ADOT Planning to Programming Scoring Guidebook

Contract No.:
MPD0036-21

Prepared by:

November 2025

Table of Contents

Appendices

Acronyms

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ADOT	Arizona Department of Transportation
AZTDM	Arizona Travel Demand Model
COG	Council of Governments
ECD	Enforcement & Compliance Division
E2C2	Estimated Engineering Construction Cost
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FY	Fiscal Year
GIS	Geographic Information System
LOS	Level of Service
LOSS	Level of Safety Service
LOTTR	Level of Travel Time Reliability
MPD	Multimodal Planning Division
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
NHS	National Highway System
P2P	Planning to Programming
PDO	Project Delivery and Operations Division
RAM	Responsibilities Assignment Matrix
TMC	Traffic Messaging Channel
TTG	Transportation Technology Group
TTTR	Truck Travel Time Reliability
V/C	Volume/Capacity

1 Introduction

The P2P process is conducted annually by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) to prioritize all prospective statewide facility improvements. The P2P process is a performance-based process that provides the foundation for the development of the Tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program (Five-Year Program). The scoring criteria, weights, and process as identified in this P2P Guidebook (November 2025) are utilized to prioritize and recommend the top performing construction projects for consideration in ADOT's Five-Year Program but may be subject to change at the direction of ADOT leadership and the State Transportation Board (STB).

The P2P process supports the ADOT investment categories that were recommended by the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP): Preservation, Modernization, and Expansion.

- Preservation – Activities that improve or sustain the condition of road pavement and bridge facilities to a state of good repair.
- Modernization – Improvements to the existing system that upgrade efficiency, functionality, and safety without adding capacity.
- Expansion – Improvements that add capacity through new roads, adding lanes to existing highways, new rail, and constructing new grade-separated overpasses/underpasses.

To provide a comprehensive evaluation of a large range of project types and locations, the P2P scoring process is comprised of the following four components:

- *Technical Score*: Based on individual prioritization methods from individual ADOT groups involved in the management of the various types of projects. At the writing of this Guidebook, prioritization processes for Preservation projects are conducted by the Pavement Management Section and Bridge Group. For Modernization projects, prioritization is provided by the project's nominating Technical Group, originating study document, or other methods developed by the MPD P2P Manager. The technical prioritization for Expansion projects is conducted by the MPD Modeling and Forecasting Section.
- *Policy Score*: Derived from planning-level criteria including freight flow, functional classification of corridors, census tracts designated as disadvantaged communities, and prior scoped project from a previous P2P cycle (pavement preservation category only).
- *Safety Score*: Based on the weighted Level of Safety Service (LOSS) values computed using the P2P Safety Tool developed in accordance with the guidelines of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Highway Safety Manual's Part B LOSS calculations.
- *District Score*: Derived from each ADOT District's prioritization of projects reflecting local assessments.

The purpose of this document is to outline the overall P2P process as well as individual scoring components. Authority for the P2P Guidebook is provided by ARS Title 28, Chapter 2, Article 7 and 23 USC Section 135(d)(2); 49 USC Section 5304(d)(2).

1.1 Project Scoring

Project scoring of potential P2P projects occurs in a matrix as shown in **Table 1**. Each project is scored separately and provided relative weighting for the different scoring components based on the investment category. For example, safety scoring is not considered for Preservation projects (Pavement and Bridge) as those investments do not significantly modify the infrastructure configuration for safety. Conversely, most Modernization projects are spot improvement projects (i.e. roundabouts, shoulder widening, turn lanes, pedestrian facilities) that represent significant safety improvement opportunities without adding capacity. Expansion projects that add capacity along longer corridors receive higher scoring input from congestion mitigation, system reliability, freight movement, and economic vitality (per Federal MAP-21 goals) than from safety considerations. The component scores matrix is subject to potential revisions in future P2P cycles as deemed necessary by ADOT to provide continuous improvements in programming. Such changes will be conducted through focused studies, stakeholder outreach, and ultimately approved by ADOT leadership and the State Transportation Board.

Table 1: P2P Scoring Matrix (As of FY26)

Category	Preservation (Pavement)	Preservation (Bridge)	Modernization	Expansion
Technical Score	51%	60%	35%	50%
Safety Score	-	-	25%	15%
Policy Score	9%	10%	10%	10%
District Score	40%	30%	30%	25%

2 Project Identification

The P2P process begins with the identification of prospective projects. The identification is twofold, involving the previously recommended projects that were not selected for the Five-Year Program during the previous Fiscal Year (FY) as well as newly recommended projects. Projects accepted into the previous FY Five-Year Program are noted as programmed projects and removed to avoid duplication.

