

MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: December 4-5, 2025

From: STEVEN KECK, Chief Financial Officer

Reference Number: 4.17, Action Item

Prepared By: Tarek Tabshouri, Chief
Division of Aeronautics

Subject: **ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE AERONAUTICS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN RANKING PRIORITY MATRIX FOR ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS**
RESOLUTION G-25-60, AMENDING RESOLUTION G-15-07

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the attached amendment to the Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Scoring Criteria formerly referred to as the Priority Matrix?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the approval of the attached Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan Scoring Criteria formerly referred to as the Priority Matrix.

BACKGROUND:

The Commission approved a Priority Matrix as part of the 2013 CIP for State-funded airport projects, which was subsequently amended in 2015. The Priority Matrix consists of a ranked list of eligible improvement project types authorized under the State Aeronautics Act and associated regulations (such as runway pavement, lighting, obstruction mitigation, and others). The development of the biennial Acquisition and Development (A&D) Program of Projects is based on matching CIP projects' description (i.e. scope of work) to the rankings established in the Priority Matrix. Input from Aeronautics staff is also incorporated in the selection process. Additionally, A&D capacity is divided in three categories; a set-aside of 25 percent for Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) projects, which are a local mandate, 35 percent for projects at airports in the federal National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), and 40 percent for projects at airports not in the NPIAS.

The proposed A&D Scoring Criteria introduces a refined scoring system with expanded priority

areas. It includes six merit categories that align more closely with the Department's Division of Aeronautics' long-term goals, and a streamlined list of development items to support a more user-friendly scoring process. The 25 percent set-aside for ALUCP projects is excluded from the scoring and remains in place. Justifications are now incorporated into scoring decisions to address potential biases to account for factors such as airport readiness, exceptional need, or other mitigating circumstances.

The proposed A&D scoring criteria applies a merit-based and data-driven methodology with qualitative justifications, incorporates the significance of projects at both the airport and system levels, and establishes a foundation for streamlined data collection and cross-office collaboration for better funding decisions.

In this scoring criteria, the total score is calculated as the sum of the merit score and the project score. The merit score reflects six merit categories: safety, security, climate action, equity and environmental justice, multimodal access and economic development, and capacity. These merits are evaluated not only for the project itself, but also in terms of the benefits to the airport and the broader aviation system. The project score is assigned based on specific development items involved in the project.

Attachments:

A-Existing Priority Matrix

B-Proposed A&D Project Priority Scoring Criteria

Existing Aeronautics Priority Matrix		
Category	Description	Rank
Safety	Seal/Overlay/Rehab Existing Runway Pavement (including grading and drainage)	1
	Runway Safety Area Land Acquisition, New Pavement for Runway Turnaround (no parallel Taxiway)	2
	Obstruction Mitigation/Abatement (removal, trim, land acquisition, navigation easements for height restrictions), Obstruction Lighting (new)	3
	Seal/Overlay/Rehab Existing Taxiway Pavement (including grading and drainage), New Pavement for Run Up Area, Runway Protection Zone Land Acquisition	4
	Runway Lighting (e.g. Medium Intensity Runway Lighting [MIRL]) Repair or Replace	5
	Taxiway Lighting (e.g. Medium Intensity Taxiway Lighting [MITL]) Repair or Replace, Landing Aids (e.g. Runway End Identified Lights [REIL]), Marking, Signage, Segmented Circle, Precision Approach Path indicator, Wind Cone, AWOS, ASOS/AWSS Repair or Replace	6
	AWOS (new)	7
	Rotating Beacon (repair or replace)	8
	Seal/Overlay/Rehabilitate Existing Apron/Ramp Pavement (including grading and drainage)	9
Capacity	Runway Pavement (new), Extend or Widen	10
	Runway Lighting or Rotating Beacon (new)	11
	Taxiway Pavement (new), Extend or Widen	12
	Airport Layout Plan (new or update)	15
	Landing Aids (new), Taxiway Lighting (new)	16
	Apron/Ramp Pavement (new) or Service Roads (Air Operation Area)	17
	Utilities (drainage, water, sewage), Environmental Mitigation, Blast Wall, Fire Protection Systems, Radio Communication Equipment, Bond Servicing	18
	Land Acquisition for Airside Usage; Airport Master Plan	19
	Noise Monitoring Equipment (new)	20
Security	Security Fence (new)	13
	Apron/Ramp Lighting (new)	14

**ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT (A&D) PROJECTS PRIORITY SCORING CRITERIA
 (PROPOSED)**

Formula

$$\text{Total Score} = \text{Merit Score} + \text{Project Score}$$

Where:

$$\text{Merit Score} = \text{Base Score} + (\sum \text{Airport Benefit} + \sum \text{System Benefit}) / 6$$

Section 1: Merit Score

Priority Area: Merit Category

Merit Category	Base Score	Benefit Scores	
		Airport Benefit	System Benefit
Safety	6	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit
Security	3	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit
Climate action	2	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit
Equity and Environmental Justice	2	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit
Economic Development and Multimodal Access	2	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit
Capacity	1.5	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit	3 - High benefit 2 - Medium benefit 1 - Low benefit 0 - No benefit

How to assign scores:

- The Office of Technical Services assigns Base Score for one (1) merit category as the primary merit, based on project description
- The Office of Aviation Planning assigns Benefit Scores, including airport benefit and system benefit, by evaluating all (6) of the merit categories, referring to the airport inventory and California Aviation System Plan.
- The Office of Airport assists with Airport Benefit evaluation.

Condition:

- If the Base Score is not assigned to Safety (i.e., Base Score \neq 6), and the Safety score for both Airport Benefit and System Benefit are 0 (No benefit), the project is not eligible for numerical scoring and should not proceed to the scoring phase.
- However, the project may still be considered for funding outside of the scoring process through the justification procedure (see Section 3).

Section 2: Project Score

Priority Area: Development Item

Development Item	Scoring range
Pavement – Runway	1~30
Objects/Obstruction/Hazards	1~15
Runway safety area land acquisition	1~10
Pavement – Taxiway	1~8
Runway Protection Zone Land Acquisition	1~8
Navigation Aids (Lighting, Airport Markings and Signage, Landing Aids, Automated Weather Reporting Equipment (AWOS), Radio Communication equipment, Rotating Beacon)	1~6
Aircraft Parking Tiedown Apron, Drainage	1~5
Airport Improvements and Equipment for Emergency Services, Helipads	1~5
Fencing (Perimeter Fence, Security Fence/Gate), Airport Layout Plan	1~4
Airports Service Roads, Utilities (water, sewer), Blast Wall, Fire Protection Systems, Noise Monitoring Equipment	1~3
Environmental Mitigation, Bond Servicing, Land Acquisition for Airside Usage, Airport Master Plan	1~3
Charging Stations, Renewable Energy Microgrid System, Educational Facilities and Equipment, Fueling Facilities and Equipment	1~3

How to assign scores:

- The project scores are based on the project's significance to the improvement of the development item.
- The Office of Airports will identify development items' conditions at the airports (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Failed) based on airport inspection results, and assign scores within the given range.

Section 3: Justification

If a project of high importance fails to achieve a qualifying score during the internal review, the Department requires the project sponsor to provide a justification. This section aims to mitigate inconsistencies or biases in scoring.