

Community Road Fund Advisory Committee

Draft Congestion Projects Evaluation Measures

UPDATED based on Input at CRFAC Meeting, Sept. 12, 2019

| Topic | Comments | Evaluation Measure: Scored 0-2 |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Development | Future development (known projects, master plans) or current development that could be supported | 2- Project impacted by known development 1 – Project is located near area with development impacts 0 - Project is in area with no current development impacts |
| 2. Safety | Safety; frequency of crashes; lack of alternative routes; could include schools, personal safety, shoulders. | 2 – Project includes improvement identified as a need through CRF safety project evaluation 1 – Improves a Transportation System Plan (TSP) safety focus intersection, in a road safety audit corridor or identified as an ODOT Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) site 0 – Not indicated as a safety priority |
| 3. Traffic Impact | Number of people or trips impacted. Improves traffic flow? Reduces congestion? Future traffic. | 2 – Current ADT near or exceeds planned/future ADT (90% +) 1 – Current ADT 50-90% of expected future ADT 0 – Current ADT less than 50% of future ADT |
| 4. Commercial / Freight Impacts | Commercial impacts, improvements to freight movement. Does it support the economy? | Road classification and Emergency Transportation Route (ETR) 2 – ETR / Major Arterial roadway 1 - Minor Arterial roadway 0 – Collector roadway |
| 5. No Other Funding Sources | The Community Road Fund provides the opportunity to fund projects with no other direct funding source. | 2- No other funding source clearly available 1- No other funding source except project is eligible for SDCs (system development charges) or TIF (tax increment financing) funds 0 – A project that is grant-eligible or has grant funds readily available |
| A. Cost-Effectiveness | Cost-effectiveness; bang for the buck | Do not score initially: The TSP cost estimates vary significantly, and some are noticeably off target. Use after projects for further scoping are identified |
| B. Readiness | Low-hanging fruit. Cheaper alternative? Show progress. | Do not score initially: We may be able to identify phases or elements of project focus on with more detailed scoping. Also, we'll have more information to determine which projects may be easier to deliver quickly. |
| C. Leverage Funds / Project Synergy | Ability to leverage other funds. Partner with other agencies, such as cities, ODOT | Do not score initially: We may be able to identify phases or elements of project to focus on with more detailed scoping. |
| D. Geographic Equity | Spread projects across the county, not just in one area. | Do not score initially: Identify top projects within each area after other scoring is completed |
| E. Health Equity | Important TSP issue | Consider adding criteria to prioritize in areas where high proportions of people are 65+ or low income |