

Active Transportation Project Prioritization Tool – Ranking Comparison

Original Ranking			Alternative Ranking		
Rank	Project	Score	Rank	Project	Score
1	Midtown Trail	85	1	Butler Bike lane	84
2	Butler Bike lane	84	2	Midtown Trail	81
3	School Area Signals	83	3	School Area Signals	77
4	Ashlan Sidewalk	71	4	McKinley Sidewalk	74
5	L Street Signals	73	5	L Street Signals	68
6	McKinley Sidewalk	61	6	Herndon Trail	55
7	Herndon Trail	59	7	Ashlan Sidewalk	54
8	Copper Trail	51	8	Copper Trail	41
8	Woodward Sidewalk	51	9	Woodward Sidewalk	40

After evaluating nine projects to compare alternative scoring variables, staff found the following:

- Projects ranking in the top three included the same three projects in a slightly different order.
- The biggest shift between the tools was in the McKinley sidewalk moving from a rank of a 6 up to a 4 and the Ashlan sidewalk moving from a rank of a 4 down to a 7. The Herndon trail also shifted up one rank higher in the alternative ranking.
- The recommendation to provide 4 points to areas with ‘no connectivity to key destinations within one mile’ had no impact to any of the projects. It is counter to the ½ mile and ¼ mile parameters set by many grant funding programs and therefore not recommended for inclusion.
- It was discussed that the current feasibility and engineering considerations do not include the total project cost as a prioritization value. Future priority tools may consider weighting costs given the relative trade-offs project costs require.
- If feasibility and engineering considerations are removed from the tool all together, it has minimal impact on project scores overall. However, removing these variables from the tool is symbolic in the sense that it does not remove engineering and feasibility considerations as a variable to overall project feasibility. Due to finite funding and grant requirements that cap infrastructure costs, these variables will need to be evaluated fully when selecting projects.