

criteria

analysis

COMMUNITY VALUES

- 1. Miles of new non-motorized facilities**

This corridor has a history of non-motorized users. The community very much wants to promote the use of trails. The build alternatives increase the number of miles of on-street and off-street trails significantly.
- 2. Number of improved crossings of US 24 for non-motorized travelers**

There are no planned improvements to the non-motorized crossings with the No Build alternative. The build alternatives improve 4 to 5 crossings. There is little difference between the Expressway and Freeway alternatives.
- 3. Visual compatibility with the corridor's context and setting**

The major visual differences between the build alternatives and the No Build alternative are the amount of paving and the amount of existing vegetation. The build alternatives provide the greatest opportunity for reducing visual clutter and developing a corridor theme.
The greatest difference between the Expressway and the Freeway is the amount of elevated roadway. The Freeway has 2 times more elevated roadway than the Expressway.
- 4. Level of support from community**

The community comments have been consistent from the beginning of the project with a majority of the comments stating the need to do something. There has been a group of citizen who have expressed their preference toward the No Build alternative. Between the build alternatives there is less vocal or written difference in support. Stakeholders seem split between the Freeway and the Expressway with a slight preference toward the Expressway.
- 5. Compatibility with existing plans**

The No Build alternative is not compatible.
The build alternatives are very compatible.
- 6. Economic viability differences**

Congestion from the No Build will discourage travel to the area and approximately 50% of the current patrons come from outside the primary trade area. While both build alternatives increase the trade area, the Freeway increase the trade area slightly more than the Expressway.

criteria

analysis

ENVIRONMENTAL

- 1. Acres of new impervious surface**

The build alternatives increase impervious surface, which has an impact on water quality. 100% of impervious surface runoff must be treated.
- 2. Residences within 500 feet**

These measure if there is potential for noise and visual impacts to a greater number of homes and historic sites due to the build alternatives. The increase in the number of residences is less than 1% over the No-Build. The number of historic sites within this distance is greater in the Expressway. Noise impacts will be studied for possible mitigation.
- 3. Recorded historic sites within 500 feet**

These measure if there is potential for noise and visual impacts to a greater number of homes and historic sites due to the build alternatives. The increase in the number of residences is less than 1% over the No-Build. The number of historic sites within this distance is greater in the Expressway. Noise impacts will be studied for possible mitigation.
- 4. Acres of parks and recreation resources within 500 feet**

This measures the differences in possible park impacts between the build alternatives. There are no differences between the build alternatives. The build alternatives offer opportunities to enhance parks and trails.
- 5. Acres of new preliminary ROW**

The ROW and relocations are the most preliminary of the measurements because no design has been completed specifically to minimize and avoid ROW acquisitions.
The differences between the build alternatives are insignificant at this time because of the level of design.
- 6. Total number relocations required**

The ROW and relocations are the most preliminary of the measurements because no design has been completed specifically to minimize and avoid ROW acquisitions.
The differences between the build alternatives are insignificant at this time because of the level of design.
- 7. Acres of aquatic ecosystem within preliminary ROW**

The build alternatives have the same number of acres of aquatic habitat within the ROW. The build alternatives offer an opportunity to improve habitat along the creek.
- 8. Impacts to 100-year floodplain**

The build alternatives offer an opportunity to improve the flood plain along the creek.

criteria

analysis

SAFETY, ACCESSIBILITY & MOBILITY

- 1. Number of direct access points**

The Expressway maintains the existing number of access points.
The Freeway decreases the number of access points by 2.
- 2. Percent change in 2030 travel time on US 24**

The build alternatives significantly decrease the travel time on US 24 when compared to the No Build alternative. There is little difference between the build alternatives.
- 3. Percent change in 2030 travel time on Colorado Avenue**

There is little difference in travel time on Colorado Avenue among the 3 alternatives.
- 4. Percent change in 2030 travel time from two blocks south of US 24 to Colorado Ave.**

There is a decrease in the north-south travel times with the build alternatives.
The north south travel times are improved the most with an interchange at the cross street.
- 5. Change in number of inter-modal connections**

There are increased opportunities for inter-modal connections with the build alternatives.
- 6. Operational characteristics of transit system**

The improvement of travel time on US 24 with the build alternatives, also improves the travel time of the bus services on US 24. This improved travel time may discourage transit usage.
- 7. Levels of Service (LOS) at each intersection or interchange**

LOS are unacceptable with the No Build.
The build alternatives provide acceptable LOS that are similar.
- 8. Total hours of delay during the peak hour**

Both build alternatives reduce delay by half over the No Build alternative.
- 9. Change in regional vehicle miles traveled during the average day**

There is approximately a 4% increase in regional vehicle miles with the build alternatives.
- 10. Crash expectancy**

No Build -- highest crash expectancy
Expressway -- low crash expectancy
Freeway -- lowest due to a reduced number of vehicular conflict points.

criteria

analysis

IMPLEMENTATION

- 1. Construction impact on existing traffic**

Construction is slightly easier with the Expressway alternative.
- 2. Conceptual costs**

Due to the level of design the concept cost estimates between the build alternatives are very close to the same. The Freeway alternative is less than 10% more in cost than the Expressway alternative.
- 3. Level of support from local government agencies**

There is a low level of support from the local government agencies for the No Build alternative, as they were the groups that requested a study of the corridor.
The build alternatives meet the agencies' standards for design and operations. Support from the agencies is medium to high and varies by agency. The agencies are committed to seeing the alternatives through to a level of design that shows mitigation for the potential impacts resulting in a high level of support.