

APPENDIX G

Evaluation Criteria and Measures

Background Information on Evaluation Measures
Revised July 12, 2002

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
1: Improve Transportation Performance	
1a: Maximize Traffic Utilizing the Bypass	
	1. Percentage of year 2025 traffic utilizing the bypass for the following trips:
	(a) Local traffic (origin and destination within the study area). <i>The amount of local traffic that could be moved from Ore. 99W to the bypass could vary between <1% and 12%. The Oregon Highway Plan seeks to limit local access to roads designed for through traffic.</i>
	(b) Regional traffic (either the origin or destination is inside the study area and the other outside the study area). <i>Analyses of the Build Alternatives show that between 15% and 47% of regional traffic could move from Ore. 99W to the bypass. This means the alternatives have substantially different traffic patterns on Ore. 99W.</i>
1b: Maximize Through Traffic Utilizing the Bypass	
	1. Percentage of year 2025 <i>through</i> traffic utilizing the bypass (for trips with origin and destination outside the study area). <i>Measures the success of removing year 2025 through traffic from Ore. 99W. Safe and efficient movement of through traffic is critical for state highways.</i>
	2. Number of daily freight trips on bypass with origin and/or destination outside the study area. <i>Large truck traffic (does not include local vans or smaller delivery trucks) on Ore. 99W provides little economic value for Newberg and Dundee while contributing to downtown area congestion. Among the Build Alternatives there is a variance of nearly 2,000 truck trips per day.</i>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
1c: Meet the Project's Minimum Transportation Performance Threshold	
	<p>1. Number of locations on Ore. 99W in Newberg that do not meet the minimum transportation threshold (year 2025 volume/capacity).</p> <p><i>This measure is a count of the number of intersections in Newberg that would not meet the traffic performance standards set for this project. Because none of the Build Alternatives would affect traffic congestion to such a degree, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>
	<p>2. Number of locations on Ore. 99W through Dundee to the Ore. 99W/Ore. 18 intersection that don't meet the minimum transportation threshold (year 2025 volume/capacity).</p> <p><i>This measure is a count of the number of intersections in Dundee and to the south that would not meet the traffic performance standards set for this project. Because none of the Build Alternatives would affect traffic congestion to such a degree, the Project Management Team believes that this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>
1d: Improve Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity and Circulation	
	<p>1. Average daily traffic (ADT) on Ore. 99W in downtown Dundee.</p> <p><i>This represents a 24-hour average of traffic for the year 2025. Less traffic provides better conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists, such as fewer lanes to cross and less waiting time between signals.</i></p>
	<p>2. Number of lanes on Ore. 99W inside Dundee's urban growth boundary.</p> <p><i>Ore. 99W through Dundee now has three lanes. Depending on the alternative, as many as five lanes would be needed to meet the project's minimum threshold. Additional lanes affect how easily pedestrians and bicyclists can cross Ore. 99W.</i></p>
	<p>3. Average daily traffic (ADT) on Ore. 99W in downtown Newberg.</p> <p><i>This represents a 24-hour average of traffic for the year 2025. Less traffic provides better conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists, such as fewer lanes to cross and less waiting time between traffic signals.</i></p>
	<p>4. Number of lanes on Ore. 99W inside Newberg's urban growth boundary.</p> <p>(a) Lanes on downtown couplet</p> <p><i>For all Build Alternatives, the number of lanes on Ore. 99W in downtown Newberg would not change. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>
	<p>(b) Lanes east of downtown couplet.</p> <p><i>For all Build Alternatives, the number of lanes on Ore. 99W east of the downtown couplet would not change. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes that this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
1e: Provide for Transit Options	<p>1. Build Alternative does or does not provide for, regular transit service on Ore. 99W through study area. <i>As distinguished from the No Build Alternative, all Build Alternatives provide for regular transit service. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>
1f: Improve Movement and Efficiency of Through Traffic	
<p>1. Travel time from Rex Hill to Ore. 99W/Ore. 18 (minutes). <i>Measures efficiency of movement for through traffic, including freight traveling between Portland and the coast. The Build Alternatives differ by only 3 minutes.</i></p>	
	<p>2. Dollars and travel time saved per day (24 hours) for determination of cost/benefit of each Build Alternative.</p>
<p>(a) Time saved in hours. <i>Differences among the Build Alternatives are about 7%. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>	
