



Clackamas to Columbia (C2C) Corridor Plan

>>> Task 3.4 Corridor Prioritization Measures
and Methodology Memorandum

BACKGROUND

This memorandum provides goals, prioritization measures, and project scoring for the Clackamas to Columbia (C2C) Corridor Plan. It synthesizes metrics from the following documents, discussed in the Task 3.1 Plan Summaries:

- ▶ Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- ▶ Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP)
- ▶ Gresham TSP
- ▶ Happy Valley TSP
- ▶ SE 172nd Avenue/190th Drive Corridor Management Plan
- ▶ Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement Plan (in-process)
- ▶ Damascus Mobility Plan (in-process)
- ▶ North Carver Pleasant Valley Land Use and Transportation Plan (in-process)

In addition, the document relates these goals to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) System Evaluation Measures and documents potential other performance measures to utilize as part of the project prioritization and packaging process.

PROJECT GOALS

The purpose of the C2C Corridor Plan is to create a consistent, coordinated, multi-jurisdictional transportation plan that focuses on needed improvements for all modes along the 181st/182nd/190th/172nd corridor, connecting Interstate 84 in Multnomah County and Highway 212 in Clackamas County. The C2C Corridor Plan will develop a preferred and prioritized investment package to aid in funding and implementation of the plan. Goals, prioritization criteria, and project scoring will be used to prioritize projects in the C2C Corridor Plan. Table 1 shows the goals from the related planning documents, as well as goals for the C2C Corridor Plan. The goals were developed by looking for overlap and trends from the other planning documents, which were all developed through various public involvement processes.

Table 1. C2C Project Goals

Category	Metro RTP	Clackamas County TSP	Gresham TSP	Happy Valley TSP	172 nd -190 th Corridor Plan	Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement Plan	Damascus Mobility Plan	North Carver Guiding Principles	Proposed C2C Goals
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Healthy Environment Climate Leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Stewardship 				Project not yet started – intends to utilize the same goals as the Clackamas County TSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve and Celebrate Nature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Stewardship
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety and Security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety and Health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety and Security
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Healthy People 								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equitable Transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Healthy Equity 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equitable Transportation
Choices/Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vibrant Communities Transportation Choices Reliability and Efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Livable and Local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessibility Livability Mobility Efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessibility Livability Mobility Multi-Modal Travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streetscape Features Land Use/ Transportation Integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Livability Mobility 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote a Sense of Community Create Vibrant, Mixed-Use Centers Craft Distinctive Places 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multimodal Mobility Livability and Accessibility Transportation Choices
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared Prosperity Fiscal Stewardship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Businesses and Jobs Fiscally Responsible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic Development Sustainable Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goods Movement 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attract Local Jobs and Businesses Plan for Fiscal Health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic Development Fiscal Stewardship
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transparency and Accountability 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Cooperation Interchange Management Areas 172nd-190th Avenue Corridor Management Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corridor Alignment Project Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Plan Community Involvement Feasible Plan Coordinated Plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form Walkable, Welcoming Neighborhoods Design a Resilient, Connected Transportation System Ensure Regional Fit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION MEASURES

The prioritization measures support the project goals and will be used to identify needs and prioritize projects and/or packages of projects. The measures will be used consistently along the corridor, but evaluation targets may vary by jurisdiction. For each project goal, prioritization measures are identified in Table 2. These measures are based off the metrics used in the related planning documents as well as the performance measures identified in the Metro RTP, included in Figure 1 for reference. Some prioritization measures address multiple goals but are listed with the goal they most directly impact.

Table 2 identifies whether each prioritization measure was assessed in the related planning documents and in-process planning efforts. In some cases, the exact prioritization measure was not assessed, but a related measure was used with applicable results. For example, the SE 172nd Avenue/190th Drive Corridor Management Plan includes a criterion of "Impacts to Built Environment," with a consideration of "Minimize socio-economic and cultural resource impacts." This partially speaks to the evaluation criteria "Does the project have a potential historical, cultural and tribal lands impact?", so was noted with a half-filled circle.

The Project Partners (Cities of Gresham and Happy Valley, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties, and Metro) were asked to score each prioritization measure during the December 10, 2018 Storyboard Meeting and provide recommended additional measures. The average scores are noted in Table 2, with 1 indicating a higher priority and 3 representing a lower priority. The scoring was used to determine which prioritization measures to include in the C2C Corridor Plan. This process also resulted in the recommendation to remove some goals (in cases where all prioritization measures were recommended for removal).

