

## Tech Memo 12.2: Project Scoring and Draft Project Lists

---

Date: March 4, 2013

Project #: 11732

To: TSP GAPS Members

From: TSP Project Management Team

Project: Clackamas County Transportation System Plan Update

Subject: Project Scoring and Draft Project Lists

---

This memorandum outlines the process used to score and create a draft prioritized list of the projects on the refined Master Project List for the Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. The initial prioritized list of projects is divided by geographic area. The draft prioritized list for discussion is attached. The intended outcome of this process is to organize the refined Master Project list by geographic area into the following draft project list categories:

- 20-Year Capital Projects (*previously referred to as Fiscally Constrained List*)
- Preferred Capital Projects (*previously referred to as Preferred Project List*)
- Long-Term Capital Project Needs (*previously referred to as Vision Project List*)

In addition, there may be projects that, because of their overall low score, are recommended to be removed completely. This initial prioritization will be further refined in the next stages of the project based on input from Clackamas County staff, the Public Advisory Committee (PAC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the public and other stakeholders. Ultimately, the draft prioritized lists by geographic area will be combined into one countywide prioritized project list.

### PROJECT LISTS

Up until this point in the TSP Update, all projects under consideration have been listed on a single "Master Project List." This stage of the project is focused on organizing these projects according to the County's goals, priorities, and available funding. Ultimately, the prioritization process will result in three project list categories that will define the County's transportation priorities for the next 20 years. The three lists are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 TSP Project List Organization

TSP County Project List Name	Previous Name	Estimated Portion of the County Jurisdiction Projects on Master Project List (by cost)	Type of Projects Included
<b>20-Year Capital Projects</b>	Fiscally Constrained List	Top 15% (totaling approximately \$444 million in estimated project costs)	Top recommended projects that scored most highly in the prioritization process and for which funds may become available.
<b>Preferred Capital Projects</b>	Preferred Project List	Second 15% (totaling approximately \$444 million in estimated project costs)	Additional recommended projects that the County would build if additional revenue becomes available
<b>Long-Term Capital Project Needs</b>	Vision Project List	Remaining recommended projects (up to 70%)	All other identified, needed projects.

Projects on ODOT facilities are organized in a separate list as high, medium, or low priority based on project scoring and additional input. Transit projects will be on a third list, but not prioritized.

## INITIAL PROJECT SCORING

The *Prioritization Process Memo* (dated November 20, 2012) outlined the initial approach for scoring and prioritizing projects on the Master Project List. This process was refined based on further discussions with the PAC and County staff. Based on input from the PAC, all TSP goals were weighted equally. All projects were initially scored based on the following criteria:

- **Goals 1 – 6:** projects were judged on metrics for each goal and assigned a score from -1 to +2. The goals, metrics, scoring scale, and resources used for the analysis are detailed in the table in *Appendix A: Goal Scoring Matrix*.
- **70% Growth Analysis Score:** (See *70% Growth Projection Scenario Findings* memo for additional information.)
  - projects that address a deficient facility under the 70% growth analysis were given a score of +1;
  - projects that do not address a deficient facility under the 70% growth analysis were given a score of -1;
  - all other projects received a score of 0.
- **Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA) Analysis Score:** (See *DTA Findings* memo for additional information.)
  - projects included in the analysis that were not part of the recommended improvements for the Clackamas Regional Center Southwest Access Corridor area were given a score of -1;
  - projects included in the analysis that were part of the recommended improvements for the Clackamas Regional Center Southwest Access Corridor area received a score of 0.

- **Addresses Identified Need Score:**
  - projects that address both a gap **and** a deficiency were given a score of +2;
  - projects that address a gap **or** deficiency were given a score of +1;
  - all other projects were given a score of 0.

A complete summary of the scoring factors and ranges is in Table 2.

Table 2 Scoring Factors

Scoring Factor	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5	Goal 6	70% Growth Analysis	DTA Analysis	Addresses Identified Need	Total
Range	-1 to +2	-1 to +2	-1 to +2	-1 to +2	-1 to +2	-1 to +2	-1 to +1	-1 to 0	0 to +2	<b>-8 to +15</b>

## PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Since the initial project scoring was completed, the County projects have been ranked according to their total scores by geographic area.

- Ultimately, the highest ranking projects will comprise the list of “20-Year Capital Projects”, which will include approximately 15% of the total projects currently on the Master List, totaling about \$444 million (determined based on funding forecasts for the County).
- The second tier of projects will comprise the list of “Preferred Capital Projects”, which will also include about \$444 million of projects.
- The remaining projects will comprise the list of “Long-Term Capital Project Needs.”

The prioritized list of County projects, organized by geographic sub area, is provided in *Appendix B*. A separate list of ODOT projects, also ranked based on total score, is provided in *Appendix C*.

### NEXT STEPS

The draft prioritized project lists were provided to the TAC to discuss at TAC Meeting #6 on February 19, 2013. The TAC also received the prioritized list of ODOT projects and a list of transit projects, although discussion focused on County projects. The TAC’s comments were incorporated in to the project lists, which are provided in *Appendix B*, *Appendix C*, and *Appendix D*.

The refined draft project lists will be further refined in the Geographic Area Projects (GAPS) group meetings on March 11-12, 2013. The GAPS groups are subcommittees of the PAC and each focuses on a different geographic area. Each GAPS group will review, discuss and make recommendations on the draft prioritized project list for its area. Group members will also provide feedback on the project synergies identified to date and suggest other synergies that should be considered in the prioritization process.

Based on the outcomes from the TAC and GAPS meetings, the PMT will develop a draft countywide prioritized project list, separated into the three project list categories: 20-Year Capital Projects, Preferred Capital Projects, and Long-Term Capital Project Needs. The countywide project lists will be presented to the TAC on March 28 and to the PAC on April 23 for further refinement.