

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The detailed analysis of the alternatives is summarized in Table 43.

Table 43 – Summary of Alternative Evaluation									
Interchange Location	Fig	Right-of-way required (acres)¹	Construction Cost not incl. Right-of-way	Relocations Required	Improves Safety at existing intersections²	Existing Intersection LOS = F	Removes traffic from adjacent intersections³	Environmental Impact	Preferred Alternative
No Build	n/a	0	\$0	0	n/a	No	n/a	None	No
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass									
	3	0	\$6,000,000	0	5	No	1	Low	Yes
Jaguar Rd									
Interchange at Jaguar	5	0	\$8,000,000	0	n/a	No	3	Low	Yes
NM 599 W. Frt Rd to I-25	7&8	18 acres \$2,700,000	\$6,000,000	0	n/a	No	3	Med	No
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	7&8	17.5 acres \$2,625,000	\$7,500,000	0	n/a	No	3	Med	Yes
NM 599 W. Frt Jaguar to Airport	9	15 acres \$2,250,000	\$5,000,000	1	n/a	No	3	Med	No
NM 599 E. Frt Jaguar to Airport	9	10.5 acres \$1,575,000	\$4,500,000	0	n/a	No	3	Med	No
Airport Rd									
	10	0	\$11,000,000	0	5	No	2	Low	Yes
Caja del Rio									
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	12	2 acres \$300,000	\$4,000,000	0	n/a	No	3	Med	Yes
Interchange at Caja del Rio	13	31 acres \$4,650,000	\$8,000,000	0	n/a	No	5	Med	Yes
NM 599 S Frt Rd Caja to CR 62	14	15.5 acres \$2,325,000	\$8,000,000	0	n/a	No	1	Low	No
CR 62									
	15	0	\$6,500,000	0	5	Yes	5	Low	Yes

Interchange Location	Fig	Right-of-way required (acres) ¹	Construction Cost not incl. Right-of-way	Relocations Required	Improves Safety at existing intersections ²	Existing Intersection LOS = F	Removes traffic from adjacent intersections ³	Environmental Impact	Preferred Alternative
CR 70 Connection	16	0	\$8,000,000	0	3	Yes	5	Low	Yes
Ephriam Rd									
Ephriam Rd Interchange	17	0	\$8,000,000	0	1	No	1	Med	Yes
Ephriam Rd Overpass	18	1.5 acres \$225,000	\$5,000,000	0	1	No	1	Med	No
N Frt Rd Ephriam to Camino de los Montoyas	19	.7 acres \$105,000	\$3,000,000	0	1	No	5	Med	No
Camino de los Montoyas									
Interchange w/ Frt Rd	20	7 acres \$1,050,000	\$10,000,000	0	1	Yes	1	Med	Yes
Interchange w/ Overpass	21	1 acres \$150,000	\$12,500,000	0	1	Yes	1	Med	No
Overpass w/ Frt Rd to Ephriam	22	1.7 acres \$255,000	\$7,500,000	0	1	Yes	1	Med	No
W Frt Rd CR 85 to Ridgetop	23	17 acres \$2,550,000	\$5,500,000	0	1	Yes	3	Low	No
E Frt Rd CR 85 to Ridgetop	24	25.5 acres \$3,825,000	\$4,000,000	0	1	Yes	3	Med	No
Total Cost of Preferred Alternatives		\$8,625,000	\$77,000,000						\$85,625,000

¹ Assumes \$150,000 per acre

² Scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the least impact and 5 being the greatest impact

³ Scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the least impact and 5 being the greatest impact

The information shown in Table 43 above gives estimated costs for the construction of each alternative and an estimated right-of-way cost based on \$150,000 per acre. The NM 599 E. Frontage Road from Jaguar to Airport Road would require the relocation of a business near Airport Road.

