APPENDIX 11:

Initial Evaluation Scoring

INITIAL EVALUATION SCORING RESULTS

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Solutions	AE Solutions or combinations of solutions that address the funding gap	AG Solutions that provide sustainable revenues	AJ Solutions that can be implemented in a timely manner	AK Solutions that can garner aviation stakeholder support	AL Solutions that are equitable among various users	AM Solutions that balance the needs of various Washington airport classifications	AQ Solutions that provide for safety of people and property	AR Solutions that protect and improve, and provide access to natural resources, and cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state	AS Solutions that improve statewide mobility of people, goods, and services	AV Solutions that increase jobs, wages, economic output, and/or tax revenues	AW Solutions that provide opportunity for aviation system growth	AX Solutions that leverage private investment	AY Solutions that improve airport management across the system
SCORES	1b	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3
	1d	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3
	1e	2	3	1	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
	1g	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	1	1
	1h	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	1
	1i	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	1j	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	1k	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
	1l	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2
	1m	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
	2a	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	2b	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	2c	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2d	1	3	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
	2e	1	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2f	1	3	1	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	2
	2g	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
	3f	1	3	2	2	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	3a	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	3c	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	3d	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
	3e	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	2
	4b	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
	4c	1	3	1	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2
	4e	1	3	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	2	3	3	3
	4f	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3
	4g	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	3
CRITERIA MEASURES		***High*** *(3) – predicted to fully address the funding gap*	***High*** *(3) – solutions that provide sustaining revenues for the long term*	***High*** *(3) – predicted implementation in less than 2 years*	***High*** *(3) – predicted to garner wide-reaching support by the aviation stakeholder committee*	***High*** *(3) – impacts that are highly equitable to users*	***High*** *(3) – impact to users is comparable to benefit and impacts a wide-variety of airport categories*	***High*** *(3) – predicted to significantly improve safety*	***High*** *(3) – predicted to significantly improve protection/access*	***High*** *(3) – predicted to significantly improve mobility and benefit multi-modal projects*	***High*** *(3) – potential to significantly increase job opportunities, wages, economic output created in "status quo" scenario*	***High*** *(3) – predicted to significantly improve growth*	***High*** *(3) – requires or relies upon private investment*	***High*** *(3) – predicted to significantly improve airport management, efficiency, and fiscal stewardship*
		Med *(2) – predicted to partially address the funding gap*	N/A	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted implementation between 2-5 years*	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted to garner some support by the aviation stakeholder committee*	***Medium*** *(2) – impacts that are somewhat equitable to users*	***Medium*** *(2) – impact to users is somewhat comparable to benefit and impacts some airport*	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve safety*	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve protection/access*	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve mobility and potentially benefit some multi-modal projects*	***Medium*** *(2) – potential to somewhat increase job opportunities, wages, economic output created in "status quo" scenario*	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve growth*	***Medium*** *(2) – may encourage private investment*	***Medium*** *(2) – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve airport management and fiscal stewardship*
		Low *(1) – predicted to address the funding gap on a limited basis*	***Low*** *(1) – solutions that do not provide sustaining revenues for the long term*	***Low*** *(1) – predicted implementation time table of 5+ years*	***Low*** *(1) – predicted to not garner any or very limited support by the aviation stakeholder committee*	***Low*** *(1) – impacts that are not equitable to users*	***Low*** *(1) – impact to users is not comparable to benefit and impacts very few airport categories*	***Low*** *(1) – is not predicted to maintain "status quo" safety*	***Low*** *(1) – is not predicted to improve "status quo" protection/access*	***Low*** *(1) – is not predicted to improve "status quo" mobility or multi-modal projects*	***Low*** *(1) – limited or no potential to increase job opportunities, wages, economic output created in "status quo" scenario*	***Low*** *(1) – is not predicted to improve "status quo" growth*	***Low*** *(1) – is not predicted to improve "status quo" private investment, or perhaps discourages it*	***Low*** *(1) – is not predicted to have an impact on "status quo" airport management or fiscal stewardship*
GENERAL SCORING ASSUMPTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS		• Solutions which include broad-based taxation measures, new or modified, or funding allocation realignment, would "fully address" the funding gap, as the new structure would be setup with the funding gap in mind, and would therefore score highest. • Solutions which do not include mechanisms to increase funding score lowest.	• Solutions are scored either high/3 or low/1 for this criterion as it is assumed a Solution can either produce a sustainable (long-term) revenue source, or not. There is no medium result. • For example, a one-time infusion of cash is not a long-term Solution and therefore receives a "1".	• Simple fee structure modifications, best practices research and implementation, etc. could be implemented in less than 2 years, thus scoring highest. • Solutions requiring tax-changes or funding allocation changes could be implemented in a "Medium" timeframe, as there would be impetus behind it if determined to be a preferred Solution, although the process would still require some time. • Solutions at a Federal action level would take the longest.	• Solutions which seek outside financing or funding would be well-received, scoring highest. • Solutions which increase taxes, for example, for a few user groups might be disliked by those users, but liked by others. • Solutions which increase fees or taxes to all aviation users would be least supported (scoring lowest).	• Solutions which have the potential to impact all user groups are scored highest. • Solutions which impact limited user groups are least equitable.	• Provides equitability if the Solution provides funding to the aeronautics account, similar to AL, however, this criterion factors in disproportionate impacts to certain airport classifications. (e.g. Solution 1g would entail a lot of funding being derived from the large commercial service airports, however, the beneficiaries of that funding would be all airports that use the aeronautics account)	• It is assumed that "providing for safety" relates largely to implementation of needed projects. • Anything related to improving management practices, meeting performance indicators, etc. is assumed to also improve safety.	• Solutions that provide full funding of the gap would score highest, as projects related to protecting and improving airport access would be funded. • (It should be noted that the ability to evaluate against this criterion is difficult. It is weighted very low, however, and therefore does not have a measurable impact on results.)	• Any Solutions which speak to capacity/multi-modal development would score highest (e.g. infra. exchange financing, or those which attract investment, as they likely lean toward multi-modal projects which benefit the system as a whole). • Solutions which, for example, fund other airports that are not self-supporting (2C), score lowest.	• Solutions that provide for full funding of the gap would score highest, as that theoretically spurs the most work/economic output. Options which encourage investment in a broad spectrum of projects also score highly. • Medium scores are provided to those which might spur investment, but projects may be finite/one-time.	• "Growth" leans towards long-term, sustainable financing which impact a wide-variety of users/airport-types, expanded visibility to aviation, and/or anything which improves overall efficiency which focuses resources and theoretically supports long-term growth.	• Solutions which require/rely on private investment score highest. • Solutions which have the potential to infuse more money to the system also may spur more private investment and get medium scores. • Solutions which increase taxes or fees on users might discourage private investment.	• It is assumed that Solutions which improve the ability to leverage private money, encourage better management of money, or improve efficiency is rated highest. • A Solution which does not encourage an airport to better manage its resources as efficiently as possible (i.e. 2e), scores lowest.