



Evaluation Criteria Worksheet

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Randall Road Improvements study is to identify a transportation system improvement that will enhance mobility and local access while addressing safety issues, community values, and environmental impacts within the study area.

Randall Road improvements are needed to:

- Improve regional mobility
- Enhance local access/local system deficiencies
- Improve pedestrian/bicycle mobility
- Accommodate community values/land use planning goals
- Address safety concerns

Evaluation Process

The Evaluation Process for the Randall Road Improvements Study applies progressively more demanding criteria to the range of potential options through a series of three screening levels:

- Level 1. Functional Evaluation: Eliminates options that are not feasible or unrealistic.
- Level 2. Comparative Evaluation: Identifies feasible options that best address the purpose and need. Alternative Packages are formed from combinations of the best options.
- Level 3. Detailed Evaluation: Identifies the Preferred Alternative Package that best addresses the purpose and need and minimizes environmental impacts.

Improvement Options will be identified and categorized by the following four functions:

- Arterial Improvements
- Intersection Improvements
- Pedestrian/Bicycle Mobility Improvements
- Congestion Management System (CMS) Improvements (i.e. Strategies that manage traffic and may support additional capacity such as Incident Management, transit, or ITS elements)

All options will be analyzed based on the above evaluation process.

Guidance for the Development of Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria are a list of measures used to assess the suitability of alternatives (Options/Packages) with the project specifications (Purpose and Need). In this study they will help with the decision-making process, being used to objectively compare options and determine which options best address the Purpose and Need. Criteria are needed for the Functional Evaluation, Comparative Evaluation, and the Detailed Evaluation.

- Criteria should be based on the Purpose and Need.
- Criteria should be more quantitative in nature as opposed to qualitative.
- Criteria should be specific; however, not so specific that too many options are eliminated or there are not enough varying characteristics to effectively compare options.



Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Level Need	Level 1: Functional Evaluation* Eliminates Options that are Not Feasible/Unrealistic (Y/N)				Level 2: Comparative Evaluation Identifies Feasible Options that Best Address Purpose & Need (High/Med/Low)				Level 3: Detailed Evaluation Identifies Preferred Alternative Package that Best Addresses the Purpose & Need, Minimizes Environmental Impacts		
	Arterial Options	Intersection Options	Pedestrian/Bicycle Options	CMS Options	Arterial Options	Intersection Options	Pedestrian/Bicycle Options	CMS Options	Alternative Package 1	Alternative Package 2	Alternative Package 3
Regional Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it compatible with the existing and planned transportation system? (excluding Randall Road) 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arterial Operations (Level-of-Service) Compatibility with the Rakow Road Widening Study Compatibility with the six-lane section south of Harnish Road 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arterial Operations (Level-of-Service) 		
Local Access/Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is access to significant features/roadways maintained? 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intersection Operations (Level-of-Service) Ease of Maintenance Compatibility to Comprehensive Plans of municipalities Integrating with the local road system (Is there opportunity for access on existing local roads?) 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel Time? Ease of Maintenance 		
Pedestrian/ Bicycle Mobility					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated Pedestrian/Bicycle Use Difficulty of crossing (including distance across roadway) Connectivity with regional/local existing/planned facilities 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spacing between pedestrian/bicycle crossings 		
Community Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it compatible with local goals and objectives? Does it accommodate or preserve future transit options? 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of new ROW required (high, med, low) Amount of Sensitive Environmental Impacts (high, med, low) Estimated Capital Cost (high, med, low) Local Agency/ Municipality Support Ease of Construction Potential Relocations (commercial/residential) Parking Impacts Aesthetics/Visual Tax Impacts Will Option attract investment in community 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of new ROW required (acres) Amount of Sensitive Environmental Impacts (acres) Estimated Capital Cost (\$) Public Support Potential Relocations (commercial/residential) Parking Impacts Aesthetics/Visual 		
Safety <i>(Assuming Options Designed To Applicable Standards)</i>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic/Pedestrian/ Bicycle Safety based on option characteristics 						

*Note: An Option is eliminated from evaluation if it does not meet the Functional Evaluation criteria.
 Bold criterion indicates entry has been added since the August 22, 2007 Community Advisory Meeting.



Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

Need \ Evaluation Level	Level 1: Functional Evaluation*				Level 2: Comparative Evaluation				Level 3: Detailed Evaluation		
	Eliminates Options that are Not Feasible/Unrealistic (Y/N)				Identifies Feasible Options that Best Address Purpose & Need (High/Med/Low)				Identifies Preferred Alternative Package that Best Addresses the Purpose & Need, Minimizes Environmental Impacts		
	Arterial Options	Intersection Options	Pedestrian/Bicycle Options	CMS Options	Arterial Options	Intersection Options	Pedestrian/Bicycle Options	CMS Options	Alternative Package 1	Alternative Package 2	Alternative Package 3

*Note: An Option is eliminated from evaluation if it does not meet the Functional Evaluation criteria.