

## MEMO

---

TO: Steve Wheeler

---

FROM: Scott Vanden Bos, Elaine Howard

---

RE: Hood River Heights Urban Renewal Area Public Input – Live and Online

---

DATE: November 30, 2017

---

### **Executive Summary**

Following the conclusion of both the Hood River Heights Urban Renewal Area “live project input” meeting on November 9, 2017 and the online survey which ran through November 22, 2017, Elaine Howard Consulting was asked to compile and analyze the voting data. After consulting with the City Manager, we did so in four ways:

- Blue Dot Ranking
- Weighted Ranking
- Raw Vote Ranking
- Overall Ranking

The first three methods will be described later in this memo. The Overall Ranking for a particular project was determined by adding its rankings in the other three lists, with the lowest scores being the best. The Overall Ranking results for the “Live” meeting were combined with the online survey to give a cross reference. We acknowledge that a cross reference between the “Live” meeting results and online survey results has its pros and cons, but we wanted to provide some way of cross referencing the results, even if the committee decides to weigh other tables in this report more heavily than others. The combined Overall Ranking top ten can be seen later in this memo, but the top five projects are shown in Table 1. It is important to note that the “Guest Added” projects from the “Live” meeting were excluded from the combined Overall Ranking as

they did not have an online counterpart to combine with. Including them would have falsely inflated their overall scores. This is not meant to discount the importance of the “Guest Added” projects from the live meeting. Indeed, several guest added projects were ranked highly in Table 5, which shows the overall rankings for the “Live” meeting alone. The committee should give these projects their due consideration.

Undergrounding the utilities was the clear winner in the combined rankings. However, it should be noted that the projects in the 2, 3, and 4 slots are all streetscape projects. The three high ranking streetscape projects lead to the question of whether some sort of streetscape is in reality a higher priority than undergrounding utilities? The final project rounding out the top five is the C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development.

The most emphasized theme from the Values Board and the Online Free Response Comments was safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. There were many suggestions in how to accomplish this, but again, the overall vision from the concerns voiced was safety. These concerns bring up the question of whether some sort of streetscape project could help address the safety issues in the area?

**Table 1 – Combined Overall Rankings**

Overall Weight Live	Overall Weight Online	Combined Weight	Overall Rank	Projects
5	8	13	1	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)
10	11	21	2	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)
23	9	32	3	C1-District Identity-Street Scape
21	15	36	4	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking
11	33	44	5	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)

## Introduction

After the final project input meeting for the Hood River Heights Urban Renewal Area and consultation with the City Manager, Elaine Howard Consulting was asked to compile the voting data in a few useful representations. The first way to represent the data was by blue dot votes alone, as they were the most important vote. The second way was to weight the votes, giving blue dots a value of three and orange dots a value of one, which mirrors the ratio of dot distribution per person. The third way was by raw votes, unweighted. The final way was an overall rank given by the projects ranking in the previous representations (explained further later). The following is a summary of those representations. A full list of the rankings of each project by each representation can be found at the end of this memo.

## “Live” Blue Dot Rankings

The top ten projects by “Live” blue dot votes can be seen in Table 2. Some trends emerge, for instance four of the top five projects are from Category 3 (as noted by the C3 designation), the most expensive category. As well, three of the top ten projects are “Guest Added Projects”. While the “Two Way Traffic” project is something that is unlikely and would need to be negotiated with ODOT as the owner of the roads, it is still significant that so many people found it important.

**Table 2 – Blue Dot Rankings Live**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot
1A	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	12
1B	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic	12
3	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	9
4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	7
5	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	6
6	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	5
7	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	4
8	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	3
9	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks	3
10	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes	3

## Live Weighted Rankings

The “Live” weighted ranking (3 for blue, one for orange) top ten, as seen in Table 3, is similar to the blue dot rankings, only differing in the order of the projects included in the top ten.