Early coordination on infrastructure needs is conducted via "Road Reviews" involving the P2P Manager and the ADOT Districts. The P2P Manager and the Pavement Management Section physically visit each District and participate in group tours of those roadways that have been identified as exhibiting improvement needs. These field visits help confirm/refine the scope of prior P2P projects that were not selected for the Five-Year Program as well as identify new potential projects. Road Reviews are typically conducted in March with some activity in April and May depending on staff availability.

Following Road Reviews, the P2P Manager requests new project recommendations from the State Transportation Board (STB), State Legislature elected officials, ADOT MPD planners, COGs, MPOs, Tribal Partners, and ADOT Districts. For ADOT MPD planners, this process typically consists of reviewing all completed planning studies finalized between the current year and previous year's project identification process. Recommended projects that have not been previously considered in the P2P process are consolidated for the new P2P cycle. These project nominations are typically due early May of the P2P planning cycle.

Examples of past planning studies that have been used to identify projects include, but are not limited to:

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Plans
- Corridor Profile Studies
- Statewide Planning Studies
- State Freight Plan
- COG and MPO Studies
- Other plans and studies, as applicable

Technical Groups are also requested to submit potential projects to the P2P process. The request for projects from the Technical Groups is sent in early May with submittals due to the P2P Manager in June. These project submissions are required to be prioritized by the originating Technical Groups as the priority ranking provides the basis for the future Technical Scoring component. For the Preservation category, the technical groups are Pavement Management Section and Bridge Group. For the Expansion category, projects are typically identified through the ADOT MPD planners and the ADOT Districts. The Modernization category is broad and applicable technical groups are provided in **Table 2**.

Table 2: ADOT Technical Groups for Modernization Projects

Geohazard/Rockfall	Traffic Safety (Including Bike/Pedestrian)
Utilities and Railroad	Transportation Technology (ITS, Broadband)
Rest Area	Environmental Planning (Wildlife)
ADA/Civil Rights	Freight
Water Resources (Stormwater & Erosion Control)	ECD Division (Port of Entry)
Winter Operations Support	Drainage

This sequential project identification process is structured to allow all potential project recommendations, including District-originating recommendations, to be competitive in the Five-Year Program. The final list of potential P2P projects will include all projects that were not selected for the previous FY Five-Year Program.

3 MPD Data Update Requirements

The Policy and Safety components of the P2P scoring process require updated information each P2P cycle to accurately score proposed projects. **Table 3** notes the specific data fields and respective data sources required for updates as well as the frequency of data updates.

Table 3: Data Update Schedule

Policy Criteria		
Data Field	Data Source	Update Frequency
T-Factor	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) Report and MS2 database	Annual
Functional Classification	ADOT ESRI Roads and Highways database (ATIS_Prod)	Annual
Census tract data including federally recognized tribes	USDOT Justice40 Initiative (Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool)	MPD Discretion
Scoped P2P Project (pavement preservation category only)	Previously scored P2P pavement preservation list	MPD Discretion
Safety Criteria		
Data Field	Data Source	Update Frequency
Crash Frequency and Severity	ACIS	Annual
Roadway Characteristics	ATIS	Annual
Directional Traffic Volume Data [link-level]	MS2	Annual

Note: The data source that provided information on census tracts with categories of burden will be reviewed by MPD in FY2027-31 cycle to determine its usability and update requirements for the future given the project is not federally supported.

Several of the processes within the P2P process require access to the ADOT's ESRI Roads and Highways server to ensure the latest updates to NHS system (e.g. new construction) and associated data are captured in the scoring process. Most of the data will be available as part of the annual reporting for federal HPMS program.

4 Technical Score Criteria

The *Technical Score* component of the P2P scoring process constitutes between 35 and 60 percent of the overall P2P final score depending on the applicable investment category. Each investment category approaches the Technical Score differently due to the project types. Scoring of projects within a single investment category are scored independently from projects within the other categories.

4.1 Preservation Projects (Pavement)

During the project identification phase, the Pavement Management Section evaluates all roadways under ADOT ownership and recommends pavement preservation projects based on a data-driven, quantitative methodology. The submittal of the Pavement Management Section's project list includes the results of the quantitative process which forms the basis of the project prioritization and the technical score.

