

2021 TA Set-Aside Project Rating Scales

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Project Readiness	
Criterion Name	Criterion Definition

Project Readiness

Projects that have completed planning and defined their construction scope of work that are ready to begin work immediately after the project is awarded. Indications of project readiness include a reasonable and clearly defined plan for implementation, secured knowledgeable project team and commitments for pre-construction funding. Other indications of project readiness are prepared bid documents, prepared preliminary environmental clearances, secured right-of-way, procurement specifications, or existence of a completed design for the project.

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Financial Information (Cost Estimates)	This criterion will be used to assess the project construction cost estimates and the availability of funds to pay for pre-construction activities associated with all elements of the project. The application project costs are accurate and acceptable to the review committee (full credit). The application project costs are unacceptable/incomplete/inaccurate (no credit).

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
Fully Acceptable	1.000	Construction estimate is accurate with construction year prices. All pre-construction local contribution funds have been secured and sponsor can cover the full amount necessary; including cost overruns in construction.
Acceptable	0.75	Construction estimate is accurate with construction year prices. Pre-construction funds are secured.
Average	0.5	Construction estimate is accurate with construction year prices. Pre-construction funds are secured pending final approval.
Below Average	0.25	Either construction estimate is not accurate or some percentage of the pre-construction dollars have yet to be secured.
Unacceptable	0.000	Construction estimate is inaccurate and no pre-construction dollars have been secured.

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Clearances - ROW, Environmental, Utility	The project right-of-way, environmental, and utility clearances have been completed (full credit). The project clearances have not been started and/or there are major issues (no credit).

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
100	1.000	ROW, Environmental, Utility Clearance is completed.
75	0.75	All clearances information has been determined, but submissions for approval have not been made.
50	0.5	No clearances have been obtained and there do not appear to be issues with any of the clearances.
25	0.25	No clearances have been obtained and there are minor issues with some or all of the clearances.
0	0.000	Zero clearances have been obtained and there are major issues with one or more clearances.

2021 TA Set-Aside Project Rating Scales

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Schedule	This criterion refers to the project's schedule. The schedule thoroughly describes the project completion within 2 years (full credit). The application schedule is confusing/inaccurate/incomplete (no credit).

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
Fully Acceptable	1.000	The project will be obligated within the obligation limits.
High Probability	0.75	The project can be obligated within the obligation limits without much added effort.
Probable	0.5	The project can most likely be obligated within the obligation limits with some added effort.
Hopeful	0.25	The project has a low probably of obligating within the obligation limits. A large collective effort from the sponsor, consultant, project manager, and PennDOT will be required.
Unacceptable	0.000	The project has a high probably of missing the obligation deadline.

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Project Team	This criterion refers to the project teams' capacity and commitment to implement the project. Indications of project team include a history implementing federally funded programs or similar project types, project team includes an engineering firm familiar with the PennDOT Design Development Process and has experience completing federally funded projects within a short timeline.

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
High	1.000	High likelihood of implementation means that project sponsor and engineering firm have a history of successful management of federally funded projects.
Mid-High	0.75	Mid-High likelihood of implementation means that the only one of the project team (sponsor or engineer) are familiar with the PennDOT Design Development Process as they have been through a federally funded project before.
Medium	0.500	Medium likelihood of implementation means that project team is a stable organization with a history of successfully implementing similar projects through non-federal sources of funding. This also includes the engineering firm is familiar with PennDOT process however the individual assigned to the project is not.
Mid-Low	0.25	Some knowledge from the project team on what it takes to complete the process but not clearly explained in detail.
Low	0	Hastily assembled partnerships with weak commitment from partners, project team has little or no experience managing the type of project in application.

2021 TA Set-Aside Project Rating Scales

Project Quality	
Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Project Quality	Projects that will contribute to the achievement of regional, county, and local goals. Indications of project quality include a significant addition or enhancement to a network of regional importance; improvements to safety and public health; relief of environmental burdens on or provision of environmental benefits to environmental justice communities; and enhancement of community quality of life, economic development, access to community assets, and public engagement and education.

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Connectivity	The project supports and contributes to a significant part of a network of regional importance. Significance can result from a project's geographic size or its importance to the functioning of the overall network. A network of regional importance is one that is identified in regional plans.

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
Very High	1.000	The project completes a significant part of a network of regional importance.
High	0.75	The project is not significant, but is part of the network of regional importance.
Medium	0.5	The project is significant, but the network is only of limited or local importance.
Low	0.25	The project is not significant and the network is of only limited or local importance.
None	0.000	The project is isolated and connection to a network is unclear.

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Safety and Public Health	The project will result in safety or public health improvements. The project addresses a demonstrated safety need, increases active transportation opportunities, and/or provides other public health benefits.

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
Very High	1.000	The project will significantly address necessary safety improvements and public health improvements.
High	0.75	The project will somewhat address safety and public health improvements.
Medium	0.5	The project will slightly improve safety or public health conditions.
Low	0.25	The project will not result in safety or public health improvements.
None	0.000	The project may negatively impact safety and public health.

2021 TA Set-Aside Project Rating Scales

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition
Environmental Justice/Entitlement Communities	The project improves mobility, provides benefits, or addresses existing adverse impacts in a community with high concentrations of minority and/or low-income populations (i.e. an environmental justice (EJ) community), either by relieving a previously imposed burden or by providing new transportation and/or environmental benefits. An EJ community for this purpose will be defined as a census tract with a score of "above average" or "well above average" for any or all of the low-income, racial minority, and ethnic minority indicators identified through DVRPC's Indicators of Potential Disadvantage (IPD) mapping tool: https://dvrpc.org/webmaps/IPD .

Rating	Value	Scale Definition
Very High	1.000	All or majority of the project clearly benefits, or addresses adverse impacts, in a community with above average and/or well above average concentrations of minority <u>and</u> low-income populations.
High	0.75	All or majority of the project is likely to benefit, or address adverse impacts, in a community with above average and/or well above average concentrations of minority <u>and/or</u> low-income populations.
Medium	0.5	All or majority of the project may benefit, or address adverse impacts, in a community with above average and/or well above average concentrations of minority <u>and/or</u> low-income populations.
Low	0.25	A portion of the project may benefit, or address adverse impacts, in a community with above average and/or well above average concentrations of minority <u>and/or</u> low-income populations.
None	0.000	The project is not located in a community with above average and/or well above concentrations of minority or low-income populations.

2021 TA Set-Aside Project Rating Scales

Criterion Name	Criterion Definition	
Community Enhancement	The project will improve community quality of life, promote local economic development, provide access to community assets, and/or provide opportunities to engage and educate the public.	
Rating	Value	Scale Definition
Very High	1.000	The project significantly improves community quality of life, promotes local economic development, provides access to community assets, and provides opportunities to engage and educate the public.
High	0.75	The project improves community quality of life, promotes local economic development, provides access to community assets, and provides opportunities to engage and educate the public, but enhancements are minimal -or- the project does not provide for enhancements in all categories.
Medium	0.5	The project has a neutral impact on community quality of life, local economic development, access to community assets, and opportunities to engage and educate the public, but enhancements are negligible -or- the project does not provide for enhancements in all categories.
Low	0.25	The project does not provide for enhancement in all categories and enhancements are minimal.
None	0.000	The project does not improve community quality of life, promote local economic development, provide access to community assets, or provide opportunities to engage and educate the public.