In order to track the progress towards meeting these targets, the *Connections 2045 RMP* relates the performance targets to how each project being recommended can address one or more of these areas. The performance measures are outlined in Appendix C: System Performance Report. The sections that follow highlight how the RMP responds to each major performance measure category.



Safety

The CRTPA *Connections 2045 RMP* increases the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users as required. The LRTP aligns with the Florida SHSP and the FDOT HSIP with specific strategies to improve safety performance focused on prioritized safety projects, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety enhancements, and traffic operation improvements to address our goal to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

The LRTP identifies safety needs within the metropolitan planning area and provides funding for targeted safety improvements. The CRTPA has developed a project selection process that considers projects with the potential for safety improvements and weights this higher than any other prioritization criteria. Additionally, projects that incorporate dedicated infrastructure for bicyclists and pedestrians are considered to help address safety of non-motorized travelers. Many of the projects in the financially constrained plan, once implemented will greatly improve regional safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. In addition to the 2045 RMP projects, safety and security of the transportation system remain at the forefront of CRTPA's goals and objectives.

Pavement and Bridge Condition

The CRTPA recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the CRTPA *Connections 2045 RMP* reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other state and public transportation plans and processes, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and the Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan.

System Performance

The CRTPA *Connections 2045 RMP* seeks to address system reliability and congestion mitigation through various means, including capacity expansion and operational improvements. The 2045 RMP included a prioritization process that included existing and future congestion reduction, as well as support for the transportation technology. Additionally, the CRTPA CMP recommendations and the Tallahassee-Leon County ITS Master Plan were incorporated into the needs plan, and projects that performed well were included in the financially constrained plan. Additionally, for the first time, the 2045 RMP sets aside \$100 million for intersection and ITS project implementation. This will help CRTPA and its member jurisdictions address congestion and reliability with more modern operational strategies instead of full-scale widening projects.

Transit Asset Management

To support progress towards TAM performance targets, transit investment and maintenance funding in the *Connections 2045 RMP* totals \$251 million, approximately 12 percent of total LRTP funding. Improving the State of Good Repair (SGR) of capital assets is an overarching goal of this process.