MEMORANDUM

Salem Parkway/Kroc Center Access Feasibility Study:

Draft Evaluation Framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PREPARED FOR:** | Salem Parkway/Kroc Center Consultant Team |
| **PREPARED BY:** | Sumi Malik, AICP |
| **DATE:** | July 11, 2012 |

### Background

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the method of evaluating and comparing the facility alternatives including the proposed set of evaluation criteria, descriptions of each criterion, and a point system for scoring each criterion (aka "Evaluation Framework"). The criteria are intended to represent a broad range of City, ODOT, public and stakeholder values and objectives in this feasibility study.

An evaluation framework and analysis is useful for objectively comparing the variety of characteristics of each alternative. The purpose of this evaluation process is not to be an exhaustive study of each alternative’s benefits and impact, but to highlight relative differences between alternatives to aide decision-making.

### Proposed Process

Initially, the project team will develop six (6) crossing "concepts" that will be reviewed by the public and Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC). These concepts will then be screened down to four (4) "facility alternatives" and be more fully developed by the project team. These four facility alternatives will be evaluated using the evaluation framework and criteria in this memo. Results will be included in a draft and final "Transportation Facility Alternatives and Evaluation Report".

The evaluation criteria described in the remainder of this memo contains a mixture of quantitative and qualitative measures. Criteria are organized into eight objectives, listed below:

1. Safety for Users of the Facility
2. Directness of Route
3. Facility integrates with the larger multi-modal system
4. Property and Environmental impacts
5. Transportation and Utility impacts
6. Public Support
7. Cost
8. Ability to Phase Project

### Objective 1: Safety for Users of the Facility

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1a:** Minimizes the potential for vehicle conflicts at facility crossings.  **Description:** This criterion will evaluate the number of potential controlled1 and uncontrolled2 vehicle crossing points (i.e. locations where there could be a conflict between motor vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists along the facility or at the end(s) of the facility.) The evaluation will consider a trip from a location northwest of the Salem Parkway to the Kroc Center | |
| Controlled Crossings 1 | Points |
| 1 or less | 4 |
| 2 | 2 |
| > 3 | 0 |
| **Uncontrolled Crossings2** | Points |
| 1 or less | 2 |
| 2 | 1 |
| >3 | 0 |
| 1Controlled—a crossing with either a stop sign or traffic signal | |
| 2Uncontrolled—a crossing with no stop control, such as a driveway | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1b:** Facility meets project design criteria.  **Description:** AASHTO, ODOT, and BNSF design guidelines define standards for width, grade, clearance, etc. All alternatives will be designed following these guidelines, but some may require minor exceptions (e.g. horizontal curves). | |
| Meets Design Criteria | Points |
| Yes | 4 |
| Requires minor design exception | 3 |
| Requires major design exception | 2 |
| No | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1c:** Personal safety and security  **Description:** Qualitative assessment of whether the facility creates isolated areas, or has obscured views or confined areas; or **(**conversely) provides a more safe and secure environment. This criterion considers both the user of the facility and the impact of the facility on the surrounding area. | |
| Isolation, safety | Points |
| Minimizes points of potential isolation; feels safe and secure | 4 |
| Creates some points of potential isolation | 2 |
| Creates several points of potential isolation; feels relatively unsafe | 0 |

### Objective 2: Directness of Route

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 2:** Reduce the potential for out-of-direction travel for bicyclists and pedestrians.  **Description:** Bicyclists and pedestrians are not inclined to travel out-of-direction, which can lead to crossing unsafely across the Salem Parkway and/or railroad tracks. They prefer the most direct route. This criterion evaluates how well the facility provides a direct route for pedestrians and bicyclist to the Kroc Center. Trip length and the number of households within a prescribed distance will be evaluated for each alternative. For trip length, the evaluation will consider a trip starting from the intersection of Brooks Ave and Candlewood Drive in Keizer (located north of the Salem Parkway multi-use path) and going to the Kroc Center. | |
| Directness of route | Points |
| Most Direct | 4 |
| Somewhat Direct | 2 |
| Least Direct | 0 |

### Objective 3: Facility integrates with the Larger Multi-Modal System

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 3:** Facility ties in with existing and planned bicycle, pedestrian, and transit system.  **Description:** One purpose of the study is to identify facilities that tie-in with the larger existing and planned bicycle/pedestrian system. This criterion will assess how well each facility meets this objective. | |
| Ties in with bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit stops | Points |
| Best connection to existing and planned facilities. | 4 |
| Second best connection to existing and planned facilities. | 3 |
| Third best connection to existing and planned facilities. | 2 |
| Fourth best connection to existing and planned facilities. | 0 |

### Objective 4: Property and Environmental Impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 4a:** Assessment of relative overall impact to properties and structures within the study area.  **Description:** This will look at the number of structures or properties potentially impacted. This is a preliminary assessment and not a full impact assessment. Because impacts from an alternative can vary substantially based on its location and design (i.e. whether a facility is constructed at grade, elevated on structures, or on berms), professional judgment will be used to assess whether there could be relatively minor, intermediate, or considerable impacts. | |
| Relative Amount of Potential Impact to Structures and Properties | Points |
| Least amount of impact to structures and properties | 4 |
| Second least amount of impact to structures and properties | 3 |
| Third least amount of impact to structures and properties | 2 |
| Greatest amount of impact to structures potentially displaced | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 4b:** Minimizes impacts nearby wetlands, Clagget Creek, and other natural resources in the study area    **Description:** This is based on engineering judgment on the amount of storm water mitigation and other mitigations that may be needed for the alternative. | |
| Amount of mitigation needed | Points |
| Little-to-no mitigation needed | 4 |
| Some-to-moderate mitigation needed | 2 |
| Significant mitigation needed | 0 |

### Objective 5: Transportation and Utility Impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 5:** Minimizes impact to existing and planned transportation facilities and utilities during construction or as a permanent impact.  **Description:** This is based on engineering judgment on the impact to utilities (BPA power lines), transportation facilities (railroad track and rail operations; Salem Parkway and other streets within the study area); and other infrastructure within the study area. | |
| Facilities Impacted | Points |
| Little-to-no impact to transportation or utilities | 4 |
| Moderate impact to transportation or utilities | 2 |
| Considerable impact to transportation or utilities | 0 |

### Objective 6: Public Support

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 6:** Public support of each alternative based on comments at public "listening stations", surveys, website comments, and public open house comments. | |
| General Public Support | Points |
| Received the greatest amount of support | 4 |
| Second greatest amount of support | 3 |
| Third greatest amount of support | 2 |
| Least amount of support | 0 |

### Objective 7: Cost

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 7:** Preliminary cost estimates of the alternatives | |
| Relative Cost | Points |
| Least cost | 4 |
| Second lowest cost alternative | 3 |
| Third lowest cost alternative | 2 |
| Highest cost alternative | 0 |

### Objective 8: Ability to Phase Project

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 8:** Sub components of the project can be phased and have independent utility for users  **Description:** Due to the availability of funding, it may be advantageous to have a set of facilities that can be constructed in phases. If phased, then each phase should have independent utility (i.e. serve the public) until later phases can be constructed. | |
| Can project be phased with independent utility? | Points |
| Yes | 3 |
| No | 0 |

An additional criterion for the design and aesthetics of the facility was considered. However, it was determined that all of the initial concepts could be designed either at a higher cost or lower cost level of design, and therefore design and aesthetics would not be a valid differentiator at this point in the feasability study. Considerations about design and aesthetics may want to be revisited when discussing the recommended alternative at the latter part of this study.