The Pavement Management Section, in their evaluation, uses a roadway pavement management system to quantify the following factors:

- Current and anticipated future conditions (5-year projections) of the pavement based on their cracking, rutting, and international roughness index (IRI).
- Cumulative traffic load and resulting damage to pavement expressed in terms of Equivalent Single Axle Load (ESAL).
- Functional classification of the roadway.
- Benefit-Cost Ratio for the proposed improvement to measure the relative cost-effectiveness of the proposed P2P project.

Based on the above factors, projects are ranked for consideration with higher technical scores resulting in higher project priority/ranking. MPD staff normalizes the ranking order to a 51-point scale allocated to the P2P *Pavement Preservation Technical Score*. All scores are derived from the Pavement Management Section's sequential ranking as determined by the following formula:

*Pavement Preservation Technical Score = (x/n) * 51*

x = raw technical score

n = maximum of pavement technical score

Therefore, the top-ranking project receives the maximum allocation of *Pavement Preservation Technical Score* points and subsequent projects descend on a linear scale.

4.2 Preservation Projects (Bridge)

During the project identification phase, the Bridge Group evaluates all bridges under ADOT ownership and recommends bridge preservation projects based on a data-driven, quantitative methodology. The submittal of the Bridge Group's project list includes the results of the quantitative process which forms the basis of the project prioritization and the technical score.

The Bridge Group, in their evaluation, uses a bridge asset management system – currently AASHTOWare Bridge Management (BrM) – to quantify the following factors:

- Deck conditions are measured based on various National Bridge Inventory (NBI) fields related to elevation, year of construction, service years, available concrete cover, calculated deck concrete strength.

- Superstructure conditions are measured based on various NBI fields related to elevation, year of construction, service years, available concrete cover, calculated superstructure concrete strength, steel strength, calculated structural deterioration and paint deterioration.
- Substructure conditions are measured based on various NBI fields related to elevation, year of construction, service years, available concrete cover, calculated substructure concrete strength, steel strength, calculated structural deterioration and paint deterioration.
- In the case of a culvert, these considerations include elevation, year of construction, service years, available concrete cover, calculated sediment, and culvert fill conditions.
- Bridge scour conditions are measured based on hydraulic modeling, which calculates contraction, pier, and abutment scour depths (based on river conditions and bridge geometry).

Based on the above factors, projects are ranked for consideration with higher BrM scores resulting in higher project priority/ranking. MPD staff normalizes the ranking order to a 60-point scale allocated to the P2P *Bridge Preservation Technical Score*. All scores are derived from the Bridge Group's sequential ranking as determined by the following formula:

*Bridge Preservation Technical Score = (x/n) * 60*

x = raw technical score
n = maximum of bridge technical score

Therefore, the top-ranking project receives the maximum allocation of *Bridge Preservation Technical Score* points and subsequent projects descend on a linear scale.

4.3 Modernization Projects

Modernization project recommendations are derived from a number of different technical areas/groups and therefore a single quantitative approach to technical scoring is not feasible. The P2P Manager requests that each nominating group provide a ranked project prioritization based on the group's own methodology. For projects identified through Statewide planning studies such as Corridor Profile Studies, State Freight Plan, or Statewide Climbing and Passing Lane Study, the ADOT P2P Manager will rank the projects based on an overall assessment of need.

In order to normalize all of the rankings to a 35-point scale allocated to the *Modernization Technical Score*, all scores are derived from the Technical Group's sequential ranking as determined by the following formula:

*Modernization Technical Score = (101 – x) * 0.35*

x = rank order

Due to the limited available annual budget for Modernization project funding, some ADOT technical groups may not prioritize all of their P2P project nominations. The number of prioritized projects varies based on the group and the magnitude of their project list. All recommended projects outside of the top ranked projects are kept for record-keeping purposes and are updated, resubmitted, and reassessed in subsequent years' scoring processes. It should also be noted that technical scores for projects in the Modernization investment category may be duplicated as each technical group will have a #1 ranked project, #2 ranked project, and so forth.

4.4 Expansion Projects

Expansion projects are any project that adds capacity through new roads, adding lanes to existing highways, new rail, and constructing new grade-separated overpasses/underpasses. These projects are not generated from a single source during the project initiation phase and therefore prioritization/rankings are developed after the initiation phase is complete.

The ADOT MPD Modeling and Forecasting Section manages the technical score for all expansion projects using the Arizona Travel Demand Model (AZTDM) to measure the following traffic and economic performances of each project:

- Projected Level of Service (LOS) is determined by output from the Arizona Travel Demand Model (AZTDM) both for the current year and future (typically +20 years) forecast for the project segment.
- Total Delay, which represents the difference between the congested travel time and the free flow travel time on a specific project segment.
- System Reliability, expressed separately for passenger cars and trucks, is defined as a ratio between the expected travel time during peak periods and average travel time during free flow conditions.
- Economic Vitality, which is a binary (yes, no) score, is based on whether the proposed project improvements are located along a designated Key Commerce Corridor (KCC) roadway for the State of Arizona.
- Volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio, which indicates the level of congestion of a specific project segment.

