

Revised Franklin Boulevard Study evaluation process

TO: Tom Boyatt
Stakeholder Advisory Committee

COPIES: Sam Seskin
Brian Ray
Jamie Parks
Greg Tung

FROM: Kristin Hull

DATE: REVISED October 16, 2007

Introduction

Concepts for the Franklin Boulevard Study will be evaluated against a set of criteria. The criteria will measure the concepts relative to each other and will be a way to better understand the attributes of each concept. The evaluation of the concepts will likely be used to develop a hybrid concept rather than to select any of the “pure” concepts as they are currently defined.

The goal of this evaluation process is to understand the trade-offs between the Franklin Boulevard concepts well enough to develop a hybrid concept for the section of Franklin Boulevard between McVay Highway and I-5. Concepts for two segments of the study area, the Franklin/McVay intersection and the McVay Highway, will not be evaluated at this stage. These concepts will be evaluated and refined as part of the development of a hybrid concept. The reason for this is that developing the alignment and cross-section on Franklin Boulevard first allows us to develop intersection concepts that more accurately respond to and minimize impacts. Finally, the refinement of the McVay Highway alignment depends almost wholly on the location and type of intersection at McVay Highway and Franklin Boulevard due to the short distance between the intersection and the existing railroad trestle.

Most criteria are drawn specifically from the study’s evaluative outcome statements reviewed by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and City staff. The criteria shaded in gray were added based on the revised problem statement and project experience. The criteria are organized within categories to display trade-offs.

We have proposed measures for each criterion. A High/Medium/Low scale along with a qualitative description of the trade-offs between concepts will be developed for each criterion. Some criteria are labeled “will not be measured at this time” because they cannot be evaluated at this level of detail, but they are still shown to denote their importance to the advisory committee and staff.

City staff and the stakeholders will be invited to review the evaluation of the concepts and provide input about which options make the most sense in which segments of the corridor. They will also be invited to provide input on which concepts, if any, should be set aside. City staff and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) will then focus on building a hybrid alternative.

Approach to assessing business impacts and benefits

One of the key trade-offs between concepts considers enhancing redevelopment opportunities in the corridor versus protecting existing businesses. This is expressed through the following criteria:

- Promotes mixed-use, clustered redevelopment in Glenwood.
- Benefits the future business community as a whole.
- Minimizes impacts to private property and businesses

To assess the criteria related to enhancing redevelopment opportunities, the consultant team will interview economic development and real estate experts to ascertain the difference between the concepts. The consultant team will ask questions about:

- The role of street design in attracting investment.
- The role of parcel size in attracting investment.
- Likely redevelopment locations and uses.
- Overall redevelopment potential in corridor by use.

To assess business impacts, we propose to make a qualitative assessment of the likelihood that a building would be impacted by each concept with 'High' signifying a building likely to be impacted and 'Low' signifying a building unlikely to be impacted. The number of High, Medium and Low impacts will be totaled for each concept.

To assess property impacts, we propose to calculate the square footage of private property that would have to be acquired to construct each alternative. The square footage of impact will be converted to a size range to better reflect the level of detail of the design concepts.

Proposed criteria and measures

Criteria categories	Criteria	Measures
1. Cost	Project cost (unit costs for roadway and urban design features)	<p>The scale for roadway and urban design features cost will be measured in ranges to accommodate the relatively low level of detail available at this stage. The scale is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept has a relatively low construction cost.</p> <p>Medium – The concept has a moderate construction cost.</p> <p>Low – The concept has a relatively high construction cost.</p>
2. Natural environment	<i>Enhances the natural environment.</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>
	<i>Provides opportunities to incorporate sustainable design principles.</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>
	<i>Improves visual and physical connections to the river.</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>

