

## Partnering for Performance NH Primary Evaluation Criteria for Selecting Measures

---

Key Evaluation Categories (EC)	
<b>Evaluation Category 1</b>	Relevance & Coordination
<b>Evaluation Category 2</b>	Data Accessibility, Availability, and Quality
<b>Evaluation Category 3</b>	Feasibility
<b>Evaluation Category 4</b>	Other

### Fields by Categories

#### Evaluation Category 1: Relevance & Coordination

**1. Field: *Is the metric relevant to federally mandated requirements/goals OR suggested federal guidelines?***

- **Definition:** Is the metric relevant to federal requirements, such as FHWA/FTA Requirements, National Performance Goals? Is the metric relevant to suggested federal guidelines, such as Federal Planning Factors and NH FHWA Planning Emphasis Areas? Refer to the table below for some of the key federal requirements and guidelines.

MAP-21 National Goals (Requirements)	Federal Planning Factors (Guidelines)	NH FHWA Planning Emphasis Areas (Guidelines)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Infrastructure condition</li> <li>• Congestion reduction</li> <li>• System reliability</li> <li>• Freight movement and economic vitality</li> <li>• Environmental sustainability</li> <li>• Reduced project delivery delays</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic vitality</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Security</li> <li>• Accessibility and mobility options</li> <li>• Environment</li> <li>• Modal integration and connectivity</li> <li>• Efficient management and operation</li> <li>• Preservation</li> <li>• Resiliency and reliability</li> <li>• Travel and tourism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MAP-21 Implementation</li> <li>• Regional Models of Cooperation</li> <li>• Ladders of Opportunity</li> </ul>

Pick List
Yes – requirements
Yes – guidelines
Yes – both
No
N/A

**2. Field: *Geographic Planning Area Relevance***

Definition: Is the metric relevant for geography and scale of MPO /RPC regions (regional), or relevant to only the state DOT (state)?\*

*\*Keep in mind that just because a metric is relevant at the state scale, does not mean it is also relevant at the regional scale*

Pick List
Regional
State
State/Regional
Neither
Unknown
N/A

**3. Field: *Is this metric directly related to transportation?***

Definition: Is the metric directly related to transportation planning? Some of the measures that were suggest in the Phase I interviews may not directly relate to transportation planning. For example, a metric for school lunch programs and obesity would not be directly related to transportation planning. If an immediate transportation connection cannot be made from the suggested measure, the measure would not be recommended.

Pick List
Yes
No
Unknown
N/A

## Evaluation Category 2: Data Accessibility, Availability, and Quality

### 4. Field: **Data Accessibility/Availability**

Definition: This criterion asks two questions: Is the data already available (Yes/No) and how easy is it to obtain the data (Easy/Difficult)?\*

*\*Keep in mind that some data is available but difficult to access. Alternatively, data may not be available currently but would be quick and/or easy to collect.*

Pick List
Yes/Easy
Yes/Difficult
No/Easy
No/Difficult
Unknown
N/A

### 5. Field: **Smallest Data Scale Available**

Definition: Smallest (most detailed or granular) geographic unit available.

Pick List
Federal
State
Regional
County
Municipal
Sub-Municipal
Unknown
N/A

### 6. Field: **Smallest Data Scale Available for Most Reliable Data**

Definition: Smallest (most detailed or granular) geographic unit for the highest quality data available.

Pick List
Federal
State
Regional
County
Municipal
Sub-Municipal*
Unknown
N/A

*\*Elaborate in the Notes. I.E.: Neighborhood, transit.*

**7. Field: Last Update**

Definition: When was the dataset last updated?

Pick List
< 1 year ago
1-5 years ago
5-10 years ago
10-15 years ago
15+ years ago
Unknown
N/A

**8. Field: Data Frequency/Update Interval**

Definition: What is the frequency of data generation and/or release? Use the most frequently updated (and available) dataset.

Pick List
Annual (or more frequent)
Every 2-4 years
Every 5+ years
Every 10+ years
Varies*
Unknown
Other*
N/A

\* Elaborate in the Notes

## Evaluation Category 3: Feasibility

### 9. Field: **Time to Prepare**

Definition: Time to access, prepare, & calculate data (relative amount and base from workgroup lens perspective). If data is available for the measure, how long will it take members of the Workgroup to perform a calculation? Is the measure quick or slow to calculate?

- Quick (will take a reasonable time to prepare data and calculate the measure)
- Moderate
- Slow (will take an unreasonable amount of time to prepare data and calculate measure)

Pick List
Quick
Moderate
Slow
N/A

### 10. Field: **Cost to Prepare**

Definition: Cost to access, prepare, and calculate data and measures. If data is accessible, how expensive (in relative terms) would it be to retrieve the data, prepare it for calculations, and use it to calculate the measures?

Pick List
High
Moderate
Low
N/A

### 11. Field: **Technical Feasibility**

Definition: Technical feasibility to access, prepare, and calculate data and measures.

What is the feasibility of obtaining this measure for the entire state (including rurals)? What is the feasibility of generating this metric using existing resources? Include MPO/DOT specific info in notes if needed. *Refer to Fields # 4 - 10.*

- High
  - Data available at adequate frequency/easy to access AND calculation time is quick
- Moderate
  - Data available at adequate frequency /easy to access BUT calculation time is slow to moderate
  - Calculation time would be quick to moderate, BUT data is difficult to access
- Low
  - Data not available at all (or at adequate frequency)/difficult to access
  - Calculation time is slow or moderate

Pick List
High
Moderate
Low
N/A

## Evaluation Category 4: Other

### 12. Field: *Preliminary Recommendation to MPOs*

Definition: Preliminary recommendation for the MPOs. After evaluating the metric via each of the criteria, this was the final [subjective] recommendation of the individual reviewer. This recommendation should make it clear whether the measure is one of the following: Primary Metric, Secondary Metric, Potential Future Metric, Not Recommended, or Not Yet Determined. The Workgroup will go through the list of recommendations to refine each one (as in the GSF process).

- Primary Metric
  - MAP-21 Required Metrics go here
- Secondary Metric
  - Elective measure
- Possible Future Metric
  - May not have the capacity to measure now but is tied to a regional issue and may be possible to measure better in the future
- Not Recommended
- Not Yet Determined

Pick List
Primary Metric
Secondary Metric
Possible Future Metric
Not Recommended
Not Yet Determined

### 13. Field: *Preliminary Recommendation to DOT*

Definition: Preliminary recommendation for DOT. After evaluating the metric via each of the criteria, this was the final [subjective] recommendation of the DOT. This recommendation should make it clear whether the measure is one of the following: Primary Metric, Secondary Metric, Potential Future Metric, Not Recommended, or Not Yet Determined. The Workgroup will go through the list of recommendations to refine each one (as in the GSF process).

- Primary Metric
  - MAP-21 Required Metrics go here
- Secondary Metric
  - Elective measure
- Possible Future Metric
  - May not have the capacity to measure now but is tied to a regional issue and may be possible to measure better in the future
- Not Recommended
- Not Yet Determined

Pick List
Primary Metric
Secondary Metric
Possible Future Metric

Not Recommended
Not Yet Determined

**14. Field: *Notes/Comments***

Definition: Any additional information on the metric that is not covered in the criteria (but that is relevant to final recommendation) goes in this field. This field should also contain details for any criteria that need elaboration.

**15. Field: *Links***

Definition: Any links to more information, potential data sources, etc.