

Community Road Fund Advisory Committee

**Congestion Projects Evaluation Measures**

UPDATED based on input at CRFAC meeting, Sept. 26, 2019

Topic	Comments	Evaluation Measure: Scored 0-2
1. <b>Development</b>	Future development (known projects, master plans) or current development that could be supported	<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
2. <b>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
3. <b>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%)
4. <b>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
5. <b>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
A. <b>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 ((Total Cost – SDC Contribution)/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>3-</b> Medium risk <b>1-</b> High risk
C. <b>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> On paving list and other funding source <b>3-</b> On paving list OR other funding source <b>1-</b> No other funding source
D. <b>Geographic Equity</b>	Spread projects across the county, not just in one area.	<b>Second Round Scoring:</b> Identified the projects ranking from the three second round scores in each area to identify top projects within each area. <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