



APPENDIX 7:

Initial Evaluation Criteria

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following tables summarize the evaluation criteria developed to assist with prioritizing the solutions for the initial evaluation of solution ideas and narrowing the list of solutions down to a reasonable number to carry forward for detailed analyses in the study. The criteria are grouped under each of the applicable study objectives.

A number of the criteria developed are not effective at providing differentiation at this point in the study, but may be useful for comparison of the fully vetted solutions that have been carried forward in the Study. They are not effective at this time, primarily due to the lack of in-depth knowledge about each of the solution ideas. As such, these criteria were not used for the initial evaluation and are indicated by an "N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study" designation in the initial evaluation measurement column.

A number of the criteria were determined to be redundant to others in the list. Some criteria were determined to be a portion of specific solution ideas. Criteria that were not used shown as crossed out in the table, with an explanation statement.

Objective 1. Seek solutions that produce greatest benefit to the aviation system capital and preservation needs.

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AA	Solutions that support and enhance aviation system safety and security	<i>Solutions that support implementation of identified safety and security infrastructure needs</i>	<i>N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study</i>
AB	Solutions that support and enhance aviation system capacity ¹	<i>Solutions that support implementation of identified capacity infrastructure needs</i>	<i>N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study</i>
AC	Solutions that support and enhance aviation system facilities	<i>Solutions that support implementation of identified airport facilities infrastructure needs</i>	<i>N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study</i>
AD	Solutions that support aviation system sustainability	<i>Solutions that support implementation of identified infrastructure needs that enhance airport sustainability (optimizing existing infrastructure, reducing carbon footprint, etc.)</i>	<i>N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study</i>

¹ System capacity refers to the ability of our system to meet current and forecast demand.

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AE	Solutions or combinations of solutions that address the funding gap	<i>Solutions or combination of solutions that address the funding gap, either by supporting additional funding, or by managing need.</i>	High – predicted to fully address the funding gap Med – predicted to partially address the funding gap Low – predicted to address the funding gap on a limited basis
AF	Solutions that support emerging technologies and future aviation system needs	<i>Solutions that support implementation of emerging technologies projects.</i>	N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study
AG	Solutions that provide sustainable revenues	<i>Solutions that provide reliable and long-term revenues to the aviation system preservation and capital needs.</i>	High – solutions that provide sustaining revenues for the long term Low – solutions that do not provide sustaining revenues for the long term
AH	Solutions that have the highest benefit to cost ratio	<i>Solutions that provide the greatest benefit to the aviation system capital and preservation needs per unit cost.</i>	N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study

Objective 2. Seek solutions that yield scalable and appropriate impact to users

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AJ	Solutions that can be implemented in a timely manner	<i>Solutions that may be implemented within 10 years.</i>	High – predicted implementation in less than 2 years Medium – predicted implementation between 2-5 years Low – predicted implementation time table of 5+ years
AK	Solutions that can garner aviation stakeholder support	<i>Solutions that are endorsed or are anticipated to be able to be supported by a majority of aviation system stakeholders.</i>	High – predicted to garner wide-reaching support by the aviation stakeholder committee Medium – predicted to garner some support by the aviation stakeholder committee Low – predicted to not garner any or very limited support by the aviation stakeholder committee

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AL	Solutions that are equitable among various users	<i>Solutions that provide the widest reaching impact to its various users, and are not limited to impacting only a limited number of users</i>	High – impacts that are highly equitable to users Medium – impacts that are somewhat equitable to users Low – impacts that are not equitable to users
AM	Solutions that balance the needs of various Washington airport classifications	<i>Solutions that have impacts that are comparable with benefits across multiple Washington airport classifications</i>	High – impact to users is comparable to benefit and impacts a wide-variety of airport categories Medium – impact to users is somewhat comparable to benefit and impacts some airport categories Low – impact to users is not comparable to benefit and impacts very few airport categories
AN	Solutions that are balanced across Washington State geographically	<i>Solutions that provide impacts that are comparable with benefits across Washington State geographically</i>	N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study

Objective 3. Seek solutions that support the Governor’s “Results Washington” initiatives and support Washington State priorities of government.

