

Responses to Questions from October 17, 2007 Task Force Meeting

TO: Salem River Crossing Project Task Force
FROM: Tim Burkhardt
DATE: October 23, 2007

This memo provides some brief responses to key questions recorded at the October 17, 2007 Task Force meeting regarding the evaluation methods and results. The questions are divided into three groups:

- Questions about Differentiation Among Alternatives
- Other Questions about Specific Objectives
- General Questions

1. Questions about Differentiation Among Alternatives

In response to Task Force questions and discussion, some adjustments were made to several scoring methodologies and, as a result, there were some changes to the results themselves. The Draft Alternatives Evaluation Results memo reflects these changes.

Key adjustments to the methods included:

- Where raw scores were relatively close (traffic-based criteria including mobility, transit travel time, air quality, through freight traffic downtown, congestion reduction), performance was rescored to show less differentiation (see below).

The key changes to the results are:

- Somewhat less differentiation among alternatives. Previous range was from a low of 0.336 (Purple) to a high of 0.748 (Green + Red). Range now is from 0.452 (Purple) to 0.681 (Green + Red).
- Relatively minor changes in the rankings. The changes in absolute scores did not change the rankings or changed them by only one position. For example, the top 5 and the bottom 2 are the same as previously. One notable exception is Forest, which dropped from 6th to 11th as a result of the changes.

Alternatives were rescored for the following objectives, as described below.

Goal 1

- Local Travel (Objective 1), Regional Travel (Objective 2), and Through Travel (Objective 3): These were rescored and assigned scores of either “2” or “3” on a scale of 1 to 4 to reflect that the differences among alternatives were not as great as 1-4 scoring suggested.
- Transit Travel Time (Objective 5): All alternatives are now scored the same (not enough differentiation to justify different scores).

Goal 2

- Air Quality (Objective 6): all alternatives are now scored the same (not enough differentiation to justify different scores).

Goal 3

- Through Freight Traffic Downtown (Objective 9): Alternatives were rescored and assigned either a “2” or “3” on a scale of 1 to 4 to reflect that the differences among alternatives were not as great as 1-4 scoring suggested.

Goal 5

- Congestion Reduction (Objective 5): Alternatives were rescored and assigned either a “2” or “3” on a scale of 1 to 4 to reflect that the differences among alternatives were not as great as 1-4 scoring suggested.

2. Other Questions about Specific Objectives

Goal 1

- Local, Regional and Through Mobility (Objectives 1-3): Question – what is the meaning of the 2-second difference in travel times? The label for this result should be hours, not seconds In other words, the result should be 2 hours, not two seconds.
- Pedestrian Facilities (Objective 6) and Bike Facilities (Objective 7): Zeroing out the weights (which causes the scores to be reported as zero) for this objective does not change the rankings.

Goal 3

- Business Impacts (Objective 1): The number of businesses on Edgewater Road that would be displaced is the same for all 13 alternatives, regardless of whether the alternative includes “Red” or not. This is because of requirements for additional merge lanes on Highway 22 at this location.
- Traffic Intrusion (Objective 5): Can you show a map for each alternative of the streets that had a 20% or greater increase in traffic? Yes, this will be provided at the meeting.
- Schools (Objective 14): Rescored to place higher value on neighborhood elementary schools

3. General Questions

1. Will railroad traffic interfere with performance of the alternatives on the east side, and should any changes be made to the rankings to reflect this?

Response: This will be provided at the meeting.

2. Please show the percent difference between each alternative ranking.

Response: Shown in the table below (reflects updated rankings).

Alternative	Score	% Difference
Green + Red	0.681	
Pink	0.644	5.4% (Green + Red vs. Pink)
White	0.609	5.4% (Pink vs. White)
White + Red	0.590	3.1% (White vs. White + Red)
Yellow + Red	0.583	1.2% (White + Red vs. Yellow + Red)
White + Red Light	0.580	0.5% (Yellow + Red vs. White + Red Light)
Pink + Red	0.535	7.8% (White + Red Light vs. Pink + Red)
Yellow	0.525	1.9% (Pink + Red vs. Yellow)
Blue + Red	0.524	0.2% (Yellow vs. Blue + Red)
Orange + Red	0.512	2.3% (Blue + Red vs. Orange + Red)
Forest	0.497	2.9% (Orange + Red vs. Forest)
Orange	0.465	6.4% (Forest vs. Orange)
Purple	0.452	2.8% (Orange vs. Purple)

3. Can you prepare a table to compare the construction cost vs. the right-of-way cost for each alternative?

Response: This will be provided at the meeting.

4. How much of the traffic is going eastward? And, for Pink and White alternatives, is there enough traffic to justify making a better connection to Silverton Road?

Response: This will be provided at the meeting.