

**ALEXANDRIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING CITY TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS FOR THE  
UNCONSTRAINED LONG RANGE PLAN (UPDATED MAY, 2015)**

**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
- ❖ Transportation 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

The following prioritization methodology provides the Transportation Commission with a starting point for prioritizing projects. However, the annual LRP update process also relies on a discussion by the full Commission to determine the relative importance of each project. Therefore, the individual or combined scores as a result of the prioritization exercise do not necessarily reflect the final project prioritization.

As projects from the LRP are considered for the City's annual constrained budget (Capital Improvement Program), there are a number of other criteria that are typically considered by staff, including:

- ❖ Funding / opportunities to leverage non-City funds, and impact to the City's operating budget
- ❖ Anticipated maintenance and operating costs
- ❖ Urgency or critical need related to system failure, major development, or economic development

**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.

**1. 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
- ❖ improves accessibility for persons with disabilities
- ❖ helps to improve the health and well-being of residents and visitors

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

**1A. 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*

**1B. 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*

## **2. 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

**2A. 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*

**2B. 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*

**3. 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.

**3A. 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*

**3B. 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*

**4. MODE CHOICE**

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 and amenities such as improved frequency or other capacity enhancements
- ❖ Construction of bicycle or pedestrian facilities
- ❖ Car / Bikeshare programs

Minor improvements may include:

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

**4A. DOES THE PROJECT IMPROVE OR ADD MULTIMODALITY?**

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

**4B. DOES THE PROJECT ENCOURAGE NON-SOV TRAVEL?**

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

**5. 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, or has the opportunity to apply best environmental practices and update to meet accessibility standards.

**5A. DOES THE PROJECT IMPROVE AGING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE?**

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

**6. 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

**6A. 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*

**7. 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, and improves the overall perception of safety within the surrounding environment.

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. Other safety considerations include design that will provide for a real or perceived improved safety of the user.

**7A. 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*

**7B. WHAT EFFECT WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAVE ON PERCEIVED PERSONAL SAFETY?**

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