

DRAFT Criteria for Prioritization

PREPARED FOR: Statewide Pedestrian Master Plan TAC
 HDOT

PREPARED BY: Kathleen Chu, CH2M HILL

COPIES: Kathleen Chu, CH2M HILL

DATE: June 3, 2010, revised May 19, 2011

Introduction

This memorandum outlines the process and criteria for prioritization of capital projects and educational and enforcement programs for the Statewide Pedestrian Master Plan. Though these criteria will be applied later in the planning process (during the task related to identification and prioritization of solutions), it is important to develop and weight the criteria early to ensure transparency and to provide clear direction relating to the selection of higher-priority projects and programs. The purpose of the criteria is to evaluate proposed projects or programs by how they address different stakeholder and community values. The criteria will be assigned a weighting indicating importance in coordination with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to determine the collective importance of the criteria to stakeholders. The criteria and weightings will then be validated with the public through a series of public meetings in July and August 2010 and via the project website. This process will be used to show how both committees would prioritize the projects and programs identified as part of the Statewide Pedestrian Master Plan.

FIGURE 1
 Hawaii Statewide Pedestrian Master Plan Schedule



Evaluation Process

The following criteria were derived from the project scope and goals and will be refined based on conversations with the TAC and CAC. These criteria are not listed in any particular order, nor are they weighted at this time. A weighting exercise will be conducted with the TAC and CAC to determine the relative importance of each of the proposed criteria at a later date.

A draft framework is proposed to ensure that projects and programs do not falsely rate higher or lower due to the differences in scope, cost and implementation. It is important to note that the evaluation criteria were created before projects and programs were developed to guarantee that the evaluation criteria are not tailored or biased towards specific projects or programs.

The following criteria will be used to evaluate and provide detailed analysis on proposed projects and programs to determine how each performs based on project goals.

Criteria categories are as follows:

- Connectivity
- Pedestrian Safety
- Environment
- Land and Access Impacts
- Cost
- Property Impacts
- Pedestrian-Oriented Populations

The criteria are intended to show the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed solutions in relation to each other. Comparisons of the scores for the projects are more important than the scores themselves.

Once agreed upon by the TAC and CAC, the criteria will be weighted by importance by the two groups. Following the weighting exercise, ratings will be determined for recommended projects and programs and then weighting will be added to the scores. The process includes five main steps outlined below.

Step 1 - Develop criteria

Step 2 - Assign weights to the criteria

Step 3 - Rate the projects according to the criteria

Step 4 - Calculate results and apply appropriate weights to the criteria

Step 5 - Compare and report results

This process will happen once for each proposed solution.

The results of the evaluation will be used to make recommendations and share with the TAC.

Table 1 describes the criteria and measures to be used to evaluate projects for the Pedestrian Master Plan.

