

NORTH
Alexan.
Ave. to
Brighton

SOUTH
Alexan.
Ave. to
Brighton

CRITERIA	E1a	E1b	E1c	E2a	E2b	E2c	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	E3e	E4a	E4b	E4c
User Experience														
Ease of Access	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	1	1
Aesthetics	3	1	3	4	1	2	4	2	5	4	4	3	3	3
Comfort	4	2	1	4	2	3	4	3	5	2	3	4	2	3
Directness	5	5	2	5	3	4	5	5	4	2	2	5	3	3
Vehicular conflicts	5	5	0	3	3	4	5	5	2	2	3	3	5	5
Conflicts with pedestrian way	5	5	1	2	2	4	5	5	2	1	4	2	5	5
Subtotal	25	21	11	22	14	21	26	24	22	15	20	22	19	20
Score (out of 1) x 2	1.67	1.40	0.73	1.47	0.93	1.40	1.73	1.60	1.47	1.00	1.33	1.47	1.27	1.33
Environmental and Cultural Impacts														
Wetlands	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Historic resources	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mature Woodland	3	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Wildlife	3	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	4
Subtotal	16	18	20	19	19	19	16	17	19	20	19	19	19	19
Score (out of 1)	0.80	0.90	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.80	0.85	0.95	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Design Attributes														
Encroachments necessary/MOU	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	1
Fire and Safety	2	2	5	5	4	5	2	3	4	5	5	5	1	3
Potential Partnerships	5	2	3	5	5	1	5	3	3	4	2	3	3	2
Distance to residential structures	5	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5
Subtotal	15	12	17	18	16	14	16	14	15	18	13	17	12	11
Score (out of 1)	0.75	0.60	0.85	0.90	0.80	0.70	0.80	0.70	0.75	0.90	0.65	0.85	0.60	0.55
Transportation														
Connectivity to Destinations (Resources, Amenities and Transit)	4	4	4	5	4	5	1	2	4	5	3	5	2	2
Ease of universal public accessibility	5	3	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3
Consistency with regional plans (MCRT/Wayside Trail)	5	5	1	5	5	3	5	5	3	1	1	5	3	3
Impact on existing traffic/transportation	5	5	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	1	4	4
Rail conflicts/proximity	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	1	3	3
Subtotal	23	20	17	22	19	20	18	19	20	18	18	17	15	15
Score (out of 1)	0.92	0.80	0.68	0.88	0.76	0.80	0.72	0.76	0.80	0.72	0.72	0.68	0.60	0.60
Cost														
Range of Construction Costs	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	4	5	4	4	5	1	1
Operations and Maintenance Costs	2	2	3	3	3	4	2	4	5	4	4	5	1	2
Qualify for Funding	4	3	1	4	3	3	4	4	5	2	2	4	3	3
Value Added	4	3	1	5	2	5	4	4	4	2	2	3	3	3
Subtotal	11	10	7	14	11	15	11	16	19	12	12	17	8	9
Score (out of 1)	0.55	0.50	0.35	0.70	0.55	0.75	0.55	0.80	0.95	0.60	0.60	0.85	0.40	0.45
FINAL TOTAL SCORES														
maximum possible score: 6	4.69	4.20	3.61	4.90	3.99	4.60	4.60	4.71	4.92	4.22	4.25	4.80	3.82	3.88
(TOTAL SCORE / 6) x 100 = FINAL AVERAGED SCORE	78%	70%	60%	82%	67%	77%	77%	79%	82%	70%	71%	80%	64%	65%
FINAL SCORE (100 POINT DISTRIBUTION):	67%	37%	0%	81%	26%	63%	63%	70%	81%	37%	41%	74%	15%	19%

MassDOT representatives do not view the routes as equally direct they complained there are too many N/S crossings in the Pare plan

Pare assigned no penalty to the RR crossing at Brighton required with S. route

Channing Rd wall drove higher cost for northern route; Purecoat cost not considered

not clear why north should cost more to maintain

The expectation that north and south are equally fundable is not true with MBTA opposition

no budget for property acquisition on the south (Purecoat building)

Final Averaged Scores ranged from 60 - 82% Those scores were rebased (subtract 60 from all scores) and multiplied x 3.7 to produce a broader range of scores.