I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
Partnerships Powered by Context

Feasibility-Level Evaluation

Criteria	How could we measure it?	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Sustainability					
A. Is the alternative compatible with local sustainability plans?	A. (YES/NO)				
B. Is the alternative compatible with the State of Colorado Climate Action Plan?	B. (YES/NO)				
C. Does this alternative preserve future transportation options?	C. (YES/NO)				
Safety					
A. Can this idea improve safety?	A. (YES/NO)				
Healthy Environment					
A. Can adverse environmental impacts be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?	A. (YES/NO)				
B. Can impacts to irreplaceable natural resources (e.g., FENS wetlands or Gold Medal Fisheries) be avoided?	B. (YES/NO)				
Historic Context					
A. Can impacts to historic resources be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?	A. (YES/NO)				
Communities					
A. Is the alternative compatible with local land use plans?	A. (YES/NO)				
Mobility and Accessibility					
A. Does the alternative improve mobility?	A. (YES/NO)				
B. Is this alternative compatible with the existing and planned transportation system?	B. (YES/NO)				
C. Does this alternative provide access for local trips?	C. (YES/NO)				
D. Does this alternative provide for regional mobility?	D. (YES/NO)				
Aesthetics					
No specific aesthetics criteria are used to evaluate alternatives at the feasibility level.					

![I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS — Partnerships Powered by Context]

Concept-Level Evaluation					
Criteria	**How could we measure it?**	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4**
Sustainability					
A. How compatible is the alternative with local sustainability plans?	A. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
B. How compatible is the alternative with the State of Colorado Climate Action Plan?	B. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
C. How well does this alternative reduce maintenance costs?	C. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
D. What is the capital cost of this alternative?	D. ● ◐ ○ (LOW/MEDIUM/HIGH)				
Safety					
A. How well does the alternative reduce the number of or improve hazardous locations?	A. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
B. How well does the alternative follow current design standards?	B. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				

I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
Partnerships Powered by Context

Concept-Level Evaluation					
Criteria	**How could we measure it?**	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4**
Healthy Environment					
A. How well can adverse environmental impacts be avoided?	A. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
B. How well can adverse environmental impacts be minimized?	B. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
C. How well can adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?	C. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
D. Can this alternative be built within the existing right-of-way?	D. ● ◐ ○ (YES/SOMEWHAT/NO)				
E. How well does the alternative contribute toward local watershed initiatives?	E. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
F. How well does the alternative contribute toward the SWEEP MOU goals?	F. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
G. How well does the alternative contribute toward the ALIVE MOU goals?	G. ● ◐ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				

Concept-Level Evaluation					
Criteria	**How could we measure it?**	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4**
Historic Context					
A. How well does the alternative support the communities' investments in and goals for historic resources?	A. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
B. How compatible is the alternative with adopted heritage tourism plans?	B. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
Communities					
A. What is the level of community support?	A. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
B. How compatible is the alternative with adopted local land use plans?	B. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
Mobility and Accessibility					
A. How well does the alternative improve mobility?	A. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
B. How well does the alternative eliminate barriers to non-motorized mobility?	B. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
C. How well does the alternative address cut-through traffic?	C. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
D. How well does the alternative promote efficient freight movement?	D. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				

Concept-Level Evaluation					
Criteria	**How could we measure it?**	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4**
Aesthetics					
A. How consistent is the alternative with the Aesthetic Guidance?	A. ● ◑ ○ (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				

I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
Partnerships Powered by Context

Detailed-Level Evaluation

Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Sustainability					
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation. The sustainability criteria will help determine how well an alternative creates a solution for today that does not diminish resources for future generations.	A. Capital cost of the alternative ($) B. Operations and maintenance costs of the alternative ($)				
Safety					
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation. The safety criteria will help determine how well an alternative is able to enhance safety in the I-70 Mountain Corridor.	A. Number of improved high-accident locations B. Number of ALIVE MOU recommendations implemented C. Number of improved rock slide and avalanche areas				

I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
Partnerships Powered by Context

Detailed-Level Evaluation

Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Healthy Environment					

Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.
 	
The healthy environment criteria will help determine how well an alternative is able preserve, restore, and enhance natural resources and ecosystems.
 	
The healthy environment criteria are a proxy for the overall goal of avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts. For example, a significant increase in acres of new right-of-way impacted indicates that more biological resources may be impacted. These impacts could be mitigated, however, if a solution provides the same access and mobility with significantly fewer acres of new right-of-way. This may be a solution that minimizes or even avoids impacts to biological resources. Some measures, such as hours of LOS C per day, indicate environmental goals for improved noise levels.
	<u>Biological Resources</u>
	A. Acres of riparian habitat disturbed
	B. Total acres of new right-of-way. Of the new right-of way:
	   • Number of acres of impact to indicator species habitat
	   • Number of acres of native vegetation
	   • Number of acres of 6f
	   • Number of acres of 4f
	   • Number of acres of already disturbed land
	   • Number of acres of wetlands
	C. Number of ALIVE MOU recommendations implemented
	
	<u>Air Quality</u>
	A. Hours of delay at signalized intersections
	
	<u>Noise</u>
	A. Hours of LOS C per day
	
	<u>Mine Waste</u>
	A. Cubic yards of disturbed mine waste
	
	<u>Threatened and Endangered Species</u>
	A. Number of acres of T&E habitat disturbed
	
	B. Number of new habitat connections
	
	<u>Water Resources</u>
	A. Number of SWEEP MOU goals that are advanced
	
	<u>Wetlands</u>
	A. Number of acres of wetlands impacted (quality of wetlands to be noted).
	
	<u>Recreation Resources</u>
	A. Number of acres of recreation resources impacts. Including:
	   • Number of acres of 4f
	   • Number of acres of 6f
	   • Number of acres of publicly owned lands
	   • Number of acres of streams				

I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
Partnerships Powered by Context

Detailed-Level Evaluation					
Criteria Measures	**How could we measure it?**	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4**
Historic Context					
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation. The historic context criteria will help determine how well an alternative contributes to and is compatible with the human-made past that creates the corridor's sense of place and is the foundation of corridor's character.	A. Number of potentially eligible historic properties impacted				

Detailed-Level Evaluation

Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Communities					
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation. The criteria related to communities will help determine how well an alternative respects the individuality of communities and promotes their viability.	A. How well does this alternative support current and ongoing economic investments in the community? (GOOD/FAIR/POOR) B. How well is this alternative supported by the community? (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				
Mobility and Accessibility					
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation. The mobility and accessibility criteria will help determine how well an alternative addresses local, regional, and national travel while providing reliable, efficient interconnectivity between systems and communities.	A. Projected LOS and average peak-hour speed B. Projected ADT at key locations C. Projected number of person trips on alternate modes D. Projected number of miles of new transit route miles E. Projected number of person trips across the Continental Divide				

I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
Partnerships Powered by Context

Detailed-Level Evaluation

Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Aesthetics					
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation. The Aesthetics criteria will help determine whether an alternative was inspired by the surroundings, protects scenic integrity, and incorporates the context of the I-70 Mountain Corridor.	A. How well does this alternative support the Aesthetic Guidance Goals? (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)				