**Table 3 – Weighted Rankings Live**

Rank	Projects	Weighted Ranking
1	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	47
2	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic	47
3	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	41
4	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	41
5	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	31
6	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	28
7	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes	26
8	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	25
9	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks	25
10	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	22

## Live Raw Unweighted Votes

While again, there is some significant shuffling of priority in the order of projects included in the “Live” raw unweighted votes top ten, nine of the projects are from the other two lists, with only one new project coming in at number eight: C1-Public Utilities-Street Trees. The C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority was pushed to number eleven on the raw unweighted votes list, while it had been in the top ten on the two other lists.

**Table 4 – Raw Unweighted Votes Rankings Live**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	Orange Dot	Total Dots
1	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	7	20	27
2	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	4	19	23
3	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	12	11	23
4	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	9	14	23
5	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic	12	11	23
6	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes	3	17	20
7	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	3	16	19
8	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	1	18	19
9	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks	3	16	19
10	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	6	10	16

## Summary – Live Voting

Because there were so many similar projects in the top tens of all representations, and the ordering seemed to be the only varying factor, one final table was prepared to reveal the overall “Live” ranking of the project types. Table 5 takes the rank from each of the prior tables and sums them, with the lowest scores earning the highest priority. Overall it seems that C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines is the clear winner from the “Live” polling. After that, the next three projects are within one point of each other.

**Table 5 – Overall Ranking Live**

Raw	Weight	Blue	Overall Weight	Overall Rank	Projects
3	1	1	5	1	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)
5	2	2	9	2	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic
3	3	4	10	3	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)
4	4	3	11	4	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)
2	5	7	14	5	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park
10	6	5	21	6	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking
7	8	8	23	7	C1-District Identity-Street Scape
6	7	10	23	8	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes
11	10	6	27	9	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority
9	9	9	27	10	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks

## Online Blue Dot Rankings

The top ten “Online” projects by blue dot votes can be seen in Table 6. The blue dot rankings differ from that of the “Live” survey in that there is a more equal spread of projects from Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3.

**Table 6 –Blue Dot Rankings Online**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot
1	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	12
2	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	10
3	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	9
4	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	8
5	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	7
6	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	6
7	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	6
8	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	5
9	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	5
10	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	4



## Online Weighted Rankings

The “Online” weighted ranking (3 for blue, one for orange) top ten, as seen in Table 7, is similar to the blue dot rankings, differing in the order of the projects included in the top ten and the fact that C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk) was included over the other C3 housing project.

**Table 7 – Weighted Rankings Online**

Rank	Projects	Weighted
1	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	59
2	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	52
3	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	51
4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	46
5	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	41
6	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	39
7	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	38
8	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	32
9	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	29
10	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	21

## Online Raw Unweighted Votes

While again, there is some significant shuffling of priority in the order of projects included in “Online” raw unweighted votes top ten, nine of the projects are from the other two lists, with only one new project coming in at number ten: C2-Recreation-Pocket Park.

**Table 8 – Raw Unweighted Votes Rankings Online**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	Orange Dot	Total Dots
1	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	7	30	37
2	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	8	28	36
3	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	12	23	35
4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	9	19	28
5	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	6	21	27
6	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	6	20	26
7	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	5	17	22
8	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	10	11	21
9	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	5	14	19
10	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	2	13	15

### Online Summary

Because there were so many similar projects in the “Online” top ten of all representations, and the ordering seemed to be the only varying factor, one final table was prepared to reveal the overall ranking of the project types. Table 9 takes the rank from each of the prior tables and sums them, with the lowest scores earning the highest priority. The overall winner is C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements, which oddly enough does not even appear on the Live Overall Ranking.

**Table 9 – Overall Ranking Online**

Raw	Weight	Blue	Overall Weight	Overall Rank	Projects
3	1	1	5	1	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements
2	2	4	8	2	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)
1	3	5	9	3	C1-District Identity-Street Scape
4	4	3	11	4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)
8	5	2	15	5	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking
5	6	7	18	6	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces
6	7	6	19	7	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees
7	8	9	24	8	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities
9	9	8	26	9	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages
12	10	11	33	10	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)

## Live and Online Overall Rankings

Even though the live and “Online” voting experience was very different, we still thought it would be useful to combine the “Overall Rankings” Tables from both venues to provide some sort of cross reference. Table 10 takes the overall weight calculated from Tables 5 and 9 and sums them, with the lowest scores earning the highest ranking. The combined “Overall Rankings” are shown below.