Improvements to safety are evaluated for each alternative on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the least and 5 being the greatest. Since the Caja del Rio and Jaguar intersections do not exist, improvements were not applicable. The safety column attempts to take into account both the crash rate and the number of injuries at a given location. Airport Road and the I-25 N. Frontage Road were given a 5 because they are the intersections with the highest crash rate. The CR 62 intersection was also given a 5 with the third highest crash rate and a high number of injuries. The CR 70 Connection has fewer crashes but all of the crashes involved injuries so it was assigned a 4.

The next column in the table assesses traffic levels of service in the corridor. The existing unsignalized intersections of CR 62, CR 70 Connection and Camino de los Montoyas all have a failing level of service during the peak hours. The signalized intersections have acceptable levels of service.

Some of the alternatives will improve traffic at multiple locations because the intersections are interconnected outside of NM 599. Therefore improvements at one intersection will improve the operation and safety at the adjacent intersections as shown in the next column. For example, improvements at the CR 62 intersection will affect both the Caja del Rio and CR 70 Connection locations.

The environmental impact column assesses the level of environmental effort that will be needed for construction. The engineering, social, economic, and environmental investigations conducted thus far have not disclosed any potentially significant impacts on the quality of the human or natural environment so none of the locations were given a high rating. Locations where new right-of-way is located that has not been cleared previously or where arroyos will be impacted were given a medium rating.

The last column in the table indicates whether or not the alternatives are the preferred alternative or if they have been eliminated. The recommendations for each location are summarized below:

- 1. I-25 Frontage Road** - The preferred alternative at the I-25 Frontage Road Intersection with NM 599 is to install an overpass. The overpass would improve the safety at the existing intersection and meet the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 an access controlled facility. It is recommended that the I-25 Frontage Road Overpass be prioritized with the other alternatives.
- 2. Jaguar Road** - The preferred alternative at the Jaguar location is to construct an interchange. The interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 an access controlled facility, it improves safety at the Airport Road Intersection, and it would provide improved access to Tierra Contenta, the Santa Fe Airport and undeveloped areas east and west of NM 599. It is recommended that the Jaguar Interchange be prioritized with the other alternatives.

3. **The W. Frontage Road from I-25 to Jaguar Road** would improve access to undeveloped lands west of NM 599. However, the owner of the land has plans to develop a north-south circulation road further away from NM 599 which would serve the same purpose. It is recommended that the alternative be eliminated.
4. **The E. Frontage Road from I-25 to Jaguar** meets the purpose and need of improving circulation around NM 599. It would provide improved access to undeveloped areas east of NM 599. It is recommended that the frontage road be prioritized with the other alternatives.
5. **The W. Frontage Road from Jaguar Road to Airport** would improve access to undeveloped lands west of NM 599. However, the land is already master planned with an access road further to the west. This alternative frontage road would provide better access given the grades of the proposed frontage road. It is recommended that the alternative be eliminated.
6. **The E. Frontage Road from Jaguar Road to Airport** would improve access to Tierra Contenta and undeveloped lands east of NM 599. Tierra Contenta is already master planned with an access road further to the west. The Tierra Contenta access road provides access to the remaining undeveloped land in the area. The Tierra Contenta Corporation has asked that the alternative be eliminated since it requires right-of-way from their property that is already platted for commercial and community development. It is recommended that the alternative be eliminated.
7. **Airport Road** – The preferred alternative at the Airport Intersection is to construct an interchange. The interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 an access controlled facility, and it improves safety at the Airport Road Intersection. It is recommended that the Airport Interchange be prioritized with the other alternatives.
8. **Extension of Frontage Road across Santa Fe River** - The extension of the frontage road across the Santa Fe River meets the purpose and need of improving circulation in the area of NM 599. This alternative would take traffic off of the existing CR 62 intersection which would improve the safety at that location. In addition it improves the traffic flow from the Caja del Rio intersection with the NM 599 frontage road that currently has to go out of direction by approximately three miles in order to go southbound. It is recommended that the alternative be prioritized with the other alternatives.
9. **Caja del Rio** - The preferred alternative for the Caja del Rio Location is to construct an interchange. An interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 and access controlled facility. This alternative would take traffic off of the existing CR 62 intersection which would improve the safety at that location. In addition it improves the traffic flow from the Caja del Rio intersection with the NM 599 frontage road that currently has to go out of direction by approximately three miles in order

to go southbound. The estimated construction cost for the interchange is approximately the same as the cost for the south frontage road but it provides improved access both north and south. The frontage road only provides access to the south side of NM 599. It is recommended that the alternative be prioritized with the other alternatives.