<p>3. Community values and economic development</p>	<p><i>Enhances Franklin Boulevard's role as a gateway to Glenwood, downtown Springfield, Eugene and the University of Oregon.</i></p>	<p><i>Will not be measured at this time.</i></p>
	<p>Promotes mixed-use, clustered redevelopment in Glenwood.</p>	<p>Measure will be developed through discussions with real estate experts.</p>
	<p>Benefits the future business community as a whole.</p>	<p>Measure will be developed through discussions with real estate experts.</p>
	<p>Provides for the safety and convenience of pedestrians including alter-abled people</p>	<p>The scale for sidewalk location/relationship to roadway is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept locates sidewalks adjacent to a low-traffic roadway.</p> <p>Medium – The concept locates some sidewalks adjacent to a low-traffic roadway.</p> <p>Low – The concept locates sidewalks adjacent to a high-traffic roadway.</p> <hr/> <p>The scale for distance to cross roadway is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept requires crossing distance of less than 140'.</p> <p>Medium – The concept requires crossing distance of 140' to 150'.</p> <p>Low – The concept requires crossing distance of more than 150'.</p>
	<p>Provides for safety and convenience of cyclists</p>	<p>The scale for safety and convenience of cyclists is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept provides bike lanes.</p> <p>Medium – The concept provides some bike lanes.</p> <p>Low – The concept does not provide bike lanes.</p>
	<p>Provides for efficient operation of transit</p>	<p>The scale for safety and convenience of transit is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept provides transit lanes.</p> <p>Low –The concept does not provide transit lanes</p>

	<i>Distinctive designs</i>	<i>Will not be measured at this time.</i>
	Minimizes impacts to private property and businesses	<p>Business impacts will be assessed on the following scale:</p> <p>High – The concept will likely require the acquisition of the building.</p> <p>Medium – The concept is within 5 feet of the building.</p> <p>Low – The concept is more than 5 feet away from the building.</p> <p>To compare, the number of low, medium and high impacts will be counted for each concept.</p> <p>Property impacts will be assessed on the following scale:</p> <p>High – The concept will require acquisition of more than x square feet of private property.</p> <p>Medium – The concept will require acquisition of between x and y square feet of private property.</p> <p>Low – The concept will require acquisition of less than y square feet of private property.</p>
4. Transportation performance	Accommodates efficient intersection function	Will not be measured at this time.
	Accommodates freight	Will not be measured at this time.
	Accommodate long-term traffic needs	<p>Long-term traffic needs will be evaluated in terms of speed.</p> <p>Long-term traffic needs will be evaluated in terms of through-put.</p>
	Accommodates local and regional traffic	<p>The scale for accommodates local and regional traffic is as follows:</p> <p>High – The concept separates local and regional traffic.</p> <p>Low – The concept does not separate local and regional traffic.</p>

Attachment 1. Traffic evaluation methodology

Alignment	Corridor Travel Time	Traffic Through-put
14th Street Alignment, Multiway Boulevard, widened to north	High	High
14th Street Alignment, Arterial, widened to north	High	High
Franklin Alignment, Multiway Blvd., center widening	Medium	High
Franklin Alignment, Multiway Blvd., widened to south	Medium	High
Franklin Alignment, Arterial, center widening	Medium	High
Franklin Alignment, Arterial, widened to south	Medium	High

Table 1. Summary of traffic evaluation

Travel speed was compared between the concepts using the corridor travel time as the performance measure:

- Speed evaluation was based on the length of the alignment, as vehicle delay along the corridor is expected to be roughly equivalent between concepts.
- Alignments along the existing Franklin Boulevard have an overall length approximately 4% longer than the 14th Street alignments (.78 miles compared to .75 miles).
- Therefore, Franklin Boulevard alignments expected to have corridor travel times slightly longer than the 14th Street alignments.

Traffic through-put was evaluated by considering the capacity of the concepts to handle expected traffic volumes on the corridor.

- All concepts include 2 through-lanes in either direction, separated BRT lanes, and bicycle facilities separated from through-travel lanes (whether in bike lanes or local access roads).
- Separating BRT and bikes from the automobile travel lanes will serve to increase capacity over the existing Franklin Boulevard cross-section. Additionally, any access management/consolidation along the corridor will also increase capacity.
- Consequently, total capacity of the concepts to handle through-traffic is roughly equivalent.
- Expected daily traffic volumes on the corridor within the study timeframe are expected to be 35,000 vehicles or less. All of the concepts generated have sufficient capacity to handle this volume.
- Any capacity problems/bottlenecks along the corridor will occur at intersections, primarily Franklin/McVay. Concept evaluation at Franklin/McVay will consider intersection capacity.