Table 2. Prioritization Measures

Proposed C2C Goal	Proposed C2C Prioritization Measure (Bold indicates in Metro RTP)	Evaluated in:							Data Needed	Level of Effort to Evaluate in C2C	Average Project Partner Scoring ⁴	Recommendation
		Clackamas County TSP	Gresham TSP ¹	Happy Valley TSP ¹	172 nd -190 th Corridor Plan	Pleasant Valley TSP	Damascus Mobility Plan ²	North Carver ³				
Environmental Stewardship	Does the project avoid potential habitat , stream, wetland, riparian area, or other natural resource impacts?	●	◐	●	●	●	NA	●	Environmental GIS files	Low	2.3	Remove (addressed in individual projects)
	Does the project avoid potential historical, cultural and tribal lands impacts ?	○	◐	○	○	○	NA	○	Historical, cultural, and tribal lands GIS files	Low	2.1	Remove (low scoring)
Safety & Security	Does the project improve an intersection or roadway identified as a safety concern, especially those with more severe crashes ?	●	●	●	●	○	NA	●	List or map of safety needs	Low-Medium	1.1	Include in C2C with modification
	Does the project improve safety and comfort for all users, especially non-auto travelers?	●	●	●	●	◐	NA	●	No additional data	Low	1.4	Include in C2C
	Does the project improve the security and resiliency of the transportation system ?	○	○	○	○	○	NA	○	No additional data	Low	NA	Include in C2C
Health	Does the project have the potential to reduce emissions near schools or densely populated areas?	●	◐	○	◐	○	NA	○	Schools and population GIS files	Medium	2.4	Remove
Equitable Transportation	Does the project increase access to transit ?	◐	●	●	●	◐	NA	◐	Existing/future transit route GIS files	Low	1.7	Remove
	Does the project positively impact a disadvantaged population ?	●	○	○	○	○	NA	○	Disadvantaged populations GIS files	Low	NA	Include in C2C
Multimodal Mobility	Does the project address an operational deficiency (based on level of service and/or volume-to-capacity ratio)?	●	●	●	●	●	NA	◐	Count data, intersection configuration	Medium	1.7	Include in C2C
	Does the project positively impact goods mobility and freight ?	○	○	○	○	○	NA	○	No additional data	Low	NA	Include in C2C

Proposed C2C Goal	Proposed C2C Prioritization Measure (Bold indicates in Metro RTP)	Evaluated in:							Data Needed	Level of Effort to Evaluate in C2C	Average Project Partner Scoring ⁴	Recommendation
		Clackamas County TSP	Gresham TSP ¹	Happy Valley TSP ¹	172 nd -190 th Corridor Plan	Pleasant Valley TSP	Damascus Mobility Plan ²	North Carver ³				
Livability and Accessibility	Does the project increase access between residential and commercial areas or to daily needs and services? (access to jobs, access to community places)	●	●	◐	●	○	NA	◐	Land use GIS files	Low	1.1	Include in C2C
	Does the project increase access to active transportation and transit?	●	●	◐	●	◐	NA	●	No additional data	Low	1.6	Include in C2C
Transportation Choices	Does the project have the potential to increase the active transportation and transit mode share?	●	●	◐	●	◐	NA	●	No additional data	Low	1.6	Remove (included with goal Livability and Accessibility)
Economic Development	Does the project increase access to an employment area? (access to jobs)	●	●	●	●	◐	NA	◐	Land use GIS files	Low	1.6	Include in C2C
Fiscal Stewardship	What is the estimated project cost?	●	●	●	◐	●	NA	NA	Unit costs	Medium/High	2.6	Remove
	Does the project provide high value considering the cost (cost effectiveness)?	●	◐	◐	◐	◐	NA	NA	Unit costs Project Future Demand	Medium/High	1.4	Include in C2C
	Does the project better manage the existing transportation system or make better use of an existing facility?	○	○	○	○	○	NA	NA	No additional data	Low	NA	Include in C2C
Connectivity	Does the project fill a gap in the existing network and increase north-south continuity? (system completeness)	●	◐	●	●	◐	NA	●	Bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and vehicle network GIS files	Low	1.3	Include in C2C

- Fully evaluated, direct application
- ◐ Partially evaluated/related criteria used that is somewhat applicable
- Not evaluated

NA – Not available at this time

¹ The Gresham TSP identifies goals that are used to evaluate its projects.