- 10. CR 62** - The preferred alternative for the CR 62 Intersection is to construct an interchange. An interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 and access controlled facility. It would improve the safety at the existing intersection which has a high injury rate. It would also improve the existing level of service which is failing. It is recommended that the alternative be prioritized with the other alternatives. In the interim before funding is available for an interchange the NMDOT is considering other options such as a signal or flashers.
- 11. CR 70 Connection** - The preferred alternative for the CR 70 Connection (Via Veteranos) Intersection is to construct an interchange. An interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 and access controlled facility. It would improve the safety at the existing intersection which has a high injury rate. It would also improve the existing level of service which is failing. In the interim before funding is available for an interchange the NMDOT is considering other options such as a signal or flashers.
- 12. Ephriam Road** - The preferred alternative for the Ephriam Intersection is to construct an interchange. An interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 and access controlled facility. The frontage road alternative is the least expensive alternative; however, the interchange alternative provides access to the existing private land on the north side of NM 599 and to City of Santa Fe owned land on the south side of NM 599. It is recommended that the alternative be prioritized with the other alternatives.
- 13. Camino de los Montoyas** - The preferred alternative for the Camino de los Montoyas Intersection is to construct an interchange with a frontage road to provide access on the south side. An interchange meets the purpose and need of eventually making NM 599 and access controlled facility. The frontage road alternative is less expensive than the overpass alternative. The interchange also provides better access to the area than the alternative to use the overpass with a frontage road back to the Ephriam Interchange. It is recommended that the alternative be prioritized with the other alternatives.
- 14. The W. Frontage Road from Camino de los Montoyas to Ridgetop** would meet the purpose and need of providing improved circulation in the NM 599 corridor. However, the undeveloped area is mainly City of Santa Fe open space. The city does not have a need for improved access. There is a private development parcel on the northwest corner of the Ridgetop Road Interchange. The developer

of that parcel has plans to access Ridgetop Road. For these reasons it is recommended that the alternative be eliminated.

- 15. The E. Frontage Road from Camino de los Montoyas to Ridgetop Road** would provide improved circulation in the NM 599 corridor. However, the existing development plan for the Northwest Quadrant is approved without access at Camino de los Montoyas. There is no way to provide a frontage road in this area without providing a connection from Camino de los Montoyas to the Northwest Quadrant development which is currently not allowed. In addition, the Northwest Quadrant Development has a circulation road in the plan further away from NM 599 that serves the same purpose. For these reasons, it is recommended that the frontage road alternative be eliminated.

IX. PROJECT PRIORITY PLAN

There were ten projects identified in the *NM 599 Interchange Corridor Study Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives* as preferred alternatives. The purpose of this plan is to prioritize the preferred alternatives for public funding. Projects were prioritized based on their ability to satisfy the purpose and need, public input, and cost. The NM 599 Corridor must continue to function primarily as a relief route for the City of Santa Fe and as an alternative for hazardous waste transport from Los Alamos around the populated areas of Santa Fe. All of the alternatives help to maintain NM 599 as a bypass by eventually making it a fully access controlled facility. Improved access to or across NM 599 is needed for the all modes of travel as the area continues to develop. The factors of existing and proposed traffic volumes and traffic level of service are used to address this need. There is public perception that improvements are needed to address safety concerns, particularly at existing at-grade intersections. This is addressed by examining intersection crash rates and severity.

A. Safety at the existing at-grade intersections

Crash data was obtained from the NMDOT Traffic Safety Bureau for the period from 2003 to 2007 during the development of the *NM 599 Interchange Corridor Study Initial Evaluation of Alternatives*. The crash rates during that period of time were below the statewide crash rate. None of the fatalities during the time period occurred at the at-grade intersections. In 2009 there was one fatality at the CR 70 intersection.

