

TIP PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
Regional Highway Projects

TRANSPORTATION CRITERIA				OTHER IMPACT CRITERIA		
I: Condition	II: Mobility & Importance	III: Safety	IV: Cost Effectiveness	V: Community and Quality of Life	VI: Land Use and Economic Development	VII: Environmental Effects
I-A: Magnitude of pavement condition improvement	II-A: Effect on magnitude and duration of congestion	III-A: Effect on crash rate compared to state average	IV-A: Annualized Cost per Mile or per Approach Lane	V-A: Residential effects: right-of-way, noise, cut-through traffic, other	VI-A: Business effects: right-of-way, access, noise, traffic, parking, freight access other	VII-A: Air Quality/Climate effects
3: Road needs full depth reconstruction; PCI = 0-50	3: Solves documented congestion problem; brings LOS from E/F to D or better; Adds interconnection between intersections	3: Addresses documented high crash rate; Signalize unsignalized intersection	3: < \$50,000 per mile;	3: Draws through-traffic away from local streets; Diverts through traffic from project street; Adds noise barriers	3: In target community and directly serves identified econ. dev't sites or major existing work site; Improves truck access; Improves parking	3: Documented air quality benefits; CMAQ-tested and eligible
2: Needs major rehabilitation; PCI = 51-67	2: Addresses congestion, but problem not documented; V/C>1	2: Addresses documented safety problem, but crash rate is below state average	2: \$50,000-\$75,000 per mile;	2: Significant traffic calming features; Streetscape improvements	2: In target community and indirectly serves identified econ. dev't sites	2: Presumed air quality benefits (e.g. from reduced congestion)
1: Needs minor rehabilitation; PCI= 68-80	1: Addresses congestion, but problem not documented; V/C= .8-.99	1: Features safety elements (e.g., signs, guardrails), but not the main purpose	1: > \$75,000 per mile;	1: Minor traffic calming features	1: In target community, but does not serve identified econ. dev't sites	1: Possible minor air quality benefits (e.g. from mode shift)
0: No improvement needed; PCI= 81-100	0: No information	0: No safety improvement warranted or included; No information	NA: Intersection and Signal Projects	0: No information	0: No information	0: No information
NA: Intersection and Signal Projects	NA: System Preservation Projects; Addresses non-existent congestion	NA: System Preservation Projects		NA: No effects	NA: No effects	NA: No effects
	-1: Project fails to address perceived congestion problem			-1: Some adversarial land taking but no homes;	-1: Adversarial taking of business property, but no business displacement	-1: May increase VMT
	-2: Project fails to address documented congestion problem			-2: Adversarial taking of 1-2 homes; through traffic increases		
				-3: Adversarial taking of >2 homes	-3: Adversarial taking displacing business	-3: Strong likelihood of significant VMT increase
I-B: Magnitude of improvement of other infrastructure elements	II-B: Effect on travel time and connectivity/access	III-B: Effect on bicycle and pedestrian safety	IV-B: Annualized Cost per AADT	V-B: Environmental Justice effects	VI-B: Sustainable development effects	VII-B: Water quality/supply effects; wetlands effects
3: Replacing failed culverts or retaining walls;	3: Documented improvement in north-south travel time through Berkshire County	3: Provides physical separation for bicycles; Adds high visibility crosswalks & ped signals/signs; adds sidewalks; shortens crossing distance; Addresses documented bike/ped crashes	3: < \$50	3: Project benefits tract or community meeting all disadvantage thresholds	3: Supports a downtown area; Includes significant access management elements	3: Project improves water quality by removing point discharge highway runoff and redirecting runoff into storm water management system (to encourage storm water recharge); or project includes substantial measures to restore bank and prevent future bank erosion; or project includes substantial design measures to avoid wetland impacts or improve wetland function.