It should be noted that the performance metrics output from the AZTDM that contribute to the technical score consider various socio-economic and demographic factors related to regional growth such as population and employment. The AZTDM forecast model can, therefore, analyze any expansion project and produce performance measures for any future year corresponding to the project construction years including the long-range transportation plan (LRTP) year.

The values awarded for the above components of the *Technical Score* total 50 points and therefore do not need to be normalized using a formula.

5 District Score Criteria

The *District Score* component of the P2P scoring process constitutes between 25 and 40 percent of the overall P2P final score depending on the applicable investment category. Each District Administrator and associated staff are given the opportunity to prioritize prospective P2P projects within their District. This prioritization is requested in advance of the remaining scoring steps (Policy, Safety) in an effort to improve efficiency of the P2P process.

The District prioritization methodology is qualitative and represents the local assessment of project needs separate from other P2P scoring components. Each ADOT District prioritizes/ranks the P2P projects within their respective geographic boundaries and within each respective investment category. The MPD P2P Manager requests the following:

- Preservation (Pavement) – prioritize/rank the District's top 10 projects
- Preservation (Bridge) – prioritize/rank all projects
- Modernization – prioritize/rank the District's top 10 projects
- Expansion – prioritize/rank all projects

In order to normalize all of the ranking to a 25 to 40 point scale allocated to the *District Score*, all scores are proportionally derived from the District's sequential ranking as determined by the following formula:

*Preservation (Pavement) District Score = (101 – x) * 0.40*
*Preservation (Bridge) District Score = (101 – x) * 0.30*
*Modernization District Score = (101 – x) * 0.25*
*Expansion District Score = (101 – x) * 0.25, where*
x = rank order

These formulas are applied to each respective District list independently. Therefore, District scores may be duplicated as each top-ranking project within each investment category from each District receives the maximum allocation of *District Score* points and each list descends on their own respective scales independent of the other submitted lists.

It should be noted that the overall P2P process is designed to prioritize these competing projects across all Districts at the State level as required by State and Federal law (Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 28, Chapter 2, Article 7, and 23 USC Section 135(d)(2) and 49 USC Section 5304(d)(2).

6 Safety Score – Scoring Process

The *Safety Score* component of the P2P scoring process constitutes 15 percent of the overall P2P final score for Expansion projects and 25 percent of the overall P2P final score for Modernization projects. Safety is not considered for Preservation projects (Pavement and Bridge) as those investments do not significantly modify the infrastructure configuration.

The *Safety Score* is determined using the Level of Safety Score (LOSS) score produced by the methodologies contained in the AASHTO 2016 Highway Safety Manual (HSM) Part B. The LOSS measure, expressed numerically as LOSS 1 – 4, is a measure of a roadway section's observed crash history compared to the expected crashes for a similar section of roadway normalized for facility type and volume. The LOSS process allows the P2P process to compare diverse projects independently, preventing direct comparisons between large urban freeway projects and low-volume rural highways. Projects with a lower LOSS represent a facility with statistically low safety concerns and a project with higher LOSS represents a facility with statistically higher safety concerns. The LOSS score is a measurement of each individual project's need for safety improvements and allows the statewide transportation network to be evaluated on a universal metric.

In order to normalize all of the LOSS to a P2P *Safety Score*, all scores are proportionally derived from the LOSS score as determined by the following formula:

*Modernization Safety Score = (x/4) * 25*
*Expansion Safety Score = (x/4) * 15, where*
x = Average LOSS Score

7 Policy Score Criteria

The *Policy Score* component of the P2P scoring process constitutes between 9 and 10 percent of the overall P2P final score depending on the applicable investment category.

The *Policy Score* is applied to all projects in all investment categories. For projects in the Preservation (Bridge), Modernization, and Expansion categories, the score is derived from data related to freight flow, corridor significance/functional classification, and disadvantaged communities. For projects in the Preservation (Pavement) category, the freight flow and corridor significance criteria are substituted for scoped project criteria data. Descriptions of each scoring input are provided below.

