

ALEXANDRIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING CITY TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

The City of Alexandria's Transportation Division maintains a list of Transportation Projects as a part of the City Master Plan. This list, called the Transportation Long Range Plan (LRP), is unconstrained in that funding for the projects on it has not been identified, and it includes ALL of the Transportation Projects that have been approved by the City Council as part of the City Master Plan. The Transportation LRP also includes Transportation Projects that are part of the:

- ❖ Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan
- ❖ Bicycle Transportation and Multi-Use Trail Master Plan
- ❖ Small Area Plans
- ❖ Special area and corridor plans

Any Transportation Project proposed that is not specifically recommended in any of these plans must be consistent with City goals and policies including the:

- ❖ Mayor and Council Strategic Plan
- ❖ Master Plan and all sub-plans listed above
- ❖ Eco-City Charter

Long Range Plan (LRP)

Proposed long-range Transportation Projects with no funding identified

Once Transportation Projects are included on the LRP, they will be prioritized according to the following seven criteria using a five-point ranking schema.

I. LIVABILITY

The environmental and social quality of an area as perceived by residents, employees of local businesses, and visitors to the area

Positive impacts on neighborhood livability may include:

- ❖ improved access to community facilities, services, convenience shopping, transit and regional transportation facilities
- ❖ a safer and more pleasant walking environment
- ❖ more attractive streetscape
- ❖ traffic calming

Negative impacts on neighborhood livability may include:

- ❖ increased noise and neighborhood traffic
- ❖ local air pollution
- ❖ hazards to pedestrians and cyclists
- ❖ cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets
- ❖ spillover parking

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ON LIVABILITY IN THE AFFECTED AREA?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No net impact*
- 2 *Moderate deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ON THE OVERALL LIVABILITY IN THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No net impact*
- 2 *Moderate deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

II. CONNECTIVITY

The ability to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations

Connectivity is a measure of the interconnectedness of the transportation system. Systems with high connectivity generally provide a number of choices of routes between destinations and relatively short travel distances.

Factors that increase connectivity and reduce travel time include:

- ❖ small block size
- ❖ direct access
- ❖ redundancy
- ❖ modal options (car, pedestrian, bicycle, transit)
- ❖ optimizing signals
- ❖ bike sharing/car sharing

Factors that impede connectivity include:

- ❖ railroads
- ❖ rivers and streams
- ❖ freeways
- ❖ cul-de-sacs
- ❖ medians
- ❖ turn restrictions
- ❖ frontage roads

WHAT EFFECT WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAVE ON NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTIVITY AND THE CITY AS A WHOLE?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No net impact*
- 2 *Moderate deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

WHAT EFFECT WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAVE ON REGIONAL MOBILITY?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No net impact*
- 2 *Moderate deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

III. LAND USE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Projects that promote compact development patterns and/or promote economic development

The project focuses investment where jobs and households are located and/or served. The project encourages mixed-use, transit-oriented, compact development and discourages dispersed, low-density, single-use, automobile dependent land use patterns.

The project is in an area with existing or planned development that creates opportunity for economic development.

HOW WELL DOES THE PROJECT FOCUS INVESTMENT NEAR EXISTING OR PROPOSED POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT CENTERS?

- 5 *Very Well*
- 4 *Moderately Well*
- 3 *No Impact*
- 2 *Poorly*
- 1 *Very Poorly*

HOW WELL DOES THE PROJECT FOCUS INVESTMENT NEAR OPPORTUNITIES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?