² The Damascus Mobility Plan intends to use similar evaluation measures to the Clackamas County TSP.

³ The Existing Conditions for the North Carver project were reviewed to identify prioritization measures that may be applied to the project.

⁴ Scored on a scale from 1-3 with 1 indicating a higher priority and 3 representing a lower priority.

Red text indicates updates to the prioritization criteria made post December 10, 2018 Storyboard Meeting

Figure 1. How RTP System Evaluation Measures Support Meeting RTP Goals (Metro RTP)

RTP Performance Measures		RTP Goals																		
		Vibrant Communities	Shared Prosperity	Transportation Choices	Reliability and Efficiency	Safety and Security	Healthy Environment	Healthy People	Climate Protection	Equitable Transportation	Fiscal Stewardship	Transparency and Accountability								
How much do households spend on housing and transportation in our region? <i>(Evaluation measures under development for next RTP.)</i>		There are no system evaluation measures for the Ensure Fiscal Stewardship and Deliver Accountability goals.																		
n/a	Affordability*											●	●	◐	◐	○	○	●	○	●
How safe is travel in our region? <i>(Evaluation measures under development for next RTP.)</i>																				
n/a	Safety*											●	◐	●	●	●	◐	●	◐	●
How much do people and goods travel in our region?																				
1	Multimodal Travel											●	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	●	●
2	Active Transportation and Transit Mode Share											●	◐	●	●	◐	●	●	●	●
How easily, comfortably and directly can we access jobs and destinations in our region?																				
3	Access to Travel Options – system completeness *											●	◐	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
4	Access to Jobs*											●	●	●	○	○	○	◐	◐	●
5	Access to Community Places*											●	◐	●	○	○	●	●	◐	●
6	Access to Bicycle and Pedestrian Parkways											●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●
7	Access to Transit											●	●	●	◐	○	●	◐	●	●
8	Access to Industry and Freight Intermodal Facilities											○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
How efficient is travel in our region?																				
9	Multimodal Travel Times											●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
10	Congestion	◐	●	○	●	●	◐	◐	◐	○										
11	Transit Efficiency and Ridership	●	○	●	●	○	◐	○	○	○										
How will transportation impact climate change, air quality, the environment and public health?																				
12	Climate Change	○	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	○										
13	Clean Air	○	●	●	○	○	●	●	◐	●										
14	Potential habitat Impact	◐	○	○	○	○	●	●	◐	●										
15	Potential historical, cultural and tribal lands impact	●	◐	○	○	○	○	◐	○	○										
16	Public health	◐	◐	○	○	○	●	●	●	○										

Performance measures with an asterisk (*) reflects the transportation priorities identified by historically marginalized communities and serve as the basis for the federally-required Title VI Benefits and Burdens analysis.

PROJECT SCORING

The prioritization measures are framed as questions that help assess to what extent a project supports the plan goals. The projects need to be scored on each prioritization measure to create a quantitative way of comparing projects. Table 3 (next page) provides a scoring scale from -1 to +2, reflecting the extent to which a project achieves the prioritization measure. The scores could be averaged for each goal and summed to provide a project score from -6 to +14, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Goal and Total Project Scoring

Proposed C2C Goal	Proposed C2C Prioritization Measure	Minimum Scoring	Maximum Scoring
Safety & Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project improve an intersection or roadway identified as a safety concern, especially those with more severe crashes? ▪ Does the project improve safety and comfort for all users, especially non-auto travelers? ▪ Does the project improve the security and resiliency of the transportation system? 	-1 (average of three prioritization measure scores)	+2 (average of three prioritization measure scores)
Equitable Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project positively impact a disadvantaged population? 	-1	+2
Multimodal Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project address an operational deficiency (based on level of service and/or volume-to-capacity ratio)? ▪ Does the project positively impact goods mobility and freight? 	-1 (average of two prioritization measure scores)	+2 (average of two prioritization measure scores)
Livability and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project increase access between residential and commercial areas or to daily needs and services? (access to jobs, access to community places) ▪ Does the project increase access to active transportation and transit? 	-1 (average of two prioritization measure scores)	+2 (average of two prioritization measure scores)
Economic Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project increase access to an employment area? (access to jobs) 	-1	+2
Fiscal Stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project provide high value considering the cost (cost effectiveness)? ▪ Does the project better manage the existing transportation system or make better use of an existing facility? 	-1 (average of two prioritization measure scores)	+2 (average of two prioritization measure scores)
Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project fill a gap in the existing network and increase north-south continuity? (system completeness) 	0 (see Table 3)	+2
Total Project Score		-6	+14

