

PLEASANT
VALLEY



CITY OF
GRESHAM
OREGON

TRANSPORTATION REFINEMENTS



PLEASANT VALLEY TSP REFINEMENT

>>> Draft Evaluation Criteria

EVALUATION CRITERIA OVERVIEW

This document provides the draft evaluation criteria for the Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement project. The draft evaluation criteria relate to both the project process goals and outcomes goals. The evaluation criteria will form the basis for determining if the final plan addresses the project goals and objectives and will help with comparing and ranking alternatives.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The City of Gresham is beginning a process to review the transportation facilities in the Pleasant Valley Transportation System Plan (TSP) with primary focus on determining how the system can function adequately in the future. Alternatives that include and exclude a potential new arterial extension of SE 174th Avenue to connect between SE Giese Road and SE Jenne Road will be analyzed to understand the impacts of that connection on the overall function of the Pleasant Valley street network. The SE 174th Avenue extension was originally identified in the planning for the Powell-Foster corridors and is included in the current Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list. A preferred alternative will be incorporated into an updated Pleasant Valley TSP and identify the long-term vision for the area as well as near-term solutions to address community concerns and support growth of the area. In addition, it will identify how improvements can be phased and their costs, right-of-way needs, and impacts.

The Pleasant Valley TSP was adopted in 2005. Since that time, planning has occurred by Clackamas County, Portland, and Metro. These plans are based on the Pleasant Valley TSP, which includes an extension of Giese Road between SE Foster Road and SE 182nd Avenue. In addition, it includes the downgrading of Foster Road into a local access street (i.e., retain current two-lane configuration), with the potential to disconnect or vacate the street in the confluence area of Kelley Creek. For example, in 2012, Happy Valley and Clackamas County jointly adopted the 172nd Avenue/190th Drive Corridor Management Plan, including a new arterial connection between SE 172nd Avenue and SE 190th Drive (the “172nd-190th Connector”). That plan considered the constraints of Jenne Road and the 174th Extension and the need to provide a more robust connection to SE 190th Avenue to supplement north/south connectivity.

The Pleasant Valley TSP (PVTSP) Refinement project is needed to reassess the PVTSP based on the most recent transportation plans for the surrounding areas. It will validate planned projects in the TSP and assesses the need and feasibility of the 174th extension north of Giese Road. Figure 1 illustrates the Pleasant Valley Boundary as well as the SE 174th Avenue extension, SE Giese Road extension, and 172nd-190th Connector.

PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

In order to guide this project effort, goals, objectives and evaluation criteria will be established. These elements are defined as follows:

Goals: provide broad aspirations for the project.

Objectives: more refined and focused descriptions of goal statements, describing how a goal can be accomplished.

Evaluation Criteria: provide measurable achievements that help assess progress towards the project objectives.

This project goals and objectives were finalized after review by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). The following presents draft evaluation criteria for review and comment by the TAC and CAC.

Table 1. Final Project Goals and Objectives and Draft Evaluation Criteria

	Goals	Objectives	Evaluation Criteria/Measures
Process Focused	Clear Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Provide a clear plan for the area, including an implementation strategy. ▶ Incorporate and build from previous plans for the study area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Each improvement has an identified cost, timeline, and potential funding strategy (yes/no)
	Community Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Communicate key milestones throughout the project to the public. ▶ Build community support and understanding of how and why the preferred solution was selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Number of workshop participants and virtual workshop comments received (# per activity) ▶ Documentation of how community input shaped the plan (yes/no)
	Feasible Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accurately and clearly identify the feasibility of potential alternatives. ▶ Consider anticipated costs, funding sources, environmental impacts, and permitting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Cost estimates include potential bridge and retaining wall needs (yes/no) ▶ Identification of potential environmental impacts and permitting strategy where necessary (yes/no)
	Coordinated Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions and area partners to provide consistency with other area plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ All neighboring jurisdictions and area partners providing comments on the plan during development (yes/no)
Outcome Focused	Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Incorporate design elements that increase community livability and cohesiveness. ▶ Support an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning to encourage livable and sustainable communities, decrease average trip lengths, and increase accessibility for all modes. ▶ Preserve, restore and enhance natural resources and develop connected habitat corridors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Do the planned improvements increase the number of future destinations accessible by walking, biking, or public transit for residents? (yes/no) ▶ Does the preferred concept minimize impacts or mitigate habitat fragmentation? (yes/no) ▶ Does the preferred concept minimize impacts to or mitigate impacts to sensitive habitat? (yes/no)

	Goals	Objectives	Evaluation Criteria/Measures
	Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Promote efficient movement of people and freight. ▶ Facilitate access to daily needs and services. ▶ Provide transportation options for all modes of travel. ▶ Balance the functional classification system throughout the study area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Does the preferred concept improve operations for vehicles, pedestrians, and/or bicycles? (yes/no) ▶ Does the preferred concept provide new connections to enhance access to daily needs and services for all modes? (yes/no) ▶ Is the preferred concept consistent with the desired spacing of different classifications of roadway? (yes/no)
	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reduce crash frequency and severity of crashes for all modes of travel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Are the projects projected to reduce the frequency and severity of vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle crashes? (yes/no) ▶ Does the preferred concept maximize separation between modes?

NEXT STEPS

The draft evaluation criteria will be reviewed by both the TAC and CAC prior to being finalized. The goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria will be presented at the first public workshop for review and comment by the public. Throughout the project, the goals, objectives and evaluation criteria will serve as a roadmap and measuring stick for assessing project alternatives and to determine if the final plan meets the project objectives.