

Arizona State Transportation Board Meeting



P2P Process Overview February 21, 2025





What is P2P?

Long Range Transportation Plan

Five-Year Construction Program





Why P2P?

Performance-Based Planning to Programming is the Law Federal Regulation (FAST Act)

- 23 USC Section 135(d)(2), and 49 USC Section 5304(d)(2)
- State Statute
 - ARS Title 28, Chapter 2, Article 7 (§ 28-501 through § 28-507)
- Financial Stewardship
 - Maximize Use of Public Funds



ADOT P2P Process Flowchart







P2P Scoring Overview

Modernization Pavement Expansion Bridge **Preservation** Preservation Annual Annual **Annual** Annual Investment **Investment Investment** Investment Target: Target: Target: Target: \$132M \$90M \$390M \$60M **Scoring:** Scoring: Scoring: Scoring: Technical = 51% **Technical &** Technical = 35% Technical = 50% District = 40%**Safety = 60%** District = 30%District = 25%Policy = 9% District = 30% **Safety = 25% Safety = 15% Policy = 10% Policy = 10% Policy = 10%**

P2P Scoring Breakdown **Pavement Preservation**

PRESERVATION (PAVEMENT)

Work Types

Flush shoulder /shoulder edge

Maintenance

repair

Concrete repair

Leveling with premix

 \forall

A

 \forall

Activities that improve or sustain the condition of the transportation facility to a state of good repair

	-			U 1	
	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	 ✓ Patching / blade laying ✓ Pothole repair ✓ Slide representation of result metrod 	
Technical (51%)	% Interstate Good Condition = 44% % Interstate Poor Condition = 2% % Non-Interstate Good Condition = 28% % Non-Interstate Poor Condition = 6%	Pavement Condition: IRI, Cracking, & Rutting Deterioration Factors Lifecycle Factors	51%	 ✓ Side removal and rock patrol ✓ Spot filling cracks / crack seal ✓ Spot pavement profiling / AC grinding <i>Preservation</i> ✓ AC grinding / milling ✓ Cape seal ✓ Chin and 	
	Total Technical Score			 ✓ Chip seal ✓ Crack seal / fill ✓ Crack seal / fill 	
	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	 ✓ Fog sear / Hush ✓ Friction coarse (AR-ACFC / ACEC) / mill & fill or overlay of 	
District (40%)	N/A	District Engineer Evaluation	40%	friction coarse ∀ Micro surface	
		40%	 ∀ PCCP cross stitching ∀ PCCP dowel-bar retrofit (DBR) 		
	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	∀ PCCP diamond grinding∀ Slurry seal	
	N/A	Scoped Project (previous P2P cycle)	5%	∀ Spot repair∀ Thin bonded overlay	
Policy (9%)	N/A	Disadvantaged Communities	4%	Rehabilitation ∀ Major AC overlays ∀ Mill & fill (existing AC) Reconstruction	
Total Policy Score				✓ Removal and replacement of existing readway section	
*Subject to Change				 ✓ Spot reconstruction 	

P2P Scoring Breakdown **Bridge Preservation**

PRESERVATION (BRIDGE)

Activities that improve or sustain the condition of the transportation facility to a state of good repair

Work Types

Ma	intenance	
\forall	Approach	0

- Approach overlay
- \forall Barrier repair
- \forall Drainage / hydrovac
- \forall Channel work
- \forall Cleaning
- \forall Minor crash repair
- repair
- (existing)
- le repair
- intenance
- tenance
- eal
- el repair
- el)
- fit
- element cement
- repair
- re
- ert (over 20') replacement

	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	 ✓ Pipe / culvert ✓ Scour repair (
Technical & Safety (60%)	% NHS Bridges Good Condition = 52% % NHS Bridges Poor Condition = 4%	Bridge Condition: Deck, Superstructure, Substructure, Culvert, Scour Lifecycle Factors	60%	 ✓ Spall / pothol ✓ Structure ma ✓ Washing <i>Preservation</i> 	
Total Technical Score				 ∀ Cyclical Main Activities 	
District (20%)	Performance Target Measure		Weighting	∀ Deck joint / sreplacement	
District (30%)	N/A	District Engineer Evaluation	30%	∀ Deck overlay∀ Deck seal	
	30%	∀ Major chanr			
	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	 ∀ Painting (stee ∀ Scour retrofit 	
Policy (10%)	Freight Reliability on Interstate (TTTR) = 2-year - 1.37; 4-year - 1.48	Freight Percentage (T-Factor)	3%	 ∀ Seismic retro ∀ Slab jacking Rehabilitation ∀ Major bridge rehab / repla ∀ Major crash r ∀ Superstructur replacement 	
,, ,	N/A	Functional Classification	3%		
	N/A	Disadvantaged Communities	4%		
		Total Policy Score	10%	Reconstruction	
*Subject to Change				∀ Bridge / culv	