Table 3. Prioritization Measure Scoring

Proposed C2C Goal	Proposed C2C Prioritization Measure	Scoring Scale				Resources
		-1	0	+1	+2	
Safety & Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project improve an intersection or roadway identified as a safety concern, especially those with more severe crashes? 	NA	No impact.	Improves an intersection or roadway identified as a safety concern.	Improves an intersection or roadway identified as a safety concern and with a serious injury or fatal crash in the last 5 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crash data List of safety focus intersections
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project improve safety and comfort for all users, especially non-auto travelers? 	<p>Degrades safety and comfort for non-auto users.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project provides additional turn-lanes at an intersection, increasing the crossing distance for pedestrians.</p>	<p>No impact.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project provides an overlap phase at a signal with no change to pedestrian or bicycle timing or crossing distances.</p>	<p>Improves safety and comfort for non-auto travelers.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project provides separated bike lanes on a roadway.</p>	<p>Improves safety and comfort for all travelers.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project installs a roundabout with pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project improve the security and resiliency of the transportation system? 	<p>Degrades security and resiliency.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project reduces capacity of evacuation and emergency access routes.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>	<p>Indirectly improves security and resiliency.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project provides multimodal facilities on a roadway.</p>	<p>Directly improves security and resiliency.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project improves evacuation and emergency access routes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Access Routes Map
Equitable Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project positively impact a disadvantaged population? 	<p>Degrades transportation options, facilities, and/or community for transportation disadvantaged populations.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Constructing a freeway or highway through a transportation disadvantaged area.</p>	<p>No impact.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Enhancing rural capacity in an area that is not classified as transportation disadvantaged.</p>	<p>Indirectly improves transportation options and/or facilities for transportation disadvantaged populations.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Providing sidewalk access to an activity center that is not within a transportation disadvantaged area.</p>	<p>Directly improves transportation options and/or facilities for transportation disadvantaged populations.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Providing sidewalks to transit stops within a transportation disadvantaged area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation Disadvantaged Population Map
Multimodal Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project address an operational deficiency (based on level of service and/or volume-to-capacity ratio)? 	NA	No impact.	<p>Indirectly improves operations at a deficient location.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project improves capacity on a roadway parallel to an over-capacity roadway.</p>	<p>Directly improves operations at a deficient location.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project installs a roundabout at a two-way stop-controlled intersection that does not meet standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing and future operations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project positively impact goods mobility and freight? 	<p>Degrades goods and freight mobility.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project removes industrial property access or increases congestion on a freight corridor.</p>	<p>No impact.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project located on a residential corridor.</p>	<p>Indirectly improves goods and freight mobility.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project increases capacity on a corridor parallel to a freight corridor.</p>	<p>Directly improves goods and freight mobility.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Project increases capacity on a freight corridor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freight Corridors Map
Livability and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project increase access between residential and commercial areas or to daily needs and services? (access to jobs, access to community places) 	<p>Degrades access and/or mobility to existing or future residential/commercial areas.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Capacity enhancement without providing pedestrian or bicycle facilities.</p>	<p>No impact.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Capacity enhancement not related to a residential/commercial area.</p>	<p>Indirectly improves access and mobility to existing or future residential/commercial areas.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Projects aimed at reducing vehicle crashes.</p>	<p>Directly improves access and mobility to existing or future residential/commercial areas.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Capacity or active transportation enhancement project to or within a residential/commercial area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity Centers Map Land Use Zoning Map