- Freight Flow, a measurement based on T-Factor values, represents the percentage of the overall AADT volumes that are comprised of freight vehicles. Roadways with higher freight activity are awarded a higher point value.
- Corridor Significance / Functional Classification is based on the functional classifications and NHS designations of the underlying roadway associated with a project. Roadways with a higher functional classification are awarded a higher point value.
- Disadvantaged Communities, which is determined as a binary (yes, no) score, is based on whether the proposed project improvements are located adjacent to or within a census tract that is deemed disadvantaged based on eight categories of burden [Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST)] or if it encompasses or intersects with boundaries of Federally Recognized Tribes. As the USDOT's Justice40 initiative is no longer federally supported, ADOT MPD has adopted to continue utilizing an archived version of the CEJST dataset for the near term.
- The Scoped Project criteria applies only to Pavement Preservation projects and is a binary score (yes, no). A project receives points if the ADOT Project Level Scoping (PLS) Team scoped it in a prior P2P cycle. ADOT added this criterion to elevate "funding-bubble" pavement projects—those that ranked high statewide last cycle but were not programmed in the Five-Year Construction Program. Because pavement preservation is a top ADOT priority, advancing previously scoped projects early helps address roadway deterioration that can turn a pavement preservation/rehabilitation need into a far more expensive pavement reconstruction.

The values awarded for the above components of the *Policy Score* total 10 points, except for Preservation (Pavement) category which total 9 points, and therefore do not need to be normalized using a formula.

8 Development of Final P2P List

The development of a final recommended P2P project list is based on the culmination of the various scoring components. Once all scoring components have been developed and combined, a preliminary project ranking list is produced for review. The ADOT P2P Manager performs a quality review on the preliminary list and conducts additional reviews with the ADOT Districts, ADOT leadership, and other internal/external stakeholders prior to presenting the recommended list to the State Transportation Board.

8.1 District Workshops

ADOT Districts previously provided initial District scoring input on projects prior to the other scoring component inputs being finalized. Workshops provide the Districts an opportunity to review the final rankings of projects within each investment category and to refine the projects. Refinement of projects can include combining overlapping projects or adjacent projects to improve efficiency of delivery, changing projects priority due to local impacts or resources, or other considerations.

To facilitate the workshops, the ADOT MPD GIS Team develops dashboards using ESRI Experience Builder to provide dynamic and interactive visualization of project locations, scoring components, overall P2P scores, and final rank. In addition, spreadsheets with project listing and results are also developed in preparation for the District Workshops. On average, MPD staff targets the following number of top projects to be discussed with each District within each respective investment category:

- Pavement Preservation – Top 10 projects
- Bridge Preservation – All projects
- Modernization – Top 10 projects
- Expansion – All projects

Following the District Workshops, each District Administrator provides confirmation of any adjustments to their *District Score* priorities. Any scoring changes at this time will override the preliminary District prioritization provided earlier in the P2P process.

After all District Workshops are conducted, all P2P project lists are compiled into a single statewide prioritized list, resulting in the Draft Final P2P List.

8.2 Final P2P Project List

The Draft Final P2P List is separated into individual investment category lists in descending order of the total score. The ADOT P2P Manager then submits the Final P2P List to the ADOT STIP Manager (Programming Team), Major Projects Manager, Project Management Group Manager, and other applicable personnel for use in the Programming and Planning Level Scoping. This step completes the performance-based planning prioritization process.

8.3 Planning Level Scoping

Upon the finalization of the P2P Statewide Prioritized Project List, the highest scoring projects within a combined ranking of both pavement and bridge preservation projects are selected as candidates for the Major Projects Group's Planning Level Scoping process. The number of projects selected varies depending on the number of preservation projects expected to enter the Five-Year Program each FY and the applied fiscal constraint by the ADOT Financial Management Systems (FMS) Team. Additionally, all Modernization projects are reviewed to identify overlapping project limits with the selected highest scoring Preservation projects.

The highest scoring projects are submitted to the Major Projects Group to begin the Planning Level Scoping process. The Planning Level Scoping process produces a Planning Level Scoping document which includes a checklist, cost estimates, and coordination meeting minutes.

- The checklist provides engineering justification for the cost estimate and scope of work refinements.
- The cost estimates are fully itemized cost estimates adhering to ADOT's Estimated Engineering Construction Cost (E2C2) formatting.
- The meeting minutes document the coordination efforts between ADOT Technical Groups and ADOT Engineering District personnel.

For additional detail regarding the Planning Level Scoping process, reference the Planning Level Scoping Guidelines produced by the Major Projects Group.