<p>(b) Value of time saved in dollars. <i>This measure uses Average Daily Traffic, travel time and an estimated value of travel time to calculate the value of time saved from each Build Alternative. Differences among the Build Alternatives are about 7%. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>	
<p>3. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) calculated for bypass routes and Ore. 99W. <i>The Year 2025 daily vehicle miles traveled ranges from 424,310 to 685,547. There is a noticeable difference among the Build Alternatives. A higher number of vehicle miles traveled could indicate a less efficient transportation system.</i></p>	
1g: Minimize Impacts to Other Major Roads	
	<p>1. Average Daily Traffic for:</p>
<p>(a) Ore. 219 <i>There are no significant differences among the Build Alternatives. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>	
<p>(b) Ore. 240 <i>There are no significant differences among the Build Alternatives. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>	
<p>(c) Northern Arterial in Newberg <i>There are only minor differences (1,000 vehicles) among the Build Alternatives. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>	

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
2: Protect Human Health and Safety	
2a: Minimize Adverse Impacts to Health	
	<p>1. Number of listed hazardous material sites in corridor. <i>The state and federal governments maintain lists of hazardous materials sites. The number of sites per corridor in the Build Alternatives varies between three and six. Hazardous materials sites can usually be mitigated.</i></p>
	<p>2. Number of potential air quality “hot spots” (estimate based on intersection volume/capacity). <i>These are based on Year 2025 congestion at intersections along Ore. 99W. In the Build Alternatives, there are one or two intersections where additional studies to determine air quality issues are needed. Design changes (such as adding a turn lane) may mitigate these impacts.</i></p>
	<p>3. Number of residences/sensitive properties potentially affected by noise increases. <i>Estimates decibel levels and applies noise standards. While the number varies considerably among the alternatives, mitigation measures are available.</i></p>
2b: Maximize Safety	
	<p>1. Accident Potential on Ore. 99W and Bypass Alternatives. (Note: The lower the index number, the lower the potential for crashes. The crash potential index is a relative weighting of the crash rates and the future traffic exposure for highway conditions that could result from the NDTIP. The index is a qualitative estimate of how the traffic on the roadways will be distributed between types of facilities that have different historical crash characteristics.)</p>
	<p>(a) Ore. 99W <i>The index number varies from 0.32 to 0.41 among the Build Alternatives. This is a minor difference.</i></p>
	<p>(b) Bypass <i>The maximum index number for any Build Alternative is only 0.30. This is a minor issue.</i></p>
	<p>2. Total corridor (vehicular) capacity to handle emergency evacuations. <i>The Build Alternatives vary in the number of vehicles they could handle in the event of an emergency. Between 97,000 and 146,000 vehicles could move through the Newberg-Dundee area in one day.</i></p>
	<p>3. Miles of bypass in excess of 3% grade. <i>Uneven grades can affect traffic safety, particularly under inclement weather conditions. The number of miles above 3% grade varies among the Build Alternatives from about 4 miles to 5 miles.</i></p>
	<p>4. Potential number of bridges on bypass. <i>Bridges frequently freeze sooner than adjacent roads. The number of bridges in the Build Alternatives differs only by two.</i></p>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
2b: Maximize Safety (Cont.)	5. Ice-related accident potential (miles of bypass over 200 feet in elevation). <i>The higher it is in elevation, the more susceptible a bypass would be to icing. Two hundred feet is the approximate elevation at the foot of Rex Hill. The range is from 0.15 miles to 4 miles.</i>
	6. Average time (minutes) from fire station to accident sites. (a) Newberg <i>Response time among Build Alternatives varies from 3.2 minutes to 7 minutes.</i>
	(b) Dundee <i>Response time among Build Alternatives varies from 2.2 minutes to 5.3 minutes.</i>
3: Improve Environmental Quality	
3a: Minimize Impacts to the Natural Environment	
	1. Riparian areas directly affected-acres. <i>Riparian areas provide very important habitat for a variety of fish and wildlife species. The Build Alternatives vary from 17.4 acres to 25 acres of potential impact.</i>
	2. Area of wetlands directly affected, categorized according to quality-acres. <i>Wetlands provide a variety of functions, including fish and wildlife habitat, habitat for threatened and endangered plants and animals, flood storage, groundwater recharge, and water quality improvement. Biologists classified the wetlands according to high, medium, and low values by evaluating dominant plants, human disturbance, and potential presence of rare, threatened or endangered species. Wetlands in the project area that would be disturbed can be mitigated.</i>
	(a) High value <i>Very few high-value wetlands were found in the study area.</i>
	(b) Medium value <i>Build Alternatives would disturb between 1 acre and 3.2 acres.</i>
	(c) Low value <i>Build Alternatives would disturb between 10.7 acres and 22.9 acres.</i>