**Table 10 – Combined Overall Rankings**

Overall Weight Live	Overall Weight Online	Combined Weight	Overall Rank	Projects
5	8	13	1	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)
10	11	21	2	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)
23	9	32	3	C1-District Identity-Street Scape
21	15	36	4	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking
11	33	44	5	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)
40	5	45	6	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements
14	36	50	7	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park
32	19	51	8	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees
27	36	63	9	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority
45	18	63	10	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces

## **Values Board and Free Response Comments**

The final section of this memo is dedicated to compiling the Values Board comments and the Free Response Comments from the online survey. The Values Board summary can be seen in Table 11. The Free Response Comments can be seen in Table 12.

One theme that emerges from the Values Board is an overall safe-walkable-bikeable district. It is expressed in six different statements on the values board, but the overall vision from those statements is a safe-walkable-bikeable district.

Safety again seems to be a theme in the Online Free Response Comments. There are different suggestions as to how to accomplish safety throughout the district, but the vision from these suggestions is safety. Other suggestions hint at courting local dining businesses. There are two comments that request a space for a farmers' market be put in the district.

**Table 11 – Values Board**

Values Statement	# of Checkmarks	Additional Comments
Two way traffic	14	
Pedestrian friendly street network	9	
Safe travel for kids	9	
Bikeable District	8	
Pedestrian Connections	8	
Intersection Safety (Cars and Pedestrians)	8	
Safe travel for everyone, older folks, pets, likes	6	
Hidden Parking (Aesthetic Streetscape)	5	
Employment Creation	3	
Bio-swales - green design	3	
Parklets for restaurant seating	2	
Multi-level parking structure	2	"No!" "YUCK! NO! You won't need parking in 20 years"
Traffic Circle where 12th and 13th meet	2	
Sight lines with parked cars	1	
Visual Aesthetics	1	
20 mph	1	
Think Big! - apply changes to large sections, involve ODOT to make traffic changes	0	
Good opportunity here, don't just scratch the surface	0	
Opportunities for public art intergration - street drain covers etc.	0	
North South transportation plan	0	
Street Trees	0	

**Table 12 – Online Free Response Comments**

<b>Free Response Comments</b>
<p>Important to make it pedestrian, bike, kid friendly to get around the area both north and south and east and west. Many good community areas already existing (Jackson Park, may st school, ICT trail) but very hard to get around. Too dangerous to send your child across 12th and 13th to get to pool or park. No good way for kids to ride bikes to Rosauers or neighborhood behind Rosauers from May st school area or the alphabet district. Let's make a same way for all citizens to get around this area on foot bike and car.</p>
<p>Please improve cross walks. As the traffic increases the danger to pedestrians also increases</p>
<p>Intersection safety is needed.</p>
<p>I think street parking should be reduced from intersections to improve visability when crossing east/West. It is extremely difficult to see when there is a safe entry point to 12th and 13th. From what your survey seems to ask, a parking lot is the only way to accomplish this</p>
<p>A restaurant, bar, or cafe with a rooftop area to take advantage of the Adams and Hood views would be excellent. An effort to keep the historic charm of existing structures would also be ideal.</p>
<p>We need to make concerted efforts to court dining establishments, bars, coffee shops, etc. instead of less-frequently visited establishments like salons, boutique shops, and the like. Special consideration should be given to courting local businesses and discouraging chains from moving in, in order to continue Hood River's downtown atmosphere into this "secondary downtown area". Efforts should also be made to restore the facades of original historic buildings and remodel the fronts of newer buildings to create the charm associated with an older downtown area.</p>

