Beltline Facility Plan: Alternative Evaluation Criteria

PREPARED FOR: Beltline Facility Plan Phase 2 Project Management Team

PREPARED BY: Terra Lingley, CH2M HILL

COPIES: Savannah Crawford, ODOT
Kristin Hull, CH2M HILL

DATE: May 28, 2009 (revised)

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline a proposed process and set of criteria to evaluate potential alternatives for the Beltline Facility Plan. The Beltline Facility Plan (Facility Plan) will develop a set of alternatives that address the purpose statement developed during phase 1, evaluate alternatives according to the project goals and objectives, and narrow the range of alternatives to a reasonable set of alternatives that can be carried into a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

This evaluation framework, based on project goals and objectives identified in Phase 1, will be refined after they have been reviewed with the Project Management Team (PMT), the Steering Committee and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC). The evaluation criteria will be used to evaluate the performance of each potential improvement. It is important to note that the evaluation framework is developed before brainstorming potential improvements to encourage an open and unbiased evaluation process.

The general evaluation rating method is included in the table below.

Rating	
	The concept addresses the criterion and/or makes substantial improvements in the criteria category
	The concept partially addresses the criterion and/or makes some improvements in the criteria category
	The concept neither meets nor does not meet intent of criterion. Alternative has no effect, or criterion does not apply
	The concept does not support the intent of and/or negatively impacts the criteria category

Using the above rating method, a set of evaluation criteria was developed, consistent with the project goals and objectives as outlined in Phase 1 of the project. These criteria, listed in the table below are intended to address the important elements of this project. They are listed below in no particular order; a weight is not intended to be applied to these various categories.

1. **Mobility, reliability and connectivity**
2. **Safety**
3. **Community livability and economic vitality**
4. **Environmental impacts**
5. **Cost effectiveness**

Mobility, reliability and connectivity

Improve future mobility, reliability and connectivity within the study area, particularly on the Beltline Highway.

Objectives:

- Design for projected future traffic volumes as a result of future growth and land use changes
- Minimize congestion and optimize traffic flow on the mainline, in the interchange areas, and on critical study area roadways
- Provide transportation improvements that reduce trip length and potential travel times for travel modes within the study area including motor vehicles, freight, transit, bicycles and walking
- Provide improved connectivity across the Willamette River for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians

Measures:

- Volume-to-capacity (V/C) – planning-level analysis of volume to capacity on the mainline, at the study area ramps and ramp terminal interchanges, and on other critical study area roadways
- Trip length and travel time between key origins and destinations for all modes in the study area
- Number and location of access points appropriate to context and roadway classification

Safety

Provide a transportation network that has the potential to increase safety for all modes.

Objectives:

- Improve Beltline Highway and interchange areas in the study area to increase safety for users and reduce crash frequency and severity, thereby improving reliability
- Consider the needs of emergency response vehicles

Measures:

- Places in the study area where the Beltline Highway or interchanges violate known engineering best practices or design guidelines as related to safety
- Conflict points for motorists and between motorists and bicyclists or pedestrians

Community livability and economic vitality

Support, sustain, and enhance community livability and protect the quality and integrity of residential and business areas near the corridor. Support or maintain the vitality of area businesses and communities.

Objectives:

- Support local and regional goals for mode choices (e.g. bicycle, transit, pedestrian or private vehicle)
- Consider positive and negative effects on adjacent residential and business areas
- Serve existing and planned land uses
- Accommodate freight movement
- Create a facility design that instills community pride

Measures:

- Residential displacements
- Consistent with community and neighborhood goals
- New or improved multimodal facilities
- Business displacements
- Access to the interchange area businesses that is both safe and convenient
- Consistent with state planning goals

Environmental impacts

Provide a facility that avoids or minimizes adverse impacts to natural and social resources within the project area. In areas where impacts cannot be avoided, ensure that mitigation is likely to be feasible. Identify opportunities to enhance natural resource and recreational opportunities.

Objectives:

- Avoid or minimize impacts to the natural environment including rivers and water bodies, riparian zones, wetlands and habitat areas
- Minimize impacts to the community environment as described in the community livability and economic vitality goals
- Support local sustainability and greenhouse gas reduction goals
- Design features that enhance aesthetic appearance and augment the visual environment where possible
- Identify opportunities to increase or enhance park and recreational areas or natural resources.

Measures:

- Changes to system-wide vehicle miles traveled (proxy for GHG impact)
- Changes to system-wide vehicle delay (proxy for GHG impact)
- Impacts to wetlands and known habitats
- Impacts to parks and trails
- Impacts to Willamette Greenway
- Opportunity to integrate state sustainability goals into facility (e.g. construction reuse of materials, etc.)

- Impacts to cultural and historic resources

Cost effectiveness

Provide solutions that are cost-effective and can be implemented over time.

Objectives:

- Provide solutions that can be implemented in phases that provide incremental benefit
- Provide timely and cost-effective project solutions that perform as designed throughout their expected design life
- Minimize ongoing operations and maintenance costs

Measures:

- Constructible in phases
- Phases provide incremental benefits
- Construction cost
- Operation and maintenance cost

Next steps

This draft evaluation criteria memorandum will be reviewed by the PMT, the Steering Committee, and the SAC at their meetings in May and June 2009 before beginning a discussion of potential solutions. The evaluation criteria will be revised based on input from those groups.

The evaluation criteria will be used as the basis for evaluating and prioritizing improvement concepts and alternatives in August and September 2009.