P2P Scoring Breakdown Modernization

MODERNIZATION

Improvements that upgrade ncy, functionality, and vithout adding capacity

Work Types

- pedestrian
- le lane / shoulder
- bing / passing Lanes
- age
- e (new / replacement)
- drail (new / acement)
- section / interchange ncement
- w intersection
- configuration
- undabout
- mp
- nal
- rn lanes
- mation Technology ems (ITS)
- strian crossings
- ofit / correct functional lescence
- fall mitigation
- ty modifications / ncements
- removal / recovery area
- ic control and agement
- ening existing lanes / Iders
- life crossings or ation

	Performance TargetMeasureWeVariesTechnical Group Project Ranking (Statewide)Image: Complexity of the second se		Weighting	efficier safety w	
Technical (35%)			35%		
	35%	ADA Bicyc			
District (200/)	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	Climi Drair	
District (30%)	N/A	District Engineer Evaluation	30%	Fence	
	30%	Guar repla			
	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	Inter enha	
Safety (25%)	Fatalities = 2% increase Fatality Rate = 2% increase Serious Injuries = 7% decrease Serious Injury Rate = 8% decrease Non-Motorized = 1% increase	Level of Safety Service	25%	 Ne Rec Roi Rai Sig Tui Infor 	
	25%	Syste Pede			
	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting	ting • Retrobsc • Rock • Safe enha	
Policy (10%)	Freight Reliability on Interstate (TTTR) = 2-year - 1.37; 4-year - 1.48	Freight Percentage (T-Factor)	3%		
	N/A	Functional Classification	3%	Tree Traff	
	N/A	Disadvantaged Communities	4%	mana • Wide	
	10%	shou • Wild			
*Subject to Change			100%	mitig	

P2P Scoring Breakdown Expansion			Performance Target Measure		Weighting
			N/A	Level of Service (LOS)	15%
			N/A	Total Delay	10%
		Technical (50%)	Travel Time Reliability (TTR) Interstate = 2-year - 81%; 4-year - 71% TTR Non-Interstate NHS = 2-year - 84%; 4-year - 77%; Freight Reliability on Interstate (TTTR) = 2-year - 1.37; 4-year - 1.48	System Reliability (passenger vehicles & freight)	10%
	EXPANSION		N/A	Support Economic Vitality	5%
Improvements that add capacity by adding new facilities			N/A	Improve Congestion	10%
		Total Technical Score			50%
		District	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting
1	Work Types	(25%)	N/A	District Engineer Evaluation	25%
•	New grade-		Total District Score		25%
	separated overpass	separated overpass / underpass (if adding lanes)	Performance Target	Measure	Weighting
	/ underpass (if adding lanes)		(same as Modernization targets)	Level of Safety Service	15%
	 Railroad X-ing 		Total Safety Score		15%
	 Interchange 		Performance Target	Measure	Weighting
•	 DHOV Ramp New lanes 	 O DHOV Ramp New lanes New rail New routes / bypass 	(same as Modernization targets)	Freight Percentage (T-Factor)	3%
	New rail		N/A	Functional Classification	3%
	New routes / bypass		N/A	Disadvantaged Communities	4%
ĺ			Total Policy Score		10%
	*Subject to Change 1				100%

Г

Continuous Improvement



- DEPARTMENT OF -



Continuous Improvement – FY26-30 P2P Cycle

- 1. Road Review with Districts & Pavement Technical Group expanded field time
- 2. Call for New Projects State Legislature representatives included
- 3. Updated Recommended Investment Choice and Annual Investment Targets (per adopted LRTP)
- 4. Updated P2P Expansion Project Scoring Criteria
- 5. Added Scoped Project Measure (Pavement projects)
 - Forthcoming for next year's P2P Cycle:
 - Update P2P Manual
 - Data Migration of P2P Projects Layer
 - Update Performance Metrics (per TAMP)

Road Reviews: March to April 2025 (All Districts)

Call for New Projects: March to June 2025

- Round 1: COGs, MPOs, Tribes, STB, Districts, State Legislature due 5/2
- Round 2: ADOT Technical Groups (Pavement, Bridge, Modernization, Expansion) Due early June

Project Rankings: May to August 2025

- Technical Rank May/June
- District Rank June
- Safety & Policy Scores July
- QAQC Final Scores/Finalize District Project Lists August

P2P Workshops: September 2025

• All (7) ADOT Engineering Districts

Final FY27-31 P2P List: October 2025