Upon completion, each Planning Level Scoping document is submitted to the ADOT P2P Manager and STIP Manager to update project scope of work and cost estimates in the Tentative Five-Year Program. If projects are not entering into the Five-Year Program, the ADOT P2P Program Manager updates the scope of work and cost estimates for use in the next FY-cycle of the P2P process.

9 Next Steps

P2P Scoring is an annually completed process based upon the most recently updated data available. Upon the completion of each FY's P2P process, improvements to the scoring implementation procedures, scoring criteria, eligibility, and weights can be identified.

This ADOT Planning to Programming Scoring Guidebook is developed based upon the scoring criteria, eligibility, weights, and processes used during the development of the Tentative FY 2026-2030 Five Year Program. In order to maintain consistency amongst scored projects, any future improvements or adjustments made to the scoring criteria will require adjustments to all previously proposed and newly proposed projects. Similarly, this document will require periodic updates based upon any implemented improvements or adjustments made to the scoring criteria, eligibility, weights, or processes.

9.1 Arizona Management System Integration

This *Guidebook* is being integrated into ADOT's Arizona Management System (AMS) process and products. In addition, a companion *Data Governance and Management Plan* was developed to capture in detail the geospatial analysis involved in the development and maintenance of each of the scoring modules (pavement, bridge, modernization, and expansion) of the P2P GIS Tool. The procedures and guidelines included in both of these references should be treated essentially as "Standard Work" for P2P.

Appendix A – P2P Responsibilities Assignment Matrix (RAM)

Task #	Responsible Party	Responsibility	Start	Finish
1	MPD P2P Manager, MPD Leadership	Annual Lessons Learned/Items for Continuous Improvement.	January	March
2	MPD P2P Manager, PDO District Staff, Technical Groups, MPD Regional Planners	Early Coordination Meetings for P2P updates.	February	May
3	MPD P2P Manager, GIS Group, IT Group, Technical Groups	Update and maintenance of P2P Feature Class within the Roads & Highways platform. Updates to HPMS, Pavement, Bridge, and Crash databases.	January	May
4	MPD P2P Manager, Districts, Technical Groups	Road Review of Project Priorities (in field).	March	May
5	Tribal Partners, Districts, Tribal Transportation Planning	Outreach to Tribal partners re: SHS project needs & concerns. Distribute P2P New Project Nomination Form to Tribes.	March	May
6	MPD P2P Manager, Government Relations	Outreach to elected officials re: SHS project needs & concerns. Distribute P2P New Project Nomination Form to State Legislators (through ADOT Government Relations).	March	May
7	COGs, MPOs, STB Members, MPD Project Managers, District Administrators	Call for Projects Nominations from COGs, MPOs, STB Members, MPD Project Managers, and District Administrators in March. Submit New Project Nominations to the P2P Manager by early May.	March	May
8	MPD P2P Manager, MPD Programming Manager, Technical Groups	Review current Draft ADOT Five-Year Construction Program with Technical Groups.	May	May
9	MPD P2P Manager, Scoping Team, Pavement Technical Group	Submit Preliminary Top 20 Pavement Rehab projects to ADOT Planning Level Scoping (PLS) Team.	May	May
10	MPD P2P Manager, Technical Groups	Call for Projects Nominations from ADOT Technical Groups in early May. Technical Groups to email list of prioritized project nominations to P2P Manager by June.	May	June

11	MPD P2P Manager	QAQC of P2P Lists and New Project Nominations.	June	August
12	PDO District Staff	Call for District Rankings: Top 10 Pavement Rankings, All Bridge Rankings, Top 10 Modernization Rankings, and All Expansion Rankings. Final submittal by early August.	July	August
13	MPD P2P Manager	Project Prioritization Scoring: Apply Safety Scores and Policy Scores; QAQC Final Project Scores. Convert District Ranking to District Score and prepare District Workshop spreadsheets.	August	August
14	MPD P2P Manager, Technical Groups	Project Revisions Meetings (prior to District Workshops). Priority meetings with Pavement & Bridge Groups.	August	August
15	MPD P2P Manager, MPD Scoping Team	Draft P2P Projects List to Planning Level Scoping Team.	August	August
16	MPD P2P Manager, MPD Regional Planners, Technical Groups, PDO District Staff, STB Members, Tribal Partners, COG/MPO Planners	District Workshops: Confirm project details and rankings; combine projects (as appropriate).	September	September
17	Pavement Technical Group	Geotechnical Testing (coring) & FWD Field Testing for Top Ranking Pavement Rehab Projects.	June	November
18	MPD P2P Manager/MPD Regional Planners	Finalize P2P List by October. Submit Final P2P List to STIP Manager & Planning Level Scoping Team.	October	October
19	MPD STIP Manager MPD, PDO, TTG, & FMS Management	Management Review of Draft Tentative Five-Year Program.	October	December
20	MPD Planning Level Scoping Team, Roadway Pre-Design, Technical Groups	Planning Level Scoping (top ranking priority projects).	October	December
21	MPD STIP Manager MPD, PDO, TTG, & FMS Management Transportation Board	Preparation for Draft Tentative Five-Year Program Study Session (for Board consideration/approval at February STB Meeting).	January (next calendar year)	January (next calendar year)
22	MPD STIP Manager Transportation Board	Draft Five-Year Program Public Hearings.	March	May