	(d) Total <i>Build Alternatives would potentially disturb between 13.0 acres and 23.9 acres of wetlands.</i>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
3a: Minimize Impacts to the Natural Environment (Cont.)	3. Fish habitat directly affected (stream length in feet). <i>Fish habitat is further divided into high, medium, and low quality based on a rating system for 15 physical features. Effects to fish habitat can be mitigated; for example, by building bridges that clear-span the creeks.</i>
	(a) High value <i>Between 140 feet and 456 feet could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	(b) Medium value <i>Between 409 feet and 4,953 feet could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	(c) Low value <i>Between 2,148 feet and 4,365 feet could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	(d) Total <i>Between 3,541 feet and 5,775 feet of fish habitat could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	4. Wildlife habitat directly affected-acres. <i>Six types of wildlife habitat were categorized. The acreage was divided into high, medium, and low value, based on whether the vegetation is native, how much it was disturbed by human activities, how complex the habitat is and whether special status species are likely to use the area. Displacement of wildlife habitat can be partially to fully mitigated.</i>
	(a) High value <i>Between 27.4 acres and 43.2 acres could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	(b) Medium value <i>Between 54.8 acres and 83.8 acres could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	(c) Low value <i>Between 256.2 acres and 319.3 acres could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>
	(d) Total <i>Between 362.9 acres and 418.9 acres of wildlife habitat could be affected by the Build Alternatives.</i>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
3a: Minimize Impacts to the Natural Environment (Cont.)	5. Threatened and endangered species affected. <i>The two measures listed below consider potential disturbance to threatened and endangered fish and bald eagles. Impacts to these species usually can be partially to fully mitigated.</i>
	(a) Threatened and endangered species habitat-acres <i>The Build Alternatives have between 93 acres and 211 acres of threatened and endangered species' habitat within 300 feet of the corridors. This covers areas that could have either direct or indirect impacts to species. Impacts can be mitigated.</i>
	(b) Distance in miles from known threatened and endangered species locations <i>This measures the distance from the Build Alternatives to a bald eagle nest. Eagles search for food more than a mile from their nests.</i>
	6. Wildlife habitat connectivity impacts (Number of wildlife corridors crossed). <i>Animals use wildlife corridors to move through the project area. Corridors provide important connectivity between habitat types. Impacts can be partially mitigated.</i>
	7. Water quality/quantity impacts. Acres of additional impervious surface. <i>A new road is likely to increase the amount of impervious surface area. Without mitigation, water quality would likely decrease and increased runoff to streams would occur. However, ODOT projects like the NDTIP mitigate for these impacts.</i>
	8. Tree cover lost-acres. <i>This measure considers impacts to all areas that have tree cover. Trees provide habitat and visual buffers.</i>
3b: Minimize Impacts to the Built Environment	
	1. (a) Number of known archaeological sites. <i>The project area has not undergone a rigorous archaeological survey, and no sites are recorded in the state's database. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i>
	(b) Acres of high probability areas (areas likely to have archaeological sites). <i>The entire project area was favorable for prehistoric settlement and is likely to have archaeological sites. Therefore, the difference between the Build Alternatives is one of total acreage.</i>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
3b: Minimize Impacts to the Built Environment (Cont.)	2. (a) Number of potential historic sites directly affected by Build Alternatives <i>Historic sites need to be at least 50 years old to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The number of potential historic sites that could be affected by the Build Alternatives varies from 6 to 40. Sites can often be avoided by minor shifts to the alignment. In some cases, historic houses can be moved.</i>
	(b) Number of potential historic districts directly affected by Build Alternatives. <i>No potential historic districts were identified within any of the alternative corridors. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes that this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i>
	3. Number of dwellings and businesses within 50 meters of the Build Alternatives. <i>The higher the number of buildings, the higher the potential for visual impacts. The number of dwellings and businesses within 50 meters of the bypass routes range from 183 to 278. Visual impacts can often be mitigated by vegetative screening and other techniques.</i>
	4. Acres of land currently designated residential in comprehensive plans, within 50 meters of the Build Alternatives. <i>The range of acreage for land currently designated residential is 306 to 590. Impacts can be mitigated.</i>