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
	Solutions that increase jobs	<i>Solutions that support Washington State’s economy by increasing jobs.</i>	<i>This criteria is captured in Criteria AV.</i>
AO	Solutions that maintain infrastructure assets at 2012 baseline levels	<i>Solutions that support the implementation of capital and preservation projects.</i>	<i>This criteria is captured in Criteria AI.</i>
AP	Solutions that improve at least 92% of airport pavements to fair or better condition	<i>Solutions that support the implementation of airport pavement capital and preservation projects.</i>	N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study
AQ	Solutions that provide for safety of people and property	<i>Solutions that provide for the safety of people and property in Washington State’s communities</i>	High – predicted to significantly improve safety Medium – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve safety Low – is not predicted to maintain “status quo” safety

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AR	Solutions that protect and improve, and provide access to natural resources, and cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state	<i>Solutions that support protection of and access to natural resources, and cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state.</i>	<p>High – predicted to significantly improve protection/access</p> <p>Medium – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve protection/access</p> <p>Low – is not predicted to improve “status quo” protection/access</p>
	Solutions that improve economic vitality of businesses and individuals, and vibrancy of communities	N/A	<i>This criteria is captured in Objective 4.</i>
AS	Solutions that improve statewide mobility of people, goods, and services	<i>Solutions that improve the aviation system’s role in the statewide mobility of people, goods, and services.</i>	<p>High – predicted to significantly improve mobility and benefit multi-modal projects</p> <p>Medium – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve mobility and potentially benefit some multi-modal projects</p> <p>Low – is not predicted to improve “status quo” mobility or multi-modal projects</p>
AT	Solutions that improve quality of life and environment	<i>Solutions that support quality of life components including land use, economy, environment, and health.</i>	N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study
AU	Solutions that maintain prior investments in transportation systems and services	<i>Solutions that support the implementation of capital and preservation projects.</i>	<i>This criteria is captured in Criteria AI.</i>

Objective 4. Seek solutions that improve the aviation system benefit to Washington state economy.

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AV	Solutions that increase jobs, wages, economic output, and/or tax revenues	<i>Solutions that support Washington State’s economy by increasing jobs, wages, economic output and/or tax revenues.</i>	<p>High – potential to significantly increase job opportunities, wages, economic output created in “status quo” scenario</p> <p>Medium – potential to somewhat increase job opportunities, wages, economic output created in “status quo” scenario</p> <p>Low – limited or no potential to increase job opportunities, wages, economic output created in “status quo” scenario</p>

INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Code	Evaluation Criteria	Description	Initial Evaluation Measurement
AW	Solutions that provide opportunity for aviation system growth	<i>Solutions that support long-term aviation system growth.</i>	<p>High – predicted to significantly improve growth</p> <p>Medium – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve growth</p> <p>Low – is not predicted to improve “status quo” growth</p>
AX	Solutions that leverage private investment	<i>Solutions that encourage or rely upon private investment for capital and preservation needs.</i>	<p>High – requires or relies upon private investment</p> <p>Medium – may encourage private investment</p> <p>Low – is not predicted to improve “status quo” private investment, or perhaps discourages it</p>
AY	Solutions that improve airport management across the system	<i>Solutions that support improved airport management practices, including fiscal stewardship, across the aviation system.</i>	<p>High – predicted to significantly improve airport management, efficiency, and fiscal stewardship</p> <p>Medium – predicted to maintain or somewhat improve airport management and fiscal stewardship</p> <p>Low – is not predicted to have an impact on “status quo” airport management or fiscal stewardship</p>
AZ	Solutions that promote public awareness of the state aviation system	<i>Solutions that support public education about Washington State’s airport system.</i>	N/A – Awareness will be important to any preferred solution. Eliminate as a criterion and leverage as part of Airport Management BMP solution.
BA	Solutions that leverage partnerships with education	<i>Solutions that support aviation system partnerships with education and industry (e.g. flight schools, aircraft manufacturing education, etc).</i>	N/A – Partnership with education/industry is more of a solution than a criterion. Eliminate as a criterion and leverage as part of Airport Management BMP solution.
BB	Solutions that improve interstate and international commerce	<i>Solutions that leverage improvements in the aviation system to benefit interstate and international commerce.</i>	N/A – Not a measureable differentiator at this point in the study