23	MPD STIP Manager	Revise Draft Five-Year Program based on Public Comments.	June	June
24	MPD STIP Manager Transportation Board	Transportation Board Approval of Five-Year Program.	June	June
25	MPD STIP Manager Governor's Office	Governor's Office Approval of Final Five-Year Program.	June	June
26	MPD STIP Manager	Distribute Approved Five-Year Program.	July	July
27	Technical Groups	Field Inspections.	Year-round	Year-round

Appendix B – P2P Communication List

Planning to Programming Communication List
*Contacts to include in Early Coordination, Call for New Project Nominations, and District Workshop meetings
FMS
Program and Project Funding Administrator
Financial Analyst

PDO
ADA / Civil Rights
Bridge Management Group
Drainage
Geohazard / Rockfall
Pavement Management Group
Regional Traffic Safety
Rest Area
Stormwater / Erosion Control / Water Resources
Transportation Technology Group (TTG) / Broadband
Traffic Monitoring Group
Wildlife Mitigation
Winter Operations Support
Northeast District
Northcentral District
Northwest District
Central District
Southeast District
Southcentral District
Southwest District
Local Public Agency (LPA) Section
Project Management Group (PMG)
Roadway Design Group
Communications
Community Relations
Lean Coaches
Policy Group

ECD
Port of Entry (POE)

MPD
P2P Management
Regional Planning
Freight / Rail Planning
Active Transportation (Bicycle / Pedestrian)
Tribal Planning
Programming
Transit
Aeronautics Group
Major Projects/Planning-Level Scoping
Asset/Performance Management
Expansion/Traffic Modeling & Forecasting
MPD Finance

Executive Management
Director
State Engineers Office (SEO)
Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
MPD Director
ECD Director
Policy Director
PDO Director
PDO Assist Dir (Delivery)
TTG Director
Operations
PRB Manager
PDO Assist Dir (Districts)

State Transportation Board
Board District 1
Board District 2
Board District 3
Board District 4
Board District 5
Board District 6
Board District 7

FHWA
Senior Transportation Planner (Planning Region 1)
Community Planner (Planning Region 2)
Planning, Environment, Air Quality, Realty, and Civil Rights (PEARC) – Team Leader
Project Delivery - Team Leader
System Performance – Team Leader
Division Administrator (DA)
Deputy Division Administrator (DDA)

COG & MPO
Bullhead City MPO (BHCMPO)
Central Arizona Governments (CAG)
Lake Havasu MPO (LHMPO)
Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG)
MetroPlan (Flagstaff MPO)
Northern Arizona Council of Governments (NACOG)
Pima Association of Governments (PAG)
Sun Corridor MPO (SCMPO)
Southeastern Arizona Governments Organization (SEAGO)
Sierra Vista MPO (SVMPO)
Western Arizona Council of Governments (WACOG)
YavPlan (Yavapai County MPO)
Yuma MPO (YMPO)

TRIBES
Intertribal Council Association (ITCA)
Ak-Chin Indian Community
Cocopah Indian Tribe
Colorado River Indian Tribes
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
Fort Yuma Quechan Tribe
Gila River Indian Community
Havasupai Tribe
Hopi Tribe
Hualapai Tribe
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians
Navajo Nation
Pascua Yaqui Tribe
Pueblo of Zuni
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
San Carlos Apache Tribe
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
Tohono O'odham Nation
Tonto Apache Indian Tribe
White Mountain Apache Tribe
Yavapai-Apache Nation
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

Appendix C – Project Scoring Matrix

P2P - Pavement Preservation Scoring				
Technical (51%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	Fugro data collection / Pavement Management System	Pavement Condition: IRI, Cracking, & Rutting Deterioration Factors Lifecycle Factors	International Roughness Index (IRI), Cracking, & Rutting	51%
			Total Technical Score	51%
District (40%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	N/A	District Administrator Evaluation	Weighted score based on District Administrator Project Rank	40%
			Total District Score	40%
Policy (9%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	N/A	Scoped Project	Project was scoped in previous P2P cycle	5%
	Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool	Disadvantaged Communities	Project located in census tract that meets 1 of 8 categories of burden, or within the boundaries of Federally Recognized Tribes	4%
			Total Policy Score	9%

