

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Measure R Highway Improvements

Evaluation Measures for Project Assessment

DRAFT

BACKGROUND

This memorandum presents the methods used for evaluating, scoring, and weighting each of the projects in relation to the eight evaluation criteria (which were presented at the previous meeting of the IWG). The prioritization process evaluates all the eligible projects on the Measure R list to determine priorities for funding. The eight criteria used in this evaluation are consistent with many of the criteria used in the Metro Call for Projects, and include:

- Project readiness
- Multi-jurisdictional effort
- Level of congestion relief
- Measure R funding leverage
- Regional significance and intermodal integration
- Project need and benefit to transportation system
- Cost effectiveness
- Land use, environmental compatibility, and sustainability

For each criterion, each project will be scored on a scale of 0-10. This score is then multiplied by the criterion's weight. The sum of these weighted criteria scores is the project's overall score. Priority levels will be determined based on the spread of overall scores.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND HOW THEY ARE MEASURED

Project Readiness

Higher priority is given to projects that are further advanced toward being ready to implement. This is scored on a 0-10 scale, based on the project's current status in the project development process. Projects that are facing a legal challenge or substantial opposition are reduced by one point from their initial score to reflect a lower priority than similarly advanced projects that do not face such opposition.

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

- 10: PS&E complete; project not fully funded
- 8: PS&E in process
- 6: Preliminary Design/Environmental/PSR complete
- 4: Preliminary Design/Environmental/PSR in process
- 2: Planning/Feasibility Study, Conceptual Drawings
- 0: Just Idea / Proposal
- 1: Legal / Community Issues

Multi-Jurisdictional Effort

Higher priority is given to projects that are regional in nature and involve multi-jurisdictional cooperation or serve multiple jurisdictions. This is scored on a 0-10 scale, based on how many jurisdictions are involved or are served by a project. A project can earn the higher score either by physically being in multiple jurisdictions (crossing jurisdictional boundaries) or by serving neighboring jurisdictions. Also, formal resolutions of support from other jurisdictions beyond the project limits may aid in the ranking of a project.

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

- 10: Physically located in three or more jurisdictions
- 8: serves three or more jurisdictions
- 5: Physically located in two jurisdictions
- 3: serves two jurisdictions
- 0: Physically located in or serves one jurisdiction

Level of Benefit to the State Highway System

Higher priority is given to projects that provide a greater level of congestion relief on the state highway system for which these Measure R funds are designated. For this criterion, projects earn points based on the type of project and whether it is located on the freeway or arterial street system. Bonus points are awarded to projects on arterials designated as state highways, to reflect the fact that improvements on these roadways will provide the greater benefit to the state highway system.

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

| | Project Type | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | On Freeway | On street | Ops/TDM |
| 10 | fwy-fwy interchange | -- | -- |
| 9 | Aux lane + interchg | -- | -- |
| 8 | Aux lane | -- | -- |
| 7 | Full interchange | Build new segment | -- |
| 6 | Partial interchange (2+ ramps) | Arterial segment widening (add lanes) /Grade Separation | -- |
| 5 | Partial interchange (1 ramp) | Corridor intersection widenings | -- |
| 4 | -- | Arterial realignment/reconfiguration | ITS system |
| 3 | -- | Single intersection widening (>1 approach) | Corridor signal synchronization |
| 2 | -- | Single intersection widening (1 approach) | Park-and-ride |
| 1 | -- | Arterial channelize; Intersec. improve geometrics | Signal upgrade |
| 0 | -- | -- | -- |
| +3 | -- | On state route | -- |
| +2 | -- | -- | On state route |

Measure R Funding Leverage

Higher priority is given to projects that do not depend solely on Measure R for their funding. This is scored based on the percentage of project cost for which funding has already been committed from other sources (not including any Measure R funds).

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

- 10: 80% and up non-Measure R funding
- 8: 60-80%
- 6: 45-60%
- 4: 30-45%
- 2: 15-30%
- 0: 0-15%

Regional Significance and Intermodal Integration

Higher priority is given to projects that have regional significance or promote integration of transportation modes. This evaluation is based on whether a project is included in the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Metro Countywide Significant Arterial Network (CSAN); also if a project completes a gap in the transportation system, is within two miles of a major traffic generator (e.g., Los Angeles International Airport, the Port of Los Angeles, Del Amo Mall or Cal State University at Dominguez Hills), or is a multi-modal improvement.

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

Two points for each of the following (maximum 10 points):

1. Project is included in LRTP
2. Project is included in RTP
3. Project is on CSAN
4. Project is a gap closure
5. Project is within 2 miles of major traffic generator
6. Project is a multi-modal improvement (would not include any roadway widening projects unless specifically for alternate modes)

Project Need and Benefit to Transportation System

Higher priority is given to projects that benefit the transportation system. This evaluation is based on whether a project: (1) enhances a major regional project or promotes improvements between modes; (2) enhances integration with the goods movement system; (3) increases transit usage; (4) fixes deficiencies in the system (by completing a system gap or helping to eliminate a system bottleneck); (5) enhances the operation of the existing system; or (6) furthers previous actions (e.g., completes a partially-completed project or constructs the next phase of a project).

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

Two points for each of the following (maximum 10 points):

1. Mobility benefits of regional significance (part of a major regional project, connects with and complements a major regional project, promotes improvements between modes or between services provided by different transportation agencies)
2. Integration with goods movement

3. Increases transit usage
4. Fixes system deficiencies (such as gaps or major bottlenecks)
5. Enhances operation of existing system
6. Furthers previous actions (such as completing a partially completed segment or constructing the next phase of a multi-phase project)

Relative Cost Effectiveness

Higher priority is given to projects that relatively provide a higher “Level of Benefit to the State Highway System” score for a lower estimated cost. This factor is derived by dividing the project’s cost (in \$100,000) by the Benefits to State Highway score. This result (for which lower numbers represent a greater benefit per dollar expended) is then converted to a 0-10 score.

Scoring for this criterion is as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 10: 0-2 | 5: 30-40 |
| 9: 2-5 | 4: 40-50 |
| 8: 5-10 | 3: 50-60 |
| 7: 10-20 | 2: 60-80 |
| 6: 20-30 | 1: 80-100 |
| | 0: 100+ |

Land Use, Environmental Compatibility, and Sustainability

Higher priority is given to projects that support sustainable development and contribute to reductions in greenhouse gases, other mobile source pollutant emissions, and energy consumption.

Scoring of this criterion is as follows:

Two points for each of the following (maximum 10 points):

1. Supports mixed use development and walkability
2. Supports transit accessibility
3. Contributes to VMT reduction
4. Supports trip reduction strategies
5. Enhances system efficiency without increasing capacity

WEIGHTING OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

Based on the preferences indicated by the IWG at the previous meeting, the following weights will be applied to the individual criteria scores:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Project readiness | 15% |
| Multi-jurisdictional effort | 10% |
| Level of congestion relief | 15% |
| Measure R funding leverage | 10% |
| Regional significance and intermodal integration | 15% |
| Project need and benefit to transportation system | 10% |
| Cost effectiveness | 15% |
| Land use, environmental compatibility, and sustainability | 10% |
| TOTAL | 100% |