The two locations with the highest crash rates are Airport Road and the I-25 N. Frontage Road. CR 62 and the CR 70 Connection are also of interest because although they had a lower number of crashes, the crashes were all injury crashes indicating that crashes at these locations are more likely to be severe than at other locations. The crash information is summarized in the table below. A Weighted Crash Rate was determined by multiplying the Crash Rate by the percent of injuries. The intersections were then ranked with number one having the worst Weighted Crash Rate.

Intersection	Crash Rate	% Injuries	Weighted Rate	Rating from worst to best
I-25 N. Frontage Road	103.65	64	66.34	2
Airport Road	118.08	56	66.12	3
CR 62	96.19	96	92.34	1
CR 70 Connection	60.19	100	60.19	4
Ephriam	0	0	0	6
Camino de los Montoyas	22.67	33	7.48	5

B. Access to and across NM 599

A traffic analysis of the existing signalized and unsignalized intersections was done during the Phase A, *NM 599 Interchange Corridor Study Initial Evaluation of Alternatives*. All of the signalized intersections operate at acceptable levels of service. The unsignalized intersections all have level of service F movements for the side street during the peak hours. The intersections at CR 62, CR 70, and Camino de Los Montoyas, experience significant delays along the minor roadway approaches. There are not enough gaps along the NM 599 mainline to allow for these vehicles to cross and enter the flow of traffic along NM 599.

Intersection delay will be used to help prioritize the intersections in this plan. Since an interim traffic signal is being considered at CR 62 a signalized intersection analysis was performed for that intersection. Traffic volumes for the CR 62 analysis were generated by the 2006 MPO Traffic model assuming that the South Meadows Extension has been built. The capacity analysis can be found in Appendix D. A summary of the average peak hour delay and level of service can be found in the following table. The intersections were ranked from 1 to 6 with 1 being the worst delay. Intersections that don't currently exist were given the next ranking of 7.

Table 45 – Intersection Traffic Analysis				
Location	Existing condition	Average Delay	Level of Service	Rating
I-25 Frontage Road	Signalized	11.5	B	4
Jaguar Rd Interchange	No intersection			7
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	No frontage road			7
Airport Rd Interchange	Signalized	14.3	B	3
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	No frontage road			7
Caja del Rio Interchange	No intersection			7
CR 62 Interchange	If signalized (w/ S. Meadows extension)	13.3	B	2
CR 70 Connection Interchange	Unsignalized	28.75	C	1
Ephriam Rd Interchange	Unsignalized	0	A	6
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	Unsignalized	1.7	A	5

C. Improving circulation around NM 599

Another element of the purpose and need is to improve circulation around NM 599. The results are summarized in Table 46. Additional frontage roads have the ability to improve circulation by providing an alternative route to NM 599. Only two pieces of frontage road are preferred alternatives. Of these two frontage road alternatives, the extension of the existing frontage road across the Santa Fe River was deemed to be the more important alternative because existing traffic uses the ford in this location to cross the river. The proposed frontage road from the I-25 W. Frontage Road intersection to Jaguar Road would serve new development. All of the other alternatives were given a ranking of 3 because they do not improve circulation around NM 599.

Table 46 – Improves Circulation Around NM 599		
Location	Improves Circulation	Rating
I-25 Frontage Road	No	3
Jaguar Rd Interchange	No	3
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	Yes	2
Airport Rd Interchange	No	3
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	Yes	1
Caja del Rio Interchange	No	3
CR 62 Interchange	No	3
CR 70 Connection Interchange	No	3
Ephriam Rd Interchange	No	3
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	No	3

D. Volume of traffic served

Total traffic volume served was used to prioritize the alternatives. Intersections with higher entering volumes of traffic were given a higher priority. Existing traffic counts were collected during the *NM 599 Corridor Study Initial Evaluation of Alternatives*. Since the counts were performed at different times the volumes were extrapolated to 2009 assuming a 3% growth rate. The adjusted PM Peak Hour traffic volumes are shown in Table 47.

