

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The LB-ELA Project Team released a draft of the Full Evaluation Results to the Task Force and CLC on Wednesday, October 4, 2023. These materials summarized both the process and the results of the project evaluation. The evaluation process involved the creation and application of the evaluation criteria (metrics), in the form of benefits and potential concerns, towards assessing the projects and programs in terms of attaining the goals, values and principles of the corridor planning efforts and their potential impacts. This process created the draft evaluation results, project ranking by mode which will lead to the next step, the assignment of the projects and programs to tiers.

The LB-ELA Corridor Goals and Guiding Principles provide the foundation for this process. The evaluation criteria metrics aim to create summary findings for each project/program, so that the Task Force and the community can better understand how well each project/program meets the LB ELA Corridor Goals and Guiding Principles.

The evaluation criteria metrics were established, based on these project goals and principles, through collaboration and input among the project team, the CLC, TF, EWG, other stakeholders, and the community. Likewise, the project list is compiled through existing plans and programs and community inputs. The project list includes a wide range of concepts at all stages of development from the concept level to being “shovel-ready” or under construction. As such, the level of information available for each project under review varied widely. Through the evaluation process, the project team used all available information for each project and program to determine the rating of each metric.

Rubrics were developed for each project benefit to define how each of the evaluation criteria would be applied to rate the performance of each project and program. The project team assigned experienced technical staff, who applied their expertise, judgment and available tools, to develop each rubric based on their area of expertise. Some metrics were able to be quantitatively assessed while others were not. The project’s evaluation process was formed by the availability of data to assess each individual metric. Specifically, quantitative assessments are based on information that was able to be provided by data from the SCAG Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM), Air-Quality Modeling, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis. Qualitative assessments are based on past experience with similar projects, literature reviews on expected benefits, and intentions of the project or program based on the information available.

Each evaluation criteria rubric assigns each project or program a ranking between 0 (No Benefit) and 3 (High Benefit) A benefit metric can also be determined to be “Not Applicable” or NA with respect to a project or program. The individual rubric for each criterion describe how each project or program was assessed for that criterion.

After the metric scoring of benefits was complete, the technical team proceeded with rating the potential concerns. These potential concerns are developed to capture the possible negative impacts of each project and program. They were developed with input from the TF, CLC and EWG based on observations through the metric ranking and input from leadership, the CLC and TF. Potential Project concerns are scored under the same scale as the benefit metrics to ensure that all factors can be considered before a project is ranked in the investment plan. Projects are assessed to identify if there are additional considerations or potential concerns that are tied to a project.