

NEW MEXICO FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM - CYCLE 4 CALL-FOR-PROJECTS PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Programming Decisions Committee (PDC) of each state makes programming decisions. This is done in cooperation with Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs). The PDC of each state develops the evaluation criteria to meet the requirements of the FAST Act, FHWA guidance, and specific goals and requirements developed specifically for each state by the PDC. The following is the two part evaluation process that will be used for project proposals received in the New Mexico 2018/2019 Call for Projects. In addition to this evaluation, regional representatives from the FLMAs evaluate applications and share their project priorities in the state with the PDC. The PDC also considers this FLMA input in determining the final shortlist of projects.

PART A - ELIGIBILITY EVALUATION:			
This section determines if the project proposal meets minimum requirements to be eligible for FLAP funding. The proposal must have a 'Yes' answer to all of the following questions to be considered for evaluation for funding.			
A.1	Federal lands access	Is the project located on a Federal Lands Access Transportation Facility (FLATF)? ⁽¹⁾	YES or NO
A.2	Project type	Is the proposed project an eligible project type? ⁽²⁾	YES or NO
A.3	Title or maintenance responsibility	Is the title or maintenance responsibility vested in a State, county, town, township, tribal, municipal, or local government? ⁽³⁾	YES or NO
A.4	Endorsed by FLMA	Is there evidence that the applicant cooperatively engaged with the respective FLMA and the FLMA supports and endorses the project? ⁽⁴⁾	YES or NO
A.5	Non-federal share	Application shows that the applicant or partner can provide funding to meet the minimum match requirements for the program? ⁽⁵⁾	YES or NO
IS THIS PROJECT ELIGIBLE FOR THE FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM (<i>Must answer Yes to all questions above</i>) ?			YES or NO

Part B- FLAP AREAS OF ASSESSMENT EVALUATION			
Each project proposal is evaluated against criteria established by the KS PDC based on the goals of the FLAP program.			
B.1	Federal lands access proximity and significance	What is the proximity of the project to the federal lands? What is the significance if access through the project area was lost? Is the FLATF the only access to the federal lands?	10
			Close proximity, high significant facility, and only access to federal lands (10)
			Far to federal lands, low significance, and multiple accesses to federal lands (0)
B.2	High-use recreation site and/or Federal economic generator	Are the federal lands accessed considered a high use recreation site and/or a Federal economic generator? ⁽⁷⁾	10
			Very high use rec site and/or fed economic generator (10)
			High use rec site and/or fed economic generator (7)
			Medium use rec site and/or fed economic generator (5)
			Low use rec site and/or fed economic generator (3)
			Not a rec site or economic generator (0)
B.3	Improves public access	Will the project result in improving access to the federal lands for motorized, non-motorized, emergency vehicles, and/or transit users	10
			Improves access for 3 types of users (10)
			Improves access for 2 types of users (7)
			Improves access for 1 type of users (4)
			Does not improve access for any users (0)

Part B- FLAP AREAS OF ASSESSMENT EVALUATION (continued)

B.4	Safety improvement	Will the project result in improved safety for users?	10	Improves safety for wide range of users (10)
				Improves safety for some users (5)
				Does not improve safety for any users (0)
B.5	Preservation	Will the project improve the structural capacity or PCI of a roadway structural section, deficiency rating of a bridge, and/or the size or load limit of a facility? Will the project reduce the future maintenance costs for the FLATF? ⁽⁸⁾	5	Large improvement (5)
				Some improvement (2)
				No improvement(0)
B.6	Sustainability and Environmental Quality Benefits	Will the project reduce pollution, improve wildlife connectivity, protect or improve wildlife habitat, or protect a watershed?	5	Large improvement (5)
				Some improvement (3)
				No improvement(0)
B.7	Project cost and scope risk	Does the overall project scope and cost seem reasonable? Does the project have a high probability of failure or delay due to environmental issues, ROW issues, utility impacts, or other issues?	0	Unreasonable scope/cost or other large risk items(-5)
				Imprecise scope/cost or other medium risk items (-3)
				No Risk (0)
B.8	Overmatch/leveraging of funds	Is the project providing match over the minimum required of 20.00%? ⁽⁹⁾	5	Overmatch by 15% + (5)
				Overmatch by 10% + (4)
				Overmatch by 5% + (3)
				Overmatch by 3% + (2)
				Overmatch by 1% + (1)
No Overmatch (0)				
B.9	Coordination	Does the application and/or support letters demonstrate coordination with stakeholders via outreach or planning effort/documents/processes?	5	Extensive coordination (5)
				Some coordination (3)
				No coordination (0)
B.10	Program vision	Does the overall project meet the vision of the program?	5	Meets vision of program (5)
				Does not meet vision of program (0)
			65	TOTAL POINTS

Notes

(1) FLATF is defined as "a public highway, road, bridge, trail, or transit system that is located on, is adjacent to, or provides access to Federal lands

(2) Eligible project types include:

- a. transportation planning, research, engineering, preventive maintenance, rehabilitation, restoration, construction, and reconstruction i. adjacent vehicular parking areas and:
 - i. acquisition of necessary scenic easements and scenic or historic sites;
 - ii. provisions for pedestrians and bicycles;
 - iii. environmental mitigation in or adjacent to Federal land to improve public safety and reduce vehicle- caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity;
 - iv. construction and reconstruction of roadside rest areas, including sanitary and water facilities; and
 - v. other appropriate public road facilities, as determined by the Secretary;
- b. operation and maintenance of transit facilities.
 - i. includes the operation of all components of a transit system, including the acquisition of public transportation vehicles.
 - ii. applies solely to transit facilities.
- c. any transportation project eligible for assistance under title 23, United States Code, that is within or adjacent to, or that provides access to, Federal land.
 - i. includes transit capital projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that are also eligible under title 23.

(3) Includes letter committing the local agency to formalizing title or maintenance responsibility prior to construction.

(4) Signed support form and/or letter of support from the FLMA.

(5) NM FLAP Requires a minimum of 14.56% cash match.

(6) FLMA ranking should take into account their regional priority with preference to high-use recreation sites and federal economic generators. Adjust tiers and scoring based on the # of applications for the FLMA.

(7) Recreation site is any site that can be used by the public to recreate on federal public lands. High-use is relative to the region and/or local area and the relative use the site gets per the local and/or regional population base.

Federal economic generator refers to any use of/on federal lands that results in economy generation for the local community and/or region.

(8) The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a numerical index between 0 and 100 which is used to indicate the general condition of a pavement. The method is based on a visual survey of the number and types of distresses in a pavement. 100 represents the best possible condition and 0 represents the worst possible condition.

(9) Overmatch is all types of cash match above 14.56%.