Table 47 – Existing PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes		
Location	Existing traffic volume entering	Total volume from greatest to least
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass	1984	2
Jaguar Rd Interchange	0	n/a, 7
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	0	n/a, 7
Airport Rd Interchange	2200	1
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	Est. 251	6
Caja del Rio Interchange	0	n/a, 7
CR 62 Interchange	1802	3
CR 70 Connection Interchange	1786	4
Ephriam Rd Interchange	0	n/a, 7
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	1766	5

Projected traffic volumes from the NMDOT Scenario 1 traffic forecasting model were also used to prioritize the intersections as shown in Table 48. Scenario 1 is the future full build out of all of the system improvements including all interchanges on NM 599. The traffic forecasting model produces PM Peak hour counts.

Table 48 – Projected PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes		
Location	Projected traffic volume entering Scenario 1	Total volume from greatest to least
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass	5140	6
Jaguar Rd Interchange	4860	7
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	Unknown	9
Airport Rd Interchange	6090	1
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	Unknown	9
Caja del Rio Interchange	5260	4
CR 62 Interchange	5790	2
CR 70 Connection Interchange	5750	3
Ephriam Rd Interchange	5180	5
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	4130	8

E. Public Input

Public input was taken at the open houses, public information meetings and through written comments. All of the preferred alternatives have support from the public except for two negative comments about the Jaguar Interchange. At the public information meeting at the conclusion of the Phase A Study the public was asked to choose their top two priorities for improvements. That information along with all of the written and recorded comments was used to rank the public support for the alternatives as shown in Table 49.

Table 49 – Summary of Public Input						
Location	Input at Public Open House October 2006	Input at Public Open House January 2009	Input at Stakeholders Meeting April 2009	Input at Public Information Meeting October 2009	Total Public Support	Rating of public input from greatest to least
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass				1	1	8
Jaguar Rd Interchange	1		1		2	7
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25						10
Airport Rd Interchange				5	5	5
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	2	1	1	2	6	4
Caja del Rio Interchange	2	1	4	13	20	2
CR 62 Interchange	1	2	5	25	33	1
CR 70 Connection Interchange			1	6	7	3
Ephriam Rd Interchange			1		1	8
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd		2	2		4	6

F. Cost

Cost estimates were prepared for each alternative during the *NM 599 Interchange Corridor Study Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives*. Construction cost estimates include 8% Engineering and Contingencies and 7.9375% New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (NMGRT). Right-of-way was estimated at \$150,000 per acre. The total estimated costs are summarized in Table 50. The alternatives were rated from least expensive to most expensive.

Table 50 – Construction Cost Estimates				
Location	Construction Cost	Right-of-way Cost	Total Cost	Rating of Total Cost from least to greatest
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass	\$6,000,000	0	\$6,000,000	2
Jaguar Rd Interchange	\$8,000,000	0	\$8,000,000	4
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	\$7,500,000	17.5 acres \$2,625,000	\$10,125,000	7
Airport Rd Interchange	\$11,000,000	0	\$11,000,000	8
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	\$4,000,000	2 acres \$300,000	\$4,300,000	1
Caja del Rio Interchange	\$8,000,000	31 acres \$4,650,000	\$12,650,000	10
CR 62 Interchange	\$6,500,000	0	\$6,500,000	3
CR 70 Connection Interchange	\$8,000,000	0	\$8,000,000	4
Ephriam Rd Interchange	\$8,000,000	0	\$8,000,000	4
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	\$10,000,000	7 acres \$1,050,000	\$11,050,000	9

G. Summary of Alternative Ratings

The seven factors listed above are summarized in Table 51 on the following page. The project priority ratings from each factor were totaled to find the highest priority project for public funding. If private funding becomes available then any of these projects could be constructed. The projects with the least priority do not require an interchange or frontage road unless necessitated by development in which case they would be privately funded.

