

## For Discussion: Draft Criteria for Ranking Tier I Projects

---

When we started re-evaluating the list of NATA projects back in late 2013/early 2014, the underlying premise was to measure success this way:

*“SUCCESS = MOVING THE NEXT REASONABLE PHASE OF A PROJECT FORWARD.”*

Here is how we defined the Tiers for the February 2014 NATA board discussion:

- **Tier I Projects** = regionally significant projects NATA taking lead to actively support.
- **Tier II Projects** = includes studies and projects with smaller areas of influence, where we support/monitor, but where NATA members take lead.
- **Tier III Projects** = Project in the queue (horizon projects).

Criterion	Definition, as applicable	Notes
Project will service a current or future economic activity center		How do we want to define it?
Is the project currently undergoing or has concluded either a PEL-level analysis or a NEPA process?		
Does the project support regional multi-modal connections?		
If the project is for construction, can jurisdiction provide a reliable and realistic updated cost estimate?		The cost estimate needs to be realistic in order to evaluate how we advance the project to the next ‘reasonable phase’.  This becomes important as we try and determine how to ‘bridge the gap’ for funding.
Ability to leverage local/state/regional/federal funding.		