**Table 12 – Continued**

<b>Free Response Comments</b>
<p>Please prioritize projects that will provide the most benefit and serve the community as a whole, not favoring any one particular interest group. Keep in mind the heights district is a long, narrow district and many of the project examples would not be very applicable throughout the zone so projects selected should be reasonable to implement. For example, Housing and Developer Partnership Initiatives are not what I consider to be a HURA battle. Please consider including lighting- which always improves look/feel of a higher traffic areas, increases safety, and reduces vandalism. It is probably too expensive to change the roads and flow of transportation, but pedestrian connectivity and safety can certainly be improved. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input here.</p>
<p>There should be an effort to increase the amount of non-paved surfaces, the number of trees, and other measures intended to help with stormwater runoff from the heights and also to make the heights more attractive and less a concrete jungle.</p>
<p>Slowing traffic on 12th and 13th is very important. You take your life in your hands trying to walk to destinations up there. If broad sidewalks along with street trees were mentioned, I didn't see that, but it should be there. Slower traffic would also help local businesses. Two-way streets would be better.</p>
<p>Many people ride bikes in our town. Making the area more bicycle and pedestrian friendly would help unite the Heights with downtown and the waterfront. Also, a more unified overall look to the area would be more appealing for residents, shoppers, tourists...as the area is disjointed and looks run-down.</p>
<p>I do not think developers should get a reduction in expenses or any help with paying for infrastructure.</p>
<p>Pocket park on a b c streets to be used for events and farmers market. would love to see a E/W streets (a,b,c) utilized as farmers market special event space (pocket park). Pedestrian safety is really important &amp; not listed, pop out curb cuts would be great. People almost get hit by cars all the time and so so many kids walk to the middle school. Safety and walkability is VERY important and would not brake the bank.</p>



## Appendix – Raw Tables – Showing all projects

**Table 13 – Blue Dot Rankings Live**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	Orange Dot
1A	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	12	11
1B	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic	12	11
3	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	9	14
4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	7	20
5	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	6	10
6	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	5	7
7	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	4	19
8	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	3	16
9	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks	3	16
10	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes	3	17
11	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	2	0
12	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	1	8
13	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	1	18
14	C1-Guest Added Projects-Landscape and clean up	1	3
15	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	1	6

**Table 13 – Continued**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	
16	C2-Housing-Moderate Assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	1	10
17	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bus stops - pull outs and route posting	1	2
18	C2-Guest Added Projects-Robust crosswalks/pedestrian safety	1	4
19	C3-Transportation-Larger surface parking lot with amenities	1	2
20	C1-District Identity-Street Furniture	0	1
21	C1-District Identity-Signage (including large overhead street sign)	0	1
22	C1-District Identity-Façade Work	0	4
23	C1-Housing-Minor assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	0	11
24	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Surface parking lot with amenities (small scale)	0	3
25	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	0	3
26	C3-Guest Added Projects-More effective one way system (with safe intersections)	0	1
27	C3-Guest Added Projects-Traffic calming features	0	1

**Table 14 – Weighted Rankings Live**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Weighted Ranking</b>
1	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	47
2	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic	47
3	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	41
4	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	41
5	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	31
6	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	28
7	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes	26
8	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	25
9	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks	25
10	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	22
11	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	21
12	C2-Housing-Moderate Assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	13
13	C1-Housing-Minor assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	11

**Table 14 – Continued**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Weighted Ranking</b>
14	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	11
15	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	9
16	C2-Guest Added Projects-Robust crosswalks/pedestrian safety	7
17	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	6
18	C1-Guest Added Projects-Landscape and clean up	6
19	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bus stops - pull outs and route posting	5
20	C3-Transportation-Larger surface parking lot with amenities	5
21	C1-District Identity-Façade Work	4
22	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Surface parking lot with amenities (small scale)	3
23	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	3
24	C1-District Identity-Street Furniture	1
25	C1-District Identity-Signage (including large overhead street s	1
26	C3-Guest Added Projects-More effective one way system (with safe intersections)	1
27	C3-Guest Added Projects-Traffic calming features	1

**Table 15 – Raw Unweighted Votes Ranking Live**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	Orange Dot	Total Dots
1	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	7	20	27
2	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	4	19	23
3	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	12	11	23
4	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	9	14	23
5	C3-Guest Added Projects-Two Way Traffic	12	11	23
6	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bike Lanes	3	17	20
7	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	3	16	19
8	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	1	18	19
9	C2-Guest Added Projects-Pedestrian and bike friendly crosswalks	3	16	19
10	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	6	10	16
11	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	5	7	12
12	C1-Housing-Minor assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	0	11	11
13	C2-Housing-Moderate Assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	1	10	11