- 5 *Very Well*
- 4 *Moderately Well*
- 3 *No Impact*
- 2 *Poorly*
- 1 *Very Poorly*

IV. MULTIMODAL CHOICES

Project creates multimodal choices for travelers including travel by foot, bicycle, transit or car

Major improvements may include:

- ❖ Roadway widening
- ❖ High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes
- ❖ Transit service improvements such as improved frequency or other capacity enhancements
- ❖ Construction of bicycle or pedestrian facilities

Minor improvements may include:

- ❖ Intersection reconstruction/improvement
- ❖ Access and parking improvements

DOES PROJECT IMPROVE OR ADD MULTIMODALITY?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No impact*
- 2 *Minor deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

V. INFRASTRUCTURE

Projects that address major maintenance for aging transportation infrastructure

Proposed project may have an effect on aging transportation infrastructure via rehabilitation, or by increasing demand on deteriorating systems.

DOES THE PROJECT IMPROVE AGING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No impact*
- 2 *Minor deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

VI. OPERATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY

Projects that improve system efficiency through the appropriate use of technology

These projects improve system efficiency and can improve capacity without making physical changes to the transportation network. These projects may include:

- ❖ Signal optimization
- ❖ Transit technology
- ❖ Transit priority
- ❖ Real time transit information

DOES THE PROJECT IMPROVE SYSTEM EFFICIENCY THROUGH AN APPROPRIATE USE OF TECHNOLOGY?

- 5 *Major improvement*
- 4 *Moderate improvement*
- 3 *No impact*
- 2 *Moderate deterioration*
- 1 *Major deterioration*

VII. REDUCE SINGLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (SOV) TRAVEL

Projects that encourage non-SOV mode share

These projects encourage non-SOV travel through the provision of mode choices. These projects may include:

- ❖ Improved or new transit service and/or transit amenities
- ❖ Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- ❖ High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes
- ❖ Car/Bike share programs

DOES THE PROJECT ENCOURAGE NON-SOV TRAVEL?

- 5 Greatly encourages*
- 4 Moderately encourages*
- 5 No impact*
- 2 Moderately discourages*
- 1 Greatly discourages*

Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)

The list of proposed projects likely to be funded in whole or in part within six years of the current Fiscal Year (FY)

As part of the City's yearly budget process, the Transportation Commission will provide the City Manager with a recommended list of projects that is constrained in that it will ultimately need to include sources of funding for all projects. This list will be included in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

In preparing this list, the projects from the LRP with the highest priority will be re-evaluated using the LRP criteria and re-prioritized, if necessary, to take into account any changes in the project and/or updated project information and the criteria below.

Once the highest priority projects have been re-evaluated, funding for each project will be identified to complete the constrained TIP recommendation.

I. SAFETY

Project increases public safety by reducing the number and severity of vehicular crashes and creating a safer environment for all users of transportation network

Safety effects are typically measured by changes in the number and severity of vehicular crashes. Vehicle speed is a significant factor in the severity of all crashes, but is particularly important in the rate of fatalities in crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists. Emergency vehicle access and protection from crime may also be safety considerations in design and location of transportation facilities.

WHAT EFFECT WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAVE ON CRASH RISKS AND SAFETY?

- 5 Major improvement**
- 4 Moderate improvement**
- 3 No net impact**
- 2 Moderate deterioration**
- 1 Major deterioration**

II. FUNDING

Projects will be evaluated based on construction and associated costs, opportunities to leverage non-City funds, and the impact on the City's operating budget

WHAT IS THE POTENTIAL FOR OBTAINING NON-CITY FUNDING FOR THE PROJECT?

- 5 *High*
- 4 *Moderately High*
- 3 *Neutral*
- 2 *Moderately Low*
- 1 *Low*

III. ONGOING COSTS

Projects evaluated based on the anticipated level of maintenance and operating costs

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING COSTS?

- 5 *Major reduction*
- 4 *Moderate reduction*
- 3 *Neutral*
- 2 *Moderate increase*
- 1 *Large increase*

IV. URGENCY

Project evaluated on its critical need related to system failure, major development, economic development or another factor

WHAT IS THE URGENCY OF THE PROJECT?

- 5 *High*
- 4 *Moderately High*
- 3 *Neutral*
- 2 *Moderately Low*
- 1 *Low*