DKS
117 COMMERCIAL STREET NE, SUITE 310, SALEM, OR 97301 • 503.391.8773 • DKSASSOCIATES.COM

MEMORANDUM #2

DATE: December 2, 2020

TO: Project Management Team

FROM: Scott Mansur, P.E., PTOE | DKS Associates
Jenna Bogert, E.I. | DKS Associates

SUBJECT: Wheatland Road Corridor Plan – Evaluation Criteria Project #20020-009

INTRODUCTION

The goals, objectives, and policies for the future of Keizer's transportation system are found in the City's Transportation System Plan. They guide the development of the transportation system within the City and were based on the previous TSP, conversations with City of Keizer staff and the project Technical Advisory Committee. Goals and policies have been summarized below; these will guide the direction and process of the Wheatland Road Corridor Study and public process.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

GOAL #2: ENVIRONMENT

Provide for a sustainable transportation system which respects the environment and community.

- Objective #1: Minimize the adverse effects on **environmentally sensitive areas** and water quality.
- Objective #2: Minimize the adverse effects (e.g. noise, air, speed) **on neighborhoods**.
- Objective #3: Consider opportunities to minimize impervious surfaces through alternative material use and pavement width reductions while still meeting the necessary standards.

GOAL #3: STREETS

Maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system.

- Objective #1: Provide a street system emphasizing connectivity that **minimizes travel time and congestion** while being compatible with other modes of transportation.
- Objective #2: Maximize available system **capacity**.

- Objective #3: Maintain the physical integrity of existing roads to preserve and **maximize infrastructure investments.**
- Objective #4: Manage on and off-street parking to support community needs.
- Objective #5: Maintain an **acceptable level of service** within the transportation system.

GOAL #4: COMPREHENSIVE, CONNECTED, AND MULTIMODAL

Provide efficient and comprehensive linkages between all modes of transportation.

- Objective #1: Develop **paths, connections, and facilities** to provide simple access between **modes** at different parts of work, shopping, or recreational trips.
- Objective #2: **Safety** must be an underlying concept for any element of the transportation system.

GOAL #5: PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS

Develop a comprehensive system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities for the City of Keizer.

- Objective #1: Establish a **continuous, direct, and safe system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities** within the Keizer urban area and **connect** it to the greater regional system.
- Objective #2: Achieve greater public awareness of safe pedestrian, bicycling, and motoring practices, procedures, and skills.

GOAL #6: TRANSIT

Support a public transit system for all Keizer residents focusing on accessibility and mobility.

- Objective#1: Facilitate public transit services throughout the urbanized portions of the Keizer area that ensures **convenient accessibility** to a variety of destinations at different times of the day. Advocate affordable transit service and **increase ridership**.
- Objective #2: Encourage a transit system which offers **connectivity** between activity centers, such as schools, parks, shopping centers, and residences with minimum transfers.
- Objective #3: Support transit programs that **serve transportation disadvantaged** citizens consistent with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

GOAL #11: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Maximize the efficiency of the existing surface transportation system through management techniques and facility improvements

- Objective #1: Provide a system of traffic control devices maintained and operated to an acceptable LOS**.**

- Objective #2: Improve physical design and management of on-street parking consistent with community need.
- Objective #3: Increase **street system safety and capacity** through access management.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING METHODOLOGY

Based on the goals and objectives that guide future transportation projects and programs in the City of Keizer, the following categories have been created to evaluate the alternatives that will be determined through the public process and evaluated by the project team.

- Neighborhood Livability
- Environmental
- Utilization of Existing Infrastructure
- Traffic Operations
- Safe Routes to School
- Safety
- Transportation Mode Choices/Multimodal Connectivity
- Equity
- Convenient and Accessible Transit
- Cost Effective

The goals and policies in the City's Transportation System Plan provided a basis for the development of the evaluation criteria, which are intended to assess a project's potential to meet the transportation needs of the City. The evaluation criteria were then refined.

TABLE 1: WHEATLAND ROAD EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

CRITERIA	SCORING
NEIGHBORHOOD LIVABILITY: How does the alternative influence neighborhood livability (e.g. Noise, air, speed, vehicle volume)?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
ENVIRONMENTAL: How does the alternative influence the natural environment (e.g. Stormwater, air quality, natural resources)?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
UTILIZATION OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE: How much of the existing infrastructure does the alternative utilizes within the study area (e.g. sidewalks, pavement, utilities)?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS: How does the alternative accommodate commuter, transit, and heavy vehicle operations (e.g. Travel time, delay, capacity)?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
TRANSPORTATION MODE CHOICES/MULTIMODAL CONNECTIVITY: How well does the alternative support transportation and commuting mode choices and connectivity for users.	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
EQUITY: How well does the alternative serve the disadvantaged population?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL: How well do the alternatives support students walking, biking, and accessing school bus stops to connect to Salem-Keizer schools?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
SAFETY: How well does the alternative improve or impact safety for all modes of travel?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements

CONVENIENT AND ACCESSIBLE TRANSIT: How well does the alternative support existing and future transit routes within the corridor?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements
COST EFFECTIVE/FUNDABILITY: How do the alternatives compare in planning level cost estimates and their potential to receive state or federal funding?	-2 to +2 0 – No Change -2 – Significant Impacts +2 – Significant Improvements

The scoring methodology will be applied in the following way:

Equal weight for each goal category – Each of the eight categories receives an equal weight. In this method, evaluation scores for each criterion under a particular goal category would be averaged to determine one score for each goal category. They would then be summed to arrive at an overall evaluation score.

APPENDIX

EXAMPLE SCORING (EQUAL WEIGHT):

Alt A: separated multi use path with landscaping buffer, no transit improvements

Alt B: on-street buffered bike lanes with sidewalk infill, transit improvements, turn lanes at key intersections

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALT A	ALT B	COMMENT
NEIGHBORHOOD LIVABILITY	+2	+1	Landscape buffer favors Alt A. Separated path to be used by all ages/abilities.
ENVIRONMENTAL	+1	+1	Both alternatives can provide equal environmental benefits
UTILIZATION OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE	-1	+1	Alt A removes existing sidewalk/bike lanes and replaces with multiuse path. Alt B maintains majority of existing curb and sidewalk.
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS	0	+1	Alt B provides left turn lanes for improved operations at key intersections
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL	+2	+1	Alt A provides a separated path to be used by all ages/abilities.
SAFETY	+2	+1	Separated path provides safest ped/bike options. Alt B provides multimodal connected system that also improves safety.
TRANSPORTATION MODE CHOICES/MULTIMODAL CONNECTIVITY	+1	+1	Both alternatives provide a connected multimodal system.
EQUITY	+1	+1	Both alternatives improve transportation services for transportation disadvantaged.
CONVENIENT AND ACCESSIBLE TRANSIT	0	+1	Alt B provides enhanced transit amenities.
COST EFFECTIVE/FUNDABILITY	-1	+1	Alt A has higher cost estimate, Alt B maintains more of existing infrastructure and has lower cost estimate.
TOTAL	**+7**	**+10**	