

Appendix G

Southern Maine Corridors Steering Committee Corridor Prioritization

Southern Maine Corridors Steering Committee Corridor Prioritization

The guidelines here apply to scoring used to arrive at the regional importance assigned in for each regional corridor. These guidelines should be used to ensure that scoring of criteria is consistent throughout the state. Maine DOT emphasized that this prioritization process will not affect funding distribution or the number of projects for the specific corridor; rather, it is going to define MaineDOT's focus and attempt to preserve the qualities that are distinctive for a specific corridor, such as mobility, freight movements, or commuter connection.

Criteria

There are a number of factors that can be considered in estimating the relative importance of the major corridors. The following criteria were derived from the *Pennsylvania Transportation Plan* and are consistent throughout the state:

Recreation/Tourism - Is the route a scenic byway, a major tourist corridor, or serves recreation-related services and areas?

Commuter Importance - To what extent does the corridor serve commuter traffic relative to other routes?

Freight Patterns - To what extent does the corridor serve local or through-traffic carrying freight, including heavy haul truck network and railroads?

General Commerce - To what extent does the corridor service commercial development, including retail, office, and industrial clusters?

Local Planning Relationships - How would improvements to the corridor complement or detract from local land use regulations, comprehensive plans, access management, downtown revitalization, or other plans?

Transportation Linkages/Intermodal Transportation - How important is this corridor in relation to other elements of the transportation network?

Economic Significance - To what extent does the corridor supports healthy economic climate (retention, balanced growth, and attraction)?

Weights

The “weight” factor was established individually for each criterion. Averaged totals were applied to each corridor in order to identify characteristics and significance of each corridor. The weight ranges between 0 (0%) for no importance to 1 (100%) for highest importance of this criterion.

Scoring

Scoring will be done using a scale from 1 to 10 for each corridor by each criterion. A score of 1 indicates low priority while a 10 reflects highest priority. As such, if particular corridor is very important for the regions economy, it might receive a score of 8 on “economic importance.”

Aggregating Scores

The sum of all scores multiplied by their respective weights will result in an aggregate score for each corridor.

$$(\text{Tourism} * \text{Weight}_T) + (\text{Commuters} * \text{Weight}_C) + \dots = \text{Aggregate Score}$$

The aggregate scores will be used to rank the corridors under consideration in this study. MaineDOT will review the ranking and make further recommendations.

SMCC Corridor Prioritization

	Recreation / Tourism	Commuter Importance	Freight Patterns	General Commerce	Local Planning Relationships	Transport Linkages	Economic Significance	Total
<i>Peter Crichton</i>								0
<i>Wayne Davis</i>								0
<i>George Flaherty</i>								0
<i>Margaret Forbes</i>								0
<i>Connie Garber</i>								0
<i>James Gulnac</i>	10	10	20	10	0	30	20	100
<i>Peter Cavanaugh</i>	10	20	0	30	0	20	20	100
<i>Robert Kahn</i>								0
<i>Stephen Klein</i>	25	15	5	5	5	10	35	100
<i>Frank Koenig</i>	20	10	5	15	10	5	35	100
<i>Rosemary Kulow</i>								0
<i>James Long</i>								0
<i>Harold Parks</i>	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	100
<i>Robert Pettit</i>	10	30	30	10	5	10	5	100
<i>Rick Stanley</i>								0
<i>John Wathen</i>								0
<i>Jim Wendel</i>	10	0	10	0	5	10	65	100
<i>Roger Winn</i>	10	10	10	10	10	25	25	100
<i>Dick Wood</i>	10	15	25	0	10	20	20	100
<i>Steve Workman</i>								0
<i>Will Haynes</i>	30	10	10	30	0	0	20	100
<i>Dan Stewart</i>	20	20	10	0	30	10	10	100
<i>Mark</i>							100	100

Weight	14	14	11	11	8	14	29	100
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------------

Corridor	Recreation / Tourism	Commuter Importance	Freight Patterns	General Commerce	Local Planning Relationships	Transportation Linkages	Economic Significance	Total
<i>Southern Coastal</i>	140	132	106	105	75	132	290	980
<i>Coastal PACTS</i>	127	130	105	101	70	129	282	942
<i>Cumberland County Central</i>	108	130	100	94	57	122	269	879
<i>York County Central</i>	100	104	87	78	53	108	252	782
<i>Lakes Region</i>	121	117	74	70	51	93	248	775
<i>York County East-West</i>	98	117	79	69	53	103	245	764