

## Minor Betterment Program 2014 Evaluation Criteria

Factor: <b>Safety [43%]</b>	Evaluation Criteria	Points	Comments/Things to Consider	
1. <b>Incident evaluation</b>	SPIS Ranking, TVF&R cross referencing, Fire District #2	SPIS Top 1/3 (High) or 3+ TVF&R (High)	6	Taken directly from most recent ODOT safety data: <a href="https://gis.odot.state.or.us/transgis/">https://gis.odot.state.or.us/transgis/</a> (updated 7/10/2014 committee decision)
		SPIS Middle 1/3 or 2 TVF&R (Med.)	3	
		SPIS Bottom 1/3 or 1 TVF&R (Low)	1.5	
		None Identified	0	
2. <b>Separation of modes</b> (bike/ped/auto) - candidate will reduce number of conflicts	Improvement results in separation of modes	Distinct (High)	6	Subjective determination performed initially by Technical Lead
		Moderate (Medium)	3	
		None/Low (Low)	1.5	
3. <b>Traffic speed:</b> Priority given to candidates with hazards associated with higher speeds	Posted speed	45 mph+ (High)	6	posted speeds
		26-44 mph (Medium)	3	
		25 mph (Low)	1.5	
4. <b>Functional Class/Volume:</b> Priority given to candidates with hazards associated with capacity and volume	Arterials, Collectors and Urban Local/Neighborhood Route	Arterial (High)	6	
		Collector (Medium)	3	
		UL/NR (Low)	1.5	
5. <b>Geometry</b> - Priority given to candidates with little to no refuge or clear zone for pedestrians	Determine refuges for pedestrians in emergency situations - ditch, embankment, etc.	Narrow ( $\leq 1$ foot) (High)	6	
		Moderate (1-2 feet) (Medium)	3	
		Wide (2+ feet) (Low)	1.5	
Factor: <b>Connectivity [28%]</b>	Evaluation Criteria	Points	Comments/Things to Consider	
1a. <b>Facility connection: <u>School</u></b>	Proximity to a school	< 0.25 mi (High)	5	(changed 2 blocks to 0.25 mi - 7/10/14)
		.5 mi to > 0.25 mi (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
1b. <b>Facility connection: <u>Transit</u></b>	Proximity to a bus stop, park and ride, transit center, etc.	< 0.25 mi (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 0.25 mi (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
1c. <b>Facility connection: <u>Business</u></b>	Proximity to a business	< 0.25 mi (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 0.25 mi (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
1d. <b>Facility connection: <u>Park</u></b>	Proximity to a park	< 0.25 mi (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 0.25 mi (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
1e. <b>Facility connection: <u>Point of Interest</u></b> - Examples: Shopping center, library, community center, grange, sports facility, movie theater, church	Proximity to a point of interest	< 0.25 mi (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 0.25 mi (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
2. <b>Does it fill a gap?:</b> How does it fit with what's already there?	Determine nearby facilities. Example: does a sidewalk exist across the street?	None (High)	5	Higher value given to areas with no facilities nearby (name updated 7/10/14)
		Near/half block (Medium)	2.5	
		Adjacent (Low)	1.25	

## Minor Betterment Program 2014 Evaluation Criteria

Factor: <b>Cost [15%]</b>		Evaluation Criteria		Points		Comments/Things to Consider
1. <b>Estimated Cost to Road Fund</b>		< \$50k (High)	15	Higher value given to less expensive (more cost-efficient) candidates [updated 8-1-13 after committee decision]		
		\$50k-100k (Medium)	7.5			
		\$100k-\$150k (Low)	3.75			
		\$150k+	0			
2. <b>Partnership opportunities</b>	Safe Routes to Schools, Grants, CDBG, HOA participation, CWS, etc.	2+ (High)	15	Only tangible, measurable commitments considered for scoring		
		1 (Medium)	7.5			
		0 (Low)	3.75			
Factor: <b>Community [14%]</b>		Evaluation Criteria		Points		Comments/Things to Consider
1. <b>Communication in support of project received by LUT</b>	Source = individual email or letter. Org. = HOA, CPO, etc.	1 org. (High)	10			
		2+ source (Medium)	5			
		1 source (Low)	2.33			
2. <b>Population Density</b>	Metro "Population Density" census data. Unit of measure is "people per acre".	15+ (High)	10	Updated to match Metro's definitions 8/15/2012		
		6-15 (Medium)	5			
		0-6 (Low)	2.33			
3. <b>Demographics</b>	Metro "Environmental Justice and underserved" data.	Significantly Above Average (High)	10			
		Above Average (Medium)	5			
		Average and Below (Low)	2.33			

**Factors that will not differentiate projects but should be taken into consideration:**

Project location: strive to achieve geographic diversity

Involve the public in a defensible process