Table 1
Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Project Solutions

Evaluation Criteria Categories	Criteria	Criteria Description	Evaluation Measures
Connectivity	Pedestrian connectivity to pedestrian attractors	<p><i>To what extent does the project provide a direct new or improved connection to pedestrian attractors? Special attention will be given to pedestrian attractors including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Schools -Stadiums -Harbors -Hotel Areas -Commercial districts -High Density Residential Areas -Beaches -Parks -Transit stops -Trails 	<p>The scale for pedestrian connectivity near attractors is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – The project connects more than three pedestrian attractors 3 – The project connects 1-2 pedestrian attractors 0 – The project does not connect with a pedestrian attractor <p>Can also consider criteria based on demand, however, that may be harder to quantify.</p>
	Pedestrian System Gaps	<p><i>To what extent does the project fill a sidewalk gap (or address any area where the sidewalk is in need of repair)? Sidewalk gaps are locations along state highways in urban and rural areas where sidewalks are missing on both sides of the highway.</i></p> <p>In urban areas, the gaps would be for approximately 1/8 of a mile. In rural areas, the gap would be for approximately 1/2 of a mile. On Kauai, the gap may be 1 mile or less.</p>	<p>The scale for addressing pedestrian system gaps is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – Project addresses more than one gap in the pedestrian system 3 – Project addresses one gap in the pedestrian system 0 – Project does not fill a gap in the pedestrian system
Pedestrian Safety		<p><i>To what extent does the project address pedestrian safety? This criterion evaluates the degree to which the recommended projects address pedestrian safety hot-spots.</i></p> <p>There are two thresholds for urban vs. rural areas, as the likelihood of crashes differs depending on the character of the area.</p>	<p>The scale for pedestrian safety is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – Project addresses multiple pedestrian hot-spot areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban – areas with more than five accidents or more than two fatalities Rural – areas with more than three accidents or two fatalities 3 – Project addresses a few pedestrian hot-spot areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban – areas with between one and five accidents or one and two fatalities Rural – areas with between one and three accidents or one fatality 0 – Project does not address hot-spot area
Environment	Minimize impacts to environmental resources	<p><i>Does the project impact mountainous terrains, coastal roads (global warming impacts), cultural and historic resources, threatened and endangered species, or Section 4(f) park resources? This criterion evaluates the degree to which the recommended projects impact known sensitive natural and built environments, including historic resources and park lands.</i></p>	<p>The scale for impacts to environmental resources is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – The project does not impact sensitive environmental resources 3 – The project has few impacts that can be mitigated and/or minimized 0 – The project has impacts that cannot be mitigated or minimized <p>Note that the significance of some environmental resources may be greater than others.</p>
Property Impacts	Minimize impacts to adjacent land	<p><i>To what extent does the project impact property? Acquisition acreage and building impacts are considered land impacts.</i></p>	<p>The scale for impacts to property is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – The project requires no land acquisition or building impacts 3 – The project has minimal impacts—i.e. it requires 1 land acquisition or building impact 0 – The project has significant impacts—i.e. it requires more than 1 land acquisition or building impact <p>May want to consider quantifying this criterion; i.e. impacts are less than an acre, over 10 acres, etc.</p>

Evaluation Criteria Categories	Criteria	Criteria Description	Evaluation Measures
Cost	Cost	<i>How costly is the project?</i> All projects will have costs associated with development and implementation. This criterion evaluates the relative cost of the concepts and the level of investments for the improvements.	The scale for cost is as follows: 5 – The project requires a relatively low level of investment. 3 – The project requires a moderate level of investment. 0 – The concept requires a relatively high level of investment.
Funding Availability	Availability and potential funding sources	<i>To what extent does the project have potential funding sources and how competitive is the project for funding among similar projects?</i> Certain projects may qualify for specialized funding or grant sources that would improve the chances of receiving funds and being constructed.	The scale for availability and potential funding sources is as follows: 5 – The project has multiple potential funding sources, and/or a high likelihood that it would be funded by at least one of the sources. 3 – The project has only one potential funding source and/or the process is competitive and it is unclear if it would receive funds. 0 – The project has no potential funding sources and/or the process is very competitive and it is unlikely to receive funds.
Pedestrian-Oriented Population Areas	Pedestrian-Oriented Population Areas	<i>To what extent does the project serve pedestrian-oriented populations, which include high concentrations of elderly persons, youth, persons earning below the poverty line, and persons with limited access to vehicles, as defined by the US Census?</i> Census and other survey data will be used to determine where these populations exist.	The scale for high pedestrian potential is as follows: 5 – The project addresses areas with multiple concentrations of special concern populations. 3 – The project addresses one area with concentrations of special concern populations. 0 – The project does not address areas with concentrations of special concern populations.

Next Steps

The TAC will review the criteria and provide feedback on the criteria and measures: are they appropriate? The TAC will then weight the criteria. The TAC-recommended criteria and weightings will be shared with the CAC. The TAC will be informed of any CAC recommendations regarding changes. Potential projects and programs will be evaluated based on the revised criteria.