

Community Road Fund Advisory Committee  
**Congestion Projects Evaluation Measures**  
 UPDATED for CRFAC Meeting, October 17, 2019

Topic	Comments	Evaluation Measure:
<b>1. Development</b>	Future development (known projects, master plans) or current development	<b>2-</b> Project impacted by known development <b>1 –</b> Project is located near area with development impacts <b>0 -</b> Project is in area with no current development impacts
<b>2. Safety</b>	Safety; frequency of crashes; lack of alternative routes; could include schools, personal safety, shoulders.	<b>2 –</b> Project includes improvement identified as a need through CRF safety project evaluation <b>1 –</b> 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 <b>0 –</b> Not indicated as a safety priority
<b>3. Traffic Impact</b>	Number of people or trips impacted. Improves traffic flow? Reduces congestion? Future traffic.	<b>2 –</b> Current ADT is near or exceeds planned / future ADT (90% and greater) <b>1 –</b> Current ADT more than 50% of expected future ADT (50%-90%) <b>0 –</b> Current ADT is less than of 50% future ADT (0%-50%)
<b>4. Commercial / Freight Impacts</b>	Commercial impacts, improvements to freight movement. Does it support the economy?	Road classification and Emergency Transportation Route (ETR) <b>2 –</b> ETR / Major Arterial roadway / on Freight Route / provides access to commercial / industrial area <b>1-</b> Minor Arterial roadway <b>0 –</b> Collector roadway
<b>5. No Other Funding Sources</b>	The Community Road Fund provides the opportunity to fund projects with no other direct funding source.	<b>2-</b> No other funding source clearly available <b>1-</b> No other funding source except project is eligible for SDCs (system development charges) or TIF (tax increment financing) funds <b>0 –</b> A project that is grant-eligible or has grant funds readily available
<b>A. Cost-Effectiveness</b>	Cost-effectiveness; bang for the buck	<b>Second Round Scoring:</b> Using current Cost Estimates, and potential SDC reduction, created a cost effectiveness score of $((\text{Total Cost} - \text{SDC Contribution}) / \text{Average Daily Trips ADT}) / 100$ . Scoring: <b>5-</b> If Cost Effectiveness is 0 – 2.99 <b>4-</b> If Cost Effectiveness is 3 – 5.99 <b>3-</b> If Cost Effectiveness is 6 – 9.99 <b>2-</b> If Cost Effectiveness is 10 – 19.99 <b>1-</b> If Cost Effectiveness is 20+
<b>B. Readiness / Show Progress</b>	Low-hanging fruit. Cheaper alternative? Show progress. Which projects have the least amount of potential risk, and may be quicker to deliver?	<b>Second Round Scoring:</b> After the engineers created the cost assessment, they were asked to score the projects with respect to potential risk. Scoring <b>5 -</b> Low Risk <b>4 –</b> Medium/low Risk <b>3-</b> Medium Risk <b>2-</b> Medium/high Risk <b>1-</b> High Risk
<b>C. Leverage Funds / Project Synergy</b>	Ability to leverage other funds. Partner with other agencies – cities, ODOT.	<b>Second Round Scoring:</b> Identify which projects are also planned for paving, are SDC eligible, within Urban Renewal areas, potential Strategic Investment Fund, or jurisdictional contribution <b>5-</b> Multiple Funding Sources (Paving list, SDCs, Urban renewal, Etc) <b>3-</b> On Paving list OR other funding source <b>1-</b> No Other funding source
<b>D. Geographic Equity</b>	Spread projects across the county, not just in one area.	<b>Second Round Scoring:</b> Score projects in geographic area by the above three second round scores. <b>5-</b> Top scoring project for area <b>4-</b> Second Scoring project for area <b>3-</b> Third scoring project for area <b>2-</b> Fourth Scoring project for area