**Table 15 – Continued**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	Orange Dot	Total Dots
14	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	1	8	9
15	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	1	6	7
16	C2-Guest Added Projects-Robust crosswalks/pedestrian safety	1	4	5
17	C1-District Identity-Façade Work	0	4	4
18	C1-Guest Added Projects-Landscape and clean up	1	3	4
19	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Surface parking lot with amenities (small scale)	0	3	3
20	C2-Guest Added Projects-Bus stops - pull outs and route posting	1	2	3
21	C3-Transportation-Larger surface parking lot with amenities	1	2	3
22	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	0	3	3
23	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	2	0	2
24	C1-District Identity-Street Furniture	0	1	1
25	C1-District Identity-Signage (including large overhead street s	0	1	1
26	C3-Guest Added Projects-More effective one way system (with	0	1	1
27	C3-Guest Added Projects-Traffic calming features	0	1	1

**Table 16 – Blue Dot Rankings Online**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Blue Dot</b>
1	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	12
2	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	10
3	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	9
4	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	8
5	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	7
6	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	6
7	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	6
8	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	5
9	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	5
10	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	4

**Table 16 – Continued**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Blue Dot</b>	<b>Orange Dot</b>
11	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	4	9
12	C1-District Identity-Façade Work	3	11
13	C1-District Identity-Signage (including large overhead street sign)	2	7
14	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	2	13
15	C1-Housing-Minor assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	1	2
16	C3-Transportation-Larger surface parking lot with amenities	1	8
17	C1-District Identity-Street Furniture	0	4
18	C2-Housing-Moderate Assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	0	3
19	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Surface parking lot with amenities (small scale)	0	10



**Table 17 – Weighted Rankings Online**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Weighted</b>
1	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	59
2	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	52
3	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	51
4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	46
5	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	41
6	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	39
7	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	38
8	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	32
9	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	29
10	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	21

**Table 17 – Continued**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Weighted</b>
11	C1-District Identity-Façade Work	20
12	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	19
13	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	19
14	C1-District Identity-Signage (including large overhead street sign)	13
15	C3-Transportation-Larger surface parking lot with amenities	11
16	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Surface parking lot with amenities (small scale)	10
17	C1-Housing-Minor assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	5
18	C1-District Identity-Street Furniture	4
19	C2-Housing-Moderate Assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	3

**Table 18 – Raw Unweighted Votes Ranking Online**

Rank	Projects	Blue Dot	Orange Dot	Total Dots
1	C1-District Identity-Street Scape	7	30	37
2	C3-Public Utilities-Underground power lines (very expensive)	8	28	36
3	C1-Public Utilities-Small scale sidewalk improvements	12	23	35
4	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Streetscape with angled parking (small scope)	9	19	28
5	C2-District Identity-Hardscape connections to local parks and greenspaces	6	21	27
6	C1-Public Utilities-Street trees	6	20	26
7	C3-Recreation-Larger park, 1 acre+, with amenities	5	17	22
8	C3-Transportation-Large streetscape with angled parking	10	11	21
9	C1-District Identity-Building Frontages	5	14	19
10	C2-Recreation-Pocket Park	2	13	15

**Table 18 – Continued**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Blue Dot</b>	<b>Orange Dot</b>	<b>Total Dots</b>
11	C1-District Identity-Façade Work	3	11	14
12	C3-Housing-Significant assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	4	9	13
13	C3-Housing-Land bank acreage for future co-development with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority	4	7	11
14	C2-Transportation and Traffic-Surface parking lot with amenities (small scale)	0	10	10
15	C1-District Identity-Signage (including large overhead street sign)	2	7	9
16	C3-Transportation-Larger surface parking lot with amenities	1	8	9
17	C1-District Identity-Street Furniture	0	4	4
18	C1-Housing-Minor assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	1	2	3
19	C2-Housing-Moderate Assistance to partner with private development (SDC help, construct on-site improvements, e.g. curb, gutter, sidewalk)	0	3	3