

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Definition	Considerations in the Scoring Process	Weight
Safety	Allows for the safe movement of people in all forms (automobiles, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, disability aid) considering conflict points.	Number of thru/left turn vehicular conflicts; G Way characteristics (number of lanes + speed limit); Pedestrian crossing score (based off lanes to cross); Jadwin characteristics; Jadwin pedestrian crossing score; Bike lane characteristics (number of lanes).	10
Improves Appeal	Attracts visitors, new residents and businesses to the downtown and the adjacent waterfront in support of tourism, small businesses, and residents' experience in the urban environment with natural features (Columbia River).	Area gained for potential alternate modes; Changes in travel patterns; Congestion.	8
Mobility and Connectivity for Alternate Modes	Focus on moving "people" in all forms (bicycle, pedestrian, disabled, transit, etc.), in all directions, in support of the economic vitality, healthy living and healthy environment considering the context of the environment, specifically the ability for residents to safely connect on foot or with disability aid from nearby neighborhoods to the downtown and from downtown to the waterfront.	Potential number of bike lanes; Potential for additional mid-block crossings; Potential for pedestrian refuge; Potential for bulb-outs at intersections (bulb-out = extension of curb at intersection); Potential for wider sidewalks.	8
Property Acquisition Impacts	Number of properties fully and/or partially acquired.	Number of full parcels impacted; Number of partial parcels impacted.	5
Cost	Easier to implement considering right-of-way, engineering and construction of roadway changes.	Low and high range construction cost + right-of-way acquisition cost = total average cost.	4
Move Traffic/Reduce Commute Time	Accommodates the efficient movement of north-south automobile traffic through Richland.	Intersections with a level of service (LOS, ability to move traffic score) of E or F, considered a poor score; movements within intersections with LOS of E or F.	4
Parking	Provides opportunity for additional on-street parking and wayfinding signs to existing available parking lots.	Linear feet gained for potential parking on G Way; Traffic influence on G Way (implies ease of parking use); Linear feet gained for potential parking on Jadwin; Traffic influence on Jadwin.	3
Construction Impacts	Severity of inconvenienced activities during construction.	End point treatments; Impacts on G Way; Impacts on Jadwin Ave.	3

ALTERNATIVES RANKING & RECOMMENDATION

CRITERION	Criteria Weight	ALTERNATIVE							
		A		B		C		D	
		No-Build		Couplet		Jadwin		Road Diet*	
		Raw	Wt.	Raw	Wt.	Raw	Wt.	Raw	Wt.
Cost	4	10.0	40.0	4.6	18.4	0.0	0.0	8.4	33.6
Improves Appeal	8	4.0	32.0	7.5	60.0	7.7	61.6	8.0	64.0
Move Traffic / Reduce Commute Time	4	9.0	36.0	7.5	30.0	8.8	35.0	0.0	0*
Mobility and Connectivity for Alternate Modes	8	3.0	24.0	8.5	68.0	7.5	60.0	10.0	80.0
Parking	3	0.0	0.0	8.0	24.0	4.5	13.5	7.0	21.0
Property Acquisition	5	10.0	50.0	6.5	32.5	0.5	2.5	10.0	50.0
Construction Impacts	4	10.0	40.0	3.0	12.0	1.0	4.0	6.0	24.0
Safety	10	0.5	5.0	8.0	80.0	3.0	30.0	5.0	50.0
TOTAL SCORE		47	227	54	325	33	207	54	323
ALTERNATIVE RANK		4		1		3		2	

* Note: The Road Diet Scores 0 under the Moves Traffic/Reduce Commute Time due to the failure of 7 intersections that do not meet the Level of Service Standard. This is a fatal flaw of this alternative which goes against one of the main objectives of the study which was to "advance the City Council's vision for a pedestrian-friendly waterfront and downtown, while maintaining or enhancing the vehicular travel flow through downtown". As much as the Road Diet would advance many of the desired bicycle and pedestrian mobility aspects of the study, that alternative cannot be recommended.