2: Replace curbing or drainage; pave unpaved shoulder; Replace obsolete or past-useful-life signals; Replace damaged guardrails	2: Provides new connection; Increases speed for > 3 miles	2: Adds bike lanes; Adds crosswalk markings w.o. new signals/signs; improves/replaces existing sidewalk	2: \$50-\$99	2: Project benefits tract or community meeting 3-4 disadvantage thresholds		2: Project moderately improves water quality by adding new vegetated swales at discharge points, deep sump inlet structures, or minor bank erosion prevention measures.
1: Bring street up to code	1: Increases speed for 1-3 miles	1: Replaces existing ped signals or crosswalks; Paves unpaved shoulder but not as bike lane; Share-the-Road signs	1: >\$100	1: Project benefits tract or community meeting 1-2 disadvantage thresholds	1: Supports development in already built-up areas (other than downtowns); and/or supports access management	1: Project restores or repairs existing water quality protection elements; or project scope is limited to roadway footprint and avoids impacts to wetlands within or adjacent to project limits.
NA: No other infrastructure improvement included or needed	0: No information	0: No information		NA: No disadvantage concentration	0: No information	0: Wetlands are appropriately mitigated; No information
	NA: System Preservation Projects; No effects	NA: Project unrelated to bike/ped safety or traffic; No effects		-1: Project impacts tract or community meeting 1-2 disadvantage thresholds	NA: No effects	NA: No water quality/supply issues; or no wetlands within project limits
	-1: Signalization adds delay on main road	-1: Increases traffic with no bike provisions; eliminates bike lane or reduces below standard		-2: Project impacts tract or community meeting 3-4 disadvantage thresholds	-1: May encourage sprawl	-1: Project footprint encroaches on wetlands - minor impact without mitigation
		-3: Increases traffic and eliminates bike lane		-3: Project impacts tract or community meeting all disadvantage thresholds	-3: Inconsistent with "Fix-It-First" Policy; Opens up undeveloped areas for new development	-2: Project Increases impervious area without specific mitigation measures
						-3: Project has substantial impact on wetlands (EIR required due to wetland impacts)
	II-C: Effect on and benefits to other modes using facility	III-C: Importance as an Evacuation Route	IV-C: Annualized Cost/Extra mile of nearest alternate route (i.e. distance saved)	V-C: Other impacts/benefits for disadvantaged neighborhoods	VI-C: Consistent with regional land-use and economic development plans	VII-C: Aesthetic, historic and cultural resource effects
	3: Provides new bike lanes and/or sidewalks; Provides new bus pull-offs or shelters	3: AADT >10,000; Nearest alt. Rt. > 3 miles longer; Only route A-B regionally	3: < \$50,000 per extra mile, or; No alternate route available	3: Project is an investment in a tract or community with above average percentages of more than 4 disadvantaged groups:	3: Listed in Regional Transportation Plan or other BRPC or MPO-approved plans	3: Approved "Footprint Road" project; designated Scenic Byway; Directly preserves historic, aesthetic or cultural resource
	2: Replaces sidewalks; ADA compliance	2: AADT=5000-10,000; Nearest Alt. Rt. 2-3 miles longer	2: \$50,000-\$100,000 per extra mile;	2: In a tract or community with above average percentages of 2-3 disadvantaged groups:	2: Directly supports more than one goal in RTP or other BRPC or MPO approved Plans	2: Other special context-sensitive design; reduces light pollution
	1: Features minor amenities for other modes; Improves riding surface for cyclists	1: AADT< 5000; Nearest alt. Rt. <2 miles longer	1: > \$100,000 per extra mile	1: In a tract or community with above average percentages of 1 disadvantaged groups:	1: Directly supports one goal in RTP or other BRPC or MPO approved Plans	1: Indirectly supports preservation of historic, aesthetic or cultural resource
	0: No information	0: Not important as an evacuation route	NA: Intersection and Signal Projects	0: No information	0: No information	0: No information