**Subject to Change*

Total P2P Score	100%

P2P - Bridge Preservation Scoring				
Technical (60%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	Bridge Engineer Inspection	Bridge Condition: Deck, Superstructure, Substructure, Culvert, Scour Lifecycle Factors	Bridge Engineer inspection of current bridge criteria (depending on bridge type)	60%
			Total Technical Score	60%
District (30%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	N/A	District Administrator Evaluation	Weighted score based on District Administrator Project Rank	30%
			Total District Score	30%
Policy (10%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	ADOT MPD AADT Annual Report	Freight Percentage (T-Factor)	T-Factor > 25% (3 pts) T-Factor = 10% - 25% (2 pts) T-Factor < 10% (1 pt)	3%
	ADOT MPD Functional Classification Maps	Functional Classification	Interstate (3 pts), Non-Interstate NHS (2.5 pts), Major Arterial (2.0 pts), Minor Arterial (1.5 pts), Major Collector (1.0 pts), Minor Collector (0.5 pts)	3%
	Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool	Disadvantaged Communities	Project located in census tract that meets 1 of 8 categories of burden, or within the boundaries of Federally Recognized Tribes	4%
			Total Policy Score	10%

**Subject to Change*

Total P2P Score	100%

P2P - Modernization Scoring				
Technical (35%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	Varies	Technical Group Project Ranking (Statewide)	Weighted score based on Technical Project Rank	35%
			Total Technical Score	35%
District (30%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	N/A	District Administrator Evaluation	Weighted score based on District Administrator Project Rank	30%
			Total District Score	30%
Safety (25%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	P2P GIS Tool	Level of Safety Service	Average weighted LOSS Score (I - IV)	25%
			Total Safety Score	25%
Policy (10%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	ADOT MPD AADT Annual Report	Freight Percentage (T-Factor)	T-Factor > 25% (3 pts) T-Factor = 10% - 25% (2 pts) T-Factor < 10% (1 pt)	3%
	ADOT MPD Functional Classification Maps	Functional Classification	Interstate (3 pts), Non-Interstate NHS (2.5 pts), Major Arterial (2.0 pts), Minor Arterial (1.5 pts), Major Collector (1.0 pts), Minor Collector (0.5 pts)	3%
	Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool	Disadvantaged Communities	Project located in census tract that meets 1 of 8 categories of burden, or within the boundaries of Federally Recognized Tribes	4%
			Total Policy Score	10%

**Subject to Change*

Total P2P Score	100%

P2P - Expansion Scoring				
Technical (50%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	AZTDM	Level of Service (LOS)	Volume / Capacity	15%
	AZTDM	Total Delay	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) / Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	10%
	AZTDM	System Reliability (passenger vehicles & freight)	Travel Time Reliability (TTR) Ratio & Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Ratio	10%
	Key Commerce Corridors	Support Economic Vitality	Location within Key Commerce Corridor route	5%
	AZDTM	Improve Congestion	Compare projected future change in vehicle-hours traveled (VHT) at project level (volume weighted)	10%
			Total Technical Score	50%
District (25%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	N/A	District Administrator Evaluation	Weighted score based on District Administrator Project Rank	25%
			Total District Score	25%
Safety (15%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	P2P GIS Tool	Level of Safety Service	Average weighted LOSS Score (I - IV)	15%
			Total Safety Score	15%
Policy (10%)	Metric Data Source	Measure	Metric / Formula	Weighting
	ADOT MPD AADT Annual Report	Freight Percentage (T-Factor)	T-Factor > 25% (3 pts) T-Factor = 10% - 25% (2 pts) T-Factor < 10% (1 pt)	3%
	ADOT MPD Functional Classification Maps	Functional Classification	Interstate (3 pts), Non-Interstate NHS (2.5 pts), Major Arterial (2.0 pts), Minor Arterial (1.5 pts), Major Collector (1.0 pts), Minor Collector (0.5 pts)	3%
	Climate & Economic Justice Screening Tool	Disadvantaged Communities	Project located in census tract that meets 1 of 8 categories of burden, or within the boundaries of Federally Recognized Tribes	4%
			Total Policy Score	10%
			Total P2P Score	100%

**Subject to change*