APPENDIX A

Planning Process

APPENDIX A

Planning Process

AMP Process

The general approach to this project plan process included a sequence of decision points to identify issues and narrow the list of feasible alternatives to one preferred alternative. Plan development consisted of the following steps:

- **Stakeholder Input:** Meetings with property owners and relevant public agencies; collection and documentation of stakeholder concerns to help inform criteria development and alternative conceptualization.
- **Deficiency Assessment:** Analysis and validation of previously prepared traffic analysis reports; analysis and evaluation of previously prepared safety conditions reports.
- **Constraints Analysis:** Identification, four-hour field review, red flag analysis, mapping and recordation of potential environmental, land use and socio-economic project constraints.
- **Problem Statement and Criteria**: Development and consensus Steering Team adoption of a problem statement to guide alternative identification; development of criteria to screen and evaluate alternatives.
- **Alternative Identification and Analysis—**Identification and conceptual rendering of alternatives; initial refinement of alternatives based on Steering Team feedback; creation of alternative screening and evaluation criteria matrix; evaluation of alternatives using criteria matrix; final refinement of alternatives based on evaluation results and Steering Team feedback.
- **Preferred Alternative** – Recommendation of a preferred alternative package of improvements to be presented to the public for consideration; determination that preferred alternative, as conceptually conceived, can meet all applicable Linn County permitting criteria.
- **Implementation —** Description of implementation strategy; determination of next steps needed to fund and construct recommended improvements.

Alternatives Identification Approach

To address safety and operational deficiencies, a full range of system concepts were developed without prejudging their feasibility based on cost, property impact, or implementation issues. Rather, all conceptual alternatives addressed the problem definition developed by the Steering Team.

The alternative development was followed by a threshold screening of those alternatives to identify those that meet safety, operations, funding, policy, and project scope requirements. This chapter addresses the steps taken and the alternatives that were screened for further evaluation.

Threshold Screening Criteria

Each alternative was evaluated using a threshold screening process. This process is designed to eliminate infeasible, unreasonable alternatives so that no additional time and resources would be expended evaluating alternatives that have no realistic prospect of being implemented. The screening is based on criteria that represent fatal flaws. These screening/fatal flaw criteria embody the following attributes:

- Thresholds—an alternative either meets the criteria or it does not
- Easily measured—no substantial data gathering necessary
- Non-judgmental—not used to prejudge on criteria that require more analysis

Screening/fatal flaw criteria stand throughout the evaluation process so that at any time one of the fatal flaws is discovered for an alternative, that alternative is eliminated without further analysis. An alternative passed the threshold screening only if it met each of the threshold criteria.

Evaluation Approach

After the feasible alternatives were identified and screened (as detailed in Chapter 5), the team developed an evaluation framework, conducted a detailed alternative evaluation and ranked the alternatives. The purpose of this process was to continually narrow the number of alternatives moved forward in the process, ultimately resulting in a preferred alternative. The evaluation created an "apples-to-apples" comparison among the alternatives that was used as a basis for informed discussion and justification of choices.

Evaluation Framework

The alternative evaluation process included developing evaluation criteria and performance measures. The criteria and performance measures used in this project were developed by the Project Team with assistance from the Steering Committee. The evaluation criteria are measurements of values that the Project Team identified as pertinent to differentiating among alternatives with respect to addressing concerns expressed in the problem statement.

The evaluation of the criteria was conducted by Project Team technical staff based on performance measures approved by the Steering Committee. The performance measures were established to measure the extent to which the alternative helps achieve the criteria. The detailed measurements were quantified to the extent practical with the level of data available. Where quantifiable data were not available, qualitative measures were adopted to measure those criteria.

Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives

Values for each criterion were normalized to allow for one-to-one comparison across criteria (normalization resulted in scores between 0 and 1.0, with 1.0 being most favorable). Normalized scoring results were then presented to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee validated the results of the evaluation. The Steering Committee applied an informal weighting of the criteria in its consideration of evaluation results, so as to properly assess the alternatives based on the criteria that held the most importance to the Committee. Given that much of the differences between alternatives were minor, several of the normalized scores were the same across both the north and south frontage road alternatives.

Evaluation Results

This subsection summarizes the rationale behind the dismissal of feasible alternatives based on evaluation results.

- Alternative N1 preserved a vehicular connection from Electric Road to Wolcott Road and a multi-use trail from Electric Road to the crew docks. This alternative was removed from consideration as it was realized that the N1-Modified version, by flipping the location of the trail and roadway, would continue to provide a vehicular connection to the crew docks and golf course through Electric Road, and would provide a new multi-modal connection along the entire northern frontage of the corridor. This proposed frontage road configuration (N1-Modified) will serve all of the existing land uses currently accessing Oregon 34, provide separation between the various user types, and share the same benefits provided under Alternative N1.
- Alternative N2 (including sub-options A, B, and C) was removed from further consideration because it would result in the most out of direction travel. Cyclists and pedestrians would be less likely to use a circuitous route and may choose to stay on the Oregon 34 alignment. Emergency response times for the properties the frontage road would serve would further increase. In addition, the roadways would result in additional impacts to private property and additional pavement requirements. Operationally, there were no significant advantages to Alternative N2 compared to the selected alternative.
- Alternative N3 was screened out as it was decided that Wolcott Road should be the more major roadway and should not be stop-controlled. Alternative N3 also resulted in more impacts to property owners near Wolcott Road than the selected alternative.
- Finally, Alternative N4 was not selected as a Peoria Road realignment would be much more impactful, costly, and inefficient than realigning Wolcott Road, as discussed under the Peoria Road Realignment section. Realignment of Peoria Road would require the removal of homes and businesses, whereas a realignment of Wolcott Road would only impact vacant farmland.
- Alternative S2 was not selected based primarily on its environmental impact (wetland; water quality) relative to the impact caused by the other south frontage road alternative, S1.

Preferred Alternative Selection Process

The development of the preferred frontage road alternative was based on the results of property owner meetings, iterative rounds of Project Team evaluation analyses, and Steering Team consensus approval. This same selection process was utilized to arrive at a set of recommended low-cost safety and operational improvements for mainline ORE 34.