	NA: No effects			NA: No effects	NA: No effects	NA: No effects
	-1: Increases traffic			-1: Project impacts a tract or community with above average percentages of 1 disadvantaged group:	-1: Conflicts with one RTP etc. goal	-1: Indirectly detracts from historic, aesthetic or cultural resource
	-2: Sidewalks or bike lanes narrowed below standards			-2: Impacts a tract or community with above average percentages of 2-3 disadvantaged groups:	-3: Conflicts with multiple RTP etc. Goals	-3: Directly impacts historic, aesthetic or cultural resource
	-3: Bikes and pedestrians prohibited			-3: Impacts a tract or community with above average percentages of more than 4 disadvantaged groups:		
	II-D: Effect on regional and local traffic			V-D: Public, local government, legislative, and regional support	VI-D: Effect on job creation.	VII-D: Effects on wildlife habitat & rare/endangered species
	3: AADT >10,000; Nearest alt. Rt. > 3 miles longer; Only route A-B regionally			3: Town/City has invested in design, etc. Documented support at many levels w.o. opposition	3: Documented stimulation of new jobs	3: Project includes measures that improve wildlife accommodation by constructing appropriate highway crossing to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions, or remediate habitat fragmentation; or project improves stream crossing (e.g. culvert) to allow fish/wildlife passage that was disrupted by previous culvert installation; or project will employ measures during construction to avoid impacts to rare/endangered species
	2: AADT=5000-10,000; Nearest Alt. Rt. 2-3 miles longer			2: Town has invested in project but no documentation of high-level or public support	2: Documented retention of existing jobs	2: Project provides some degree of wildlife protection or shielding to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions (vegetation, earth berms, fencing, lighting); or project employs measures during construction to minimize impacts to rare/endangered species
	1: AADT< 5000; Nearest alt. Rt. <2 miles longer			1: Town expresses support for project but has not invested and no documentation of high-level or public support	1: Possible job creation/retention claimed, but not documented	1: Project includes wildlife crossing signs or reduced speed limits to heighten driver awareness; and/or project is within endangered species habitat but avoids impacts.
	0: No regional or local significance			0: No information	0: No information	0: No information
				NA: No effects	NA: No effects	NA: Project is not within rare/endangered species or wildlife habitat
				-1: Support matched by opposition; project is controversial	-1: Negative effect on a business/ job loss	-1: Minor impact on wildlife or rare/endangered species
				-2: Support outweighed by opposition		-2: Substantial impact on wildlife or rare/endangered species
				-3: No support; Proponent not forthcoming w. info		-3: Major impact (EIR required due to rare species impacts)
	III-E: Percent Trucks			V-E: Effect on development and redevelopment of housing stock.		
	3: More than 5.5%			3: Documented causal relationship between project and desired housing development		
	2: 3.5% to 5.5%			2: Project serves identified housing development or redevelopment areas		
	1: Less than 3.5%			1: Project may benefit 1-2 identified housing sites		
	0: No information			0: No information		
	NA: No effects			NA: No effects		
				-1: May induce unwanted housing development		
				-2: May have a blighting influence on housing		
				-3: Will eliminate housing		
Avg. Score	Avg. Score	Avg. Score	Avg. Score	Avg. Score	Avg. Score	Avg. Score
Improve: (0 to +3)	Improve: (-1.2 to +3)	Improve: (-1 to +3)	Improve: (1 to +3)	Improve: (-3 to +3)	Improve: (-2.5 to +3)	Improve: (-3 to +3)
Preserve: (0 to +3)	Preserve: (-1 to +3)	Preserve: (-1.5 to +3)	Preserve: (1 to +3)	Preserve: NA	Preserve: NA	Preserve: NA
				Total Scores with Cost Effectiveness:	Total Scores without Cost Effectiveness:	
				Improve: (-9.7 to +21)	Improve: (-10.7 to +18)	
				Preserve (-1.5 to +12)	Preserve (-2.5 to +12)	