

**Colorado State University**

**Alternative Transportation Fee Advisory Board 2023-2024**

**Project Rating Criteria**

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Estimated Initial Cost:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Estimated Ongoing Costs:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria:**  **Points Allotted:**

 1. Degree to which the proposed project **directly benefits**

**CSU students**, **enhances transportation safety, and promotes equity.**  \_\_\_\_\_ / 35

 2. Project design quality and efficiency. Anticipated **project lifecycle,**

 **construction time, and ongoing maintenance costs.**  \_\_\_\_\_ / 30

 3. **Environmental benefit** of proposed project. \_\_\_\_\_ / 30

 4. **Project aesthetics**. Degree to which the architecture \_\_\_\_\_ / 5

complements and/or supplements the locale of the project

(for programmatic projects: the degree to which it compliments

the CSU student body culture and needs).

   **TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ / 100**

**Criteria Considerations:**

1. **Degree to which the proposed project directly benefits CSU students and/or enhances transportation safety.**
	1. Overall student population benefitted?
	2. Student surveys and support, data (surveys, transit data, etc.)
	3. Accessibility for students with disabilities
	4. How this effects on campus vs. off campus students’ access
	5. If there is a transportation need not being met without this change- would it affect if a student could get to class?
	6. Future needs; consider population growth
	7. Enhances transportation safety for all parties involved
	8. If this project is funded, where might that money come from?
	9. Student feedback/demand for this proposed project, is this program wanted by the student body?
	10. Consider what would be the most benefit to the most people
		1. If the program is only wanted by a particular group: does it help transportation equity at CSU?
	11. We will consider the relationship between the cost of a project to the value the project will bring to students
	12. We will consider whether the project advances transportation equity for our CSU community
2. **Project design quality. Anticipated project lifecycle, construction time, and ongoing maintenance costs.**
	1. How long until more money will be needed for the project? Is this considered in the current price ask?
	2. How long will this project last until it needs to be renovated?
	3. How long will construction affect students? When will construction occur?
	4. Is there an external impact that would affect the life of the project?
		1. Are there other design considerations - such as access for large trucks, emergency vehicles, and snowplows - that would affect the lifetime of the project?
3. **Environmental benefit of proposed project.**
	1. Does the proposed project help reach the University’s sustainability goals? How?
	2. Triple bottom line: social, environmental, and economic costs; how does this benefit people, the economy, and/or the environment?
4. **Project aesthetics. Degree to which the architecture compliments and/or supplements the locale of the project. For programmatic projects: the degree to which the program compliments and/or supplements the CSU student body culture or needs.**
	1. How does the proposed design compare to the current design standards of the University?
		1. Does the design go with the University aesthetics?
		2. Has it been approved through the University Design Standard process?
	2. If the design is programmatic, does it represent CSU’s culture?
	3. How will the project or program recognize ATFAB’s contribution?