Proposed C2C Goal	Proposed C2C Prioritization Measure	Scoring Scale				Resources
		-1	0	+1	+2	
Livability and Accessibility (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project increase access to active transportation and transit? 	<p>Degrades conditions for active transportation or transit. <i>Example:</i> Enhances motorized vehicle capacity without providing pedestrian or bicycle facilities.</p>	No impact.	<p>Improves conditions for active transportation or transit. <i>Example:</i> Providing sidewalk along a roadway.</p>	<p>Highly improves conditions for active transportation or transit by providing a higher level of comfort for vulnerable users. <i>Example:</i> Providing a separated multi-use path.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project description
Economic Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project increase access to an employment area? (access to jobs) 	<p>Degrades access and/or mobility to existing or future employment areas. <i>Example:</i> Capacity enhancement without providing pedestrian or bicycle facilities.</p>	No impact. <i>Example:</i> Capacity enhancement not related to an employment area.	<p>Indirectly improves access and mobility to existing or future employment areas. <i>Example:</i> Projects aimed at reducing vehicle crashes.</p>	<p>Directly improves access and mobility to existing or future employment areas. <i>Example:</i> Capacity or active transportation enhancement project to or within an employment area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity Centers Map Land Use Zoning Map
Fiscal Stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project provide high value considering the cost (cost effectiveness)? 	Cost effectiveness factor ¹ is in the lower 50 th percentile.	Cost effectiveness factor is in the 50 th – 70 th percentile.	Cost effectiveness factor is in the 70 th – 90 th percentile.	Cost effectiveness factor is in the 90 th or above percentile.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project cost estimate Goal scoring <p><i>Note: cost effectiveness factor and percentile to be assessed once project list compiled</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project better manage the existing transportation system or make better use of an existing facility? 	Degrades an existing transportation facility.	No impact.	<p>Indirectly improves an existing transportation facility. <i>Example:</i> Provides a parallel route to a roadway over capacity or with identified safety issues.</p>	<p>Directly improves an existing transportation facility. <i>Example:</i> Addresses capacity and/or safety issues on an existing roadway.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project description
Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project fill a gap in the existing network and increase north-south continuity? (system completeness) 	NA	No impact.	<p>Fills a gap in the existing network and increases north-south continuity for one mode.</p>	<p>Fills a gap in the existing network and increases north-south continuity for multiple modes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian Network Map Bicycle Network Map Transit Network Map Auto Network Map

¹ Cost effectiveness factor defined: 1,000 times the projected future demand over the planning level cost estimate

NEXT STEPS

The goals, prioritization measures, and project scoring will be applied in Phase II of the project to develop investment packages and prioritize projects. Phase II does not include scope to conduct any technical evaluation, so the project scoring will be provided from the related planning efforts and the partner agencies. The information needed from current plans and in-process plans is shown in Table 5 and includes:

- ▶ Projects: relevant projects on the C2C corridor and parallel to the corridor that impact demands on the corridor (by July 1, 2019 to facilitate compilation of C2C Corridor project list)
- ▶ For each project, a description and geographic extents (by July 1, 2019 to facilitate compilation of C2C Corridor project list)
- ▶ For each project, a cost estimate and assessment using the goal scoring detailed above (by August 1, 2019 to facilitate development and prioritization of investment packages)

Table 5. Project Information Needed

Field	Description	Example
Project Name	Descriptive project name, including roadway or intersection	190 th Dr-Pleasant View Dr-Highland Dr Roadway upgrade
Extents	Note extents of project	Cheldelin Rd to Powell Blvd
Description	Include summary of all project elements	Widen roadway to 5-lane cross-section, including buffered bike lanes, landscape strip, and sidewalks. Includes widening of bridge over Johnson Creek.
Cost Estimate	Planning-level cost estimate using consistent assumptions	\$XXX
Projected Future Demand	Estimated 2035 annual average daily traffic (AADT) on project roadway or at project intersection (based on Metro model)	12,000
Safety & Security Goal Score	Average score of three prioritization criteria	Score from -1 to +2
Equitable Transportation Goal Score	Prioritization criteria score	Score from -1 to +2
Multimodal Mobility Goal Score	Average score of two prioritization criteria	Score from -1 to +2
Livability and Accessibility Goal Score	Average score of two prioritization criteria	Score from -1 to +2
Economic Development Goal Score	Prioritization criteria score	Score from -1 to +2
Fiscal Stewardship Goal Score	Score of second prioritization criteria (cost effectiveness factor percentile to be determined once project list compiled)	Score from -1 to +2 Cost effectiveness factor = 1,000 x projected future demand/cost estimate
Connectivity Goal Score	Prioritization criteria score	Score from -1 to +2