



Baltimore City Capital Improvement Program
FY2023-2028 Evaluation Criteria & Scoring Guide
September 23, 2021

Baseline Criteria

1. Regulatory mandate.

This covers local, state or federal requirements to complete certain work. If yes, please provide a reference (link, etc.) to the requirement and explain how this project will meet the requirement. If yes, the project does not need to be scored on other criteria.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Equity

The goal is to consider equity as it relates to all criteria, but we will also consider it as a separate criterion for now as we move in that direction. Consistent with the [Equity Assessment Program](#) legislation, consider whether and how well a project closes gaps in outcomes based on race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and income. Also consider how residents affected by the project were engaged in developing the project. The Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance has several valuable resources that could help inform this assessment.

- 3 – Project makes significant progress in closing a gap. In addition, the agency has directly and meaningfully engaged residents in the project and residents have helped shape the project.
- 2 - Project makes some progress in closing a gap.
- 1 - Project makes minimal progress in closing a gap.
- 0 - Project does not close a gap.

2. Health and safety

Assess the existing conditions and potential improvements to health and safety. Immediate threats to health and safety (including lead poisoning) should be ranked highest, but general improvements to population health are also important. This could include risk mitigation activities, such as those related to the Disaster Preparedness and Planning Project (DP3).

- 3 - Conditions present a clear and relatively immediate threat of bodily harm (including illness) if project is not funded.
- 2 - Conditions present a clear, but not immediate, health threat if project is not funded.
- 1 – The project would theoretically improve health or safety, but it is difficult to quantify the benefit.
- 0 – There is no health or safety benefit.

3. Asset condition

Ideally we would replace or rehabilitate all assets that have reached the end of their useful life. However, due to funding constraints we have to prioritize those which are failing or expected to soon fail. Provide an asset score.

- 3 – The asset is critical to the functioning of a system (e.g. road network, building, water network) and has failed. It must be replaced, demolished, sold, or relocated in order to keep the system/building functioning. If not addressed, it will affect other parts of the system or put other assets at risk.
- 2 – The asset has surpassed its useful life and is at risk of failure.
- 1 – The asset is nearing the end of its expected life and replacement would be prudent.
- 0 – The asset is in acceptable condition and proactive maintenance is not required

4. Return on investment/cost-benefit

This factor relates to an economic return on investment or cost-benefit analysis. Projects should be given credit for 1) leveraging other funds, 2) saving money (energy, emergency maintenance, or other operating costs), or 3) increasing future revenue collected by the City. Provide a dollar amount.

- 3 – An investment in the project now will save or generate an equivalent or greater amount over the next 10-20 years, or a small investment is matched by a much larger amount that would otherwise be unavailable.
- 2 – An investment in the project now will save or generate some funds over the next 10-20 years, but not as much as the cost of the project.
- 1 – The investment has an insignificant return or the return on investment is theoretical and cannot be measured.
- 0 – The investment will not provide an economic return on investment, even theoretically.

5. Environmental impact

Consider whether and how this project will produce measurable improvements to the environment over the life of the project. Compliance with standards can count towards measurable improvements if they improve air/water quality or reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigation measures that offset a negative impact of the project (such as mitigating stormwater runoff resulting from the improvement or planting trees to replace those lost due to the improvement) should not be counted, as they do not represent a net improvement in air or water quality but are rather reducing or offsetting negative environmental impacts of a project. Quantify the improvement.

- 3 – The project will result in significant, measurable improvements to air or water quality or measurable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
- 2 - The project will result in minor improvements to air or water quality or greenhouse gas emissions.
- 1 – The project has theoretical environmental benefits but they cannot be quantified.
- 0 – The project does not have any measurable environmental benefits.

6. Efficiency and Effectiveness

Consider whether this is the most cost-effective solution to achieve the goals of the project, and how well it achieves those goals. If this is replacing a building system, is there an overall strategy for maintaining and utilizing the building? If this is a neighborhood improvement, is this part of the neighborhood's overall strategy and vision? Is it coordinated with other improvements in the neighborhood (including private investments such as BGE work or development projects)? Provide the assessment of alternatives.

- 3 – This is the most cost-effective way to provide the target level of service and there has been a clear, well-documented evaluation of alternatives.
- 2 – This is the most cost-effective solution for the asset as a whole (e.g. building or neighborhood).
- 1- This is the most cost-effective solution for the immediate need (e.g. a leaking roof or unsafe intersection).
- 0 – This is not a cost-effective solution.