

Memorandum

To: Cheyenne On-Street Bicycle Plan and Greenway Plan Update Bicycle Advisory Committee

From: Rory Renfro and Kim Voros, *Alta Planning + Design*

Date: August 29, 2011

Re: Working Paper #9 Project Evaluation Criteria

The Cheyenne On-Street Bicycle Plan and Greenways Plan Update will focus implementation efforts where they will provide the greatest community benefit. While all projects represent important steps for improving Cheyenne's on-street bikeway and Greenway system, limited financial resources require a prioritization mechanism.

This memorandum describes evaluation criteria that can be used to evaluate on-street bikeway and greenway infrastructure improvements (Table 1) and supportive programs (Table 2). These criteria can be considered together to evaluate projects based on the relative benefit, 'neutral,' 'moderate,' or 'high' benefit score assigned to each criterion. The goal is to develop three tiers of project priorities so that Cheyenne can focus funding and funding applications on the highest priority projects. The resulting ranked project lists should be considered 'living documents' and should be reviewed regularly to confirm that they reflect Cheyenne's current priorities.

Table 1. Infrastructure Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Definition
Suitability for bicycling with and without improvements	To what extent is the on-street facility already suitable for cycling?
Closing Gaps	To what degree does the project fill a missing gap or overcome a barrier in the current system?
Safety and Comfort	Can the project improve walking and bicycling conditions at locations with perceived or documented safety issues? Does the project make cycling and trail use comfortable for all users?
Access & Mobility/Land Use	How many user generators does the project connect within a reasonable walking or cycling distance? Are adjacent land uses supportive of walking and bicycling? To what degree will the project generate users?
Multi-modal Connections	To what degree does the project integrate cycling into the existing transit system?
Has Community Support	Project was mentioned through the public planning process.
Cycling Level of Service	To what extent does the project increase the Cycling Level of Service? Will the improvement provide facilities in a neighborhood received a low score for the quality of the existing cycling experience during Cycle Zone Analysis.
Serves an Immediate Safety Need	To what extent the project improve conditions at locations with a history of reported bicycle crashes.

Criteria	Definition
Low Stress Facility	To what extent can cyclists expect to feel safer and more comfortable because the stress of negotiating with motorists for space in the roadway has been reduced or eliminated by design.

Table 2. Programmatic Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Definition
Reach	How many Cheyenne residents will be reached through this program concept?
Resources needed	How resource-intensive will this effort be, considering staff time, materials, and other expenses?
Reaches new audiences	To what extent will this effort help Cheyenne residents who currently do not bicycle give bicycling a try?
Buy-in from partners	To what extent will this effort require coordination and pro-active support from agency and community partners beyond the City of Cheyenne and the Cheyenne MPO?
Community need/feedback	To what extent have stakeholders and Cheyenne community members identified this program concept as a need, or to what extent have community members specifically requested this program?

Criteria Measurement

Each evaluation criterion will be assigned relative level of benefit shown in Table 3. Tables 4 and 5 show how each criterion will be measured.

Table 3. Prioritization Rating Criteria

Benefit Ranking	
Neutral Benefit	○
Moderate Benefit	◐
High Benefit	●

Table 4. Application of Infrastructure Project Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Ranking	Measurement
Closing Gaps	●	Project is within a 1/8 mile of existing on-street bikeway or Greenway. The network gap may be any length.
	◐	Project is within a 1/4 mile of existing on-street bikeway or Greenway. The network gap may be any length.
	○	Project within a 1/2 mile of existing on-street bikeway or Greenway. The network gap may be any length.
Safety & Comfort	●	The project will create an off-street facility separated from motor vehicle traffic.
	◐	The project will improve facilities where at least one reported bicycle crash has occurred in the last ten years

Criteria	Ranking	Measurement
	<input type="radio"/>	The project is on-street and does not have a history of reported bicycle crash
Access & Mobility/ Land Use	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Within 1/8 of existing multi-use, commercial or institutional land uses, schools, parks open space, or other activity center
	<input type="radio"/>	Within 1/4 of existing multi-use, commercial or institutional land uses, schools, parks open space, or other activity center
	<input type="radio"/>	Within 1/2 of existing multi-use, commercial or institutional land uses, schools, parks open space, or other activity center
Multi-modal Connections	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Project within 1/8 mile of transit service
	<input type="radio"/>	Project within 1/4 mile of transit service
	<input type="radio"/>	Project within 1/2 mile of transit service
Community Support	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Project was mentioned in during the public involvement process
	<input type="radio"/>	
	<input type="radio"/>	Project was not mentioned during the public involvement process
Improves Cycling Level of Service	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Project is located in a zone scoring in the lowest tier during Cycle Zone Analysis
	<input type="radio"/>	Project is located in a zone scoring in the middle tier during Cycle Zone Analysis
	<input type="radio"/>	Project is located in a zone scoring in the highest tier during Cycle Zone Analysis
Suitability for bicycling with and without improvements	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Proposed facility is off-street or on a local/neighborhood roadway
	<input type="radio"/>	Project is on-street and the roadway is classified as a minor arterial or collector
	<input type="radio"/>	Facility requires additional work to create a safe and comfortable cycling facility
Serves an immediate safety need	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Project identified as a location of previously reported within 1/16 mile of reported bicycle crash
	<input type="radio"/>	Project within 1/8 mile of reported bicycle crash
	<input type="radio"/>	Project is not near a crash location
Low Stress Facility	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Proposed improvement is a bicycle boulevard or off-street facility
	<input type="radio"/>	Proposed improvement is a buffered bike lane
	<input type="radio"/>	Proposed improvement is a bike lane, shared lane marking, or shoulder bikeway

Table 5. Application of Programmatic Project Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Ranking	Measurement
Reach (# of people reached)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Likely to reach over 50 people annually
	<input type="radio"/>	Likely to reach 25 – 50 people annually

Criteria	Ranking	Measurement
	<input type="radio"/>	Likely to reach fewer than 25 people annually
Resources needed	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Low budget/staff time required
	<input type="radio"/>	Medium budget/staff time required
	<input type="radio"/>	High budget/staff time
Reaches new audiences	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Primarily reaches residents who never or very infrequently use bicycles
	<input type="radio"/>	Primarily reaches residents who may bicycle occasionally; helps them increase the frequency of use
	<input type="radio"/>	Primarily reaches residents who already use bicycles regularly
Buy-in from partners	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Low level of partner coordination required; can largely be completed by City/MPO
	<input type="radio"/>	Moderate level of agency/community partner coordination needed (e.g. steering committee will be needed, but City/MPO feel confident that they can execute the partner involvement and complete the project)
	<input type="radio"/>	High level of agency/community partner coordination needed (e.g. City/MPO are not the appropriate lead agency; significant support and participation from other groups will be required to successfully complete the project)
Community need/feedback	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	High level of community feedback related to this program concept and/or the problem this program addresses (e.g. numerous members of the public brought up the program concept; BAC members stated that the program is a priority)
	<input type="radio"/>	Moderate level of community feedback related to this program concept and/or the problem this program addresses (e.g. several community members brought up this program/need in public meetings or through the BAC)
	<input type="radio"/>	Low level of community feedback related to this program concept and/or the problem this program addresses