Table 51 – Summary of Project Priority Ratings for Public Funding

Interchange Location	Crash Rating	Existing Traffic Volumes	Projected Traffic Volumes	Total Cost	Public Input	Traffic Level of Service	Improves Circulation around NM 599	Total	Priority
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass	2	2	6	2	8	4	3	27	4
Jaguar Rd Interchange	n/a, 6	n/a, 7	7	4	7	n/a, 7	3	41	8
NM 599 E. Frt Rd Jaguar Rd to I-25	n/a, 6	n/a, 7	9	7	10	n/a, 7	2	48	10
Airport Rd Interchange	3	1	1	8	5	3	3	24	3
Extend Frontage Rd across Santa Fe River	n/a, 6	6	9	1	4	n/a, 7	1	34	5
Caja del Rio Interchange	n/a, 6	n/a, 7	4	10	2	n/a, 7	3	39	6
CR 62 Interchange	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	15	1
CR 70 Connection Interchange	4	4	3	4	3	1	3	22	2
Ephriam Rd Interchange	n/a, 6	n/a, 7	5	4	8	6	3	39	6
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	5	5	8	9	6	5	3	41	8

The top priority project for the NM 599 Corridor is the CR 62 Interchange. The CR 62 Interchange meets the project purpose and need of improving safety at the existing intersections, improving access to and across NM 599, and maintaining NM 599 as a relief route for the City of Santa Fe. The interchange is one of the least expensive alternatives at an estimated \$6,500,000 for construction. No right-of-way is required for the interchange. The existing intersection has the third highest traffic volume in the corridor and the location has the second highest projected volume. The existing traffic volumes will be increased when the S. Meadows Extension is constructed to CR 62 in the year 2010. In addition, the CR 62 Interchange has a great deal of public support. It provides access to public facilities such as the fire station, Agua Fria Community Park, Community Center and the municipal facilities on Caja del Rio. The public does not support a signal at the existing intersection except as an interim solution until funding is available to construct an interchange.

The second priority project is the CR 70 Connection Interchange. The CR 70 Connection Interchange meets the project purpose and need of improving safety at the existing intersections, improving access to and across NM 599, and maintaining NM 599 as a relief route for the City of Santa Fe. The interchange has a higher cost than the CR 62 Interchange in part because a wall and erosion protection will be required to construct the northbound off ramp adjacent to the existing arroyo. No right-of-way is required for the interchange. The existing intersection has the fourth highest traffic volume in the corridor and the third highest projected volume. The Siler Road River Crossing project that was recently completed increased the attraction of the CR 70 intersection to access NM 599. There is public support for an interchange in this location.

The third priority project is the Airport Road Interchange. The Airport Road Interchange meets the project purpose and need of improving safety at the existing intersections, and maintaining NM 599 as a relief route for the City of Santa Fe. The existing Airport Road intersection has the highest traffic volumes in the corridor and the highest number of crashes; however, there are fewer injury crashes than the CR 62 and CR 70 Connection Intersections. Airport Road has one of the highest construction costs but no right-of-way would be required to construct the interchange.

The NM 599 projects in order of priority are shown in Table 52. The total cost of all projects is \$85,625,000.

Table 52 – NM 599 Priority for Public Funding		
Location	Priority	Total Cost
CR 62 Interchange	1	\$6,500,000
CR 70 Connection Interchange	2	\$8,000,000
Airport Road Interchange	3	\$11,000,000
I-25 Frontage Road Overpass	4	\$6,000,000
Extend NM 599 Frontage Road across SF River	5	\$4,300,000
Caja del Rio Interchange	6	\$12,650,000
Ephriam Rd Interchange	6	\$8,000,000
Camino de los Montoyas Interchange w/ Frt Rd	8	\$11,050,000
Jaguar Rd Interchange	8	\$8,000,000
NM 599 E. Frt Rd to I-25	10	\$10,125,000
Total Cost		\$85,625,000

H. Prioritization Ranking Check

To make sure that too much weight was not given to any one rating, all of the columns were eliminated one at a time to see how the priority would change. The results are shown in Appendix V. The highest priority project was the same in each case. The second through fourth priorities were very similar with only one or two changes in the ranking when one criterion was eliminated. This exercise indicated that the project priority ratings were valid.