

# Chula Vista Light Rail Corridor Improvements

Project Study Report

SANDAG / City of Chula Vista

## APPENDIX A: Results of Criteria Weighting

### E Street

The results for weighting of the criteria at E Street were as shown in Table A1 below. Minimize utility impacts was eliminated for E Street because it was determined that there would be no major utility impacts at this location.

**Table A1: Criteria Weighting for E Street**

<i>Criteria</i>								<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>A. Constructability</b>	B	A	D	A	F	G	H	2	7.1%
<b>B. Customer Experience</b>	B	D	B	F	G	H		3	10.7%
<b>C. ROW Impacts</b>		D	E	F	G	H		0	0%
<b>D. Imp. Site Efficiency</b>			D	F	G	D		5	17.9%
<b>E. Long Term Maintenance</b>				F	G	H		1	3.6%
<b>F. Visual Impacts</b>					F	H		6	21.4%
<b>G. Enhance Ped. Movement</b>						G		6	21.4%
<b>H. Improve Comm. Acceptance</b>								5	17.9%
								28	100%

# Chula Vista Light Rail Corridor Improvements

Project Study Report

SANDAG / City of Chula Vista

---

## H Street

The results for weighting of the criteria at H Street were as shown in Table A2 below. Visual Impacts were eliminated from this location because it is not a view corridor like E Street. Any visual impacts were included in the community acceptance category. Enhance pedestrian movement was eliminated for H Street because there is less of a problem with pedestrians jaywalking in this location.

**Table A2: Criteria Weighting for H Street**

<i>Criteria</i>							<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>A. Constructability</b>	B	A	D	A	A	G	3	<b>14.3%</b>
<b>B. Customer Experience</b>	B	D	B	B	G		4	<b>19.0%</b>
<b>C. ROW Impacts</b>		D	E	F	G		0	<b>0%</b>
<b>D. Imp. Site Efficiency</b>			D	D	D		6	<b>28.6%</b>
<b>E. Long Term Maintenance</b>				E	G		2	<b>9.5%</b>
<b>F. Minimize Utility Impacts</b>					G		1	<b>4.8%</b>
<b>G. Improve Comm. Acceptance</b>							5	<b>23.8%</b>
							21	100%

# Chula Vista Light Rail Corridor Improvements

Project Study Report

SANDAG / City of Chula Vista

---

## Palomar Street

The results for the criteria weighting at Palomar Street were as shown in Table A3 below. The visual impacts category was eliminated here because it is not a view corridor like E Street. Any visual impacts were be included in the community acceptance category.

**Table A3: Criteria Weighting for Palomar Street**

<i>Criteria</i>							<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>A. Constructability</b>	B	C	A	A	A	G	3	<b>14.3%</b>
<b>B. Customer Experience</b>	B	D	B	F	G		3	<b>14.3%</b>
<b>C. Minimize Utility Impacts</b>		D	C	F	G		2	<b>9.5%</b>
<b>D. Imp. Site Efficiency</b>			E	F	D		3	<b>14.3%</b>
<b>E. Long Term Maintenance</b>				F	E		2	<b>9.5%</b>
<b>F. Enhance Pedestrian Movement</b>					F		5	<b>23.8%</b>
<b>G. Improve Community Acceptance</b>							3	<b>14.3%</b>
							21	100%