	5. Number of potential sites protected by Section 4(f).
	(a) Historic sites <i>Between 6 and 40 historic sites could be affected by the Build Alternatives. The number is likely to be reduced through minor alignment shifts.</i>
	(b) Acres of park/refuge <i>Between 0.5 and 1.1 acres of park land could be displaced by the Build Alternatives. This is likely to be reduced through minor shifts to the alignment. Park land that would be displaced can be mitigated through replacement with property that serves the same recreational function.</i>
	6. Acres of existing land use and comprehensive plan designations.
	(a) Existing land use <i>Highway facilities would occupy land now in other uses, displacing those uses. The alternatives vary in the total amount of and existing uses of the land.</i> (1) Total (2) Residential (3) Commercial/Industrial (4) Forest, Park, Riparian (5) Agricultural (6) Vacant (7) Other (includes public/quasi-public, road right of way)

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
3b: Minimize Impacts to the Built Environment (Cont.)	<p>(b) Comprehensive plan designations <i>In some cases, the land the highway facilities would occupy has comprehensive plan designations that differ from existing uses. These vary among the Build Alternatives, as well as in the amount of urban and rural land they would use.</i></p> <p>(1) Total (2) Urban Residential (3) Urban Industrial (4) Other Urban (5) Agricultural (Exclusive Farm Use) (6) Rural Residential (7) Other Rural (8) Total Urban (9) Total Rural</p>
	<p>7. Number of potential minority/low income housing units displaced. <i>The minimum and maximum numbers are the sum of estimated minority, Hispanic, and low-income household displacements. "Minority" refers to race, and "Hispanic" refers to ethnic heritage. The numbers represent worst-case displacements because the categories can overlap. Actual totals may be less than half. The minimum number includes six minority, four Hispanic, and two low-income households. The maximum number includes 13 minority, 17 Hispanic, and 27 low-income households. The percentages of minority and Hispanic households displaced are lower than their percentages in Yamhill County as a whole. With the exception of one Build Alternative, the percentage of low-income households the alternatives would displace is higher than the percentage of low-income households in Yamhill County.</i></p>
	<p>8. Acres of vacant and redevelopable land that are in or adjacent to Urban Growth Boundaries and within one kilometer driving distance from a bypass interchange or intersection. <i>This measure estimates the amount of property that could be subject to pressure to convert to highway-oriented commercial uses. The amount of acreage varies among the Build Alternatives from 955 acres to 2,423 acres. Potential impacts can be mitigated.</i></p>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
4: Maximize Benefits to Community Economics	
4a: Minimize Impacts to Business	
	<p>1. Number of businesses displaced. <i>Between five and 22 businesses could be displaced by the Build Alternatives.</i></p>
	<p>2. Acres of exclusive farm use land outside the urban growth boundary. <i>Exclusive farm use designation protects high quality farm land. Exclusive farm use land receives additional protection outside of Urban Growth Boundaries. The Build Alternatives could displace between 178 acres and 227 acres. Agricultural land taken out of production is difficult or impossible to replace.</i></p>
	<p>3. Farm operation impacts (high/medium/low). <i>This measure addresses operational impacts to farm property after construction of a bypass. Impacts include poor access to farm fields or remaining farm parcels that are too small for economic success. This measure will be rated as "high, medium, or low" impact.</i></p>
	<p>4. Impacts to businesses that rely on drive-by traffic for customers (Number of businesses with substantially less [more than 30% less] drive-by traffic). <i>Considers adverse effects on businesses that rely on through traffic. Results among the Build Alternatives vary from four to 66 businesses. Impacts can be partially mitigated.</i></p>
	<p>5. Number of freight trips on Ore. 99W:</p>
	<p>(a) Newberg <i>This measures the number of daily freight trips in downtown Newberg (Year 2025). The Build Alternatives vary from 1,400 to 1,850.</i></p>
	<p>(b) Dundee <i>This measures the number of daily freight trips in downtown Dundee (Year 2025). The Build Alternatives vary considerably, from 525 to 1,250.</i></p>
	<p>6. Congestion on Ore. 99W (hours of congested traffic per day). <i>Congested conditions on Ore. 99W are not expected to occur under any of the Build Alternatives. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>
	<p>7. Average peak period time delay per vehicle (for Ore. 99W). <i>Travel time was calculated for the length of time to drive from East Newberg to Dayton. The time differences between the Build Alternatives vary by 2 minutes. Therefore, the Project Management Team believes this evaluation measure is not a useful tool for choosing the best Build Alternative.</i></p>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
4a: Minimize Impacts to Business (Cont.)	8. Fuel consumed due to bypass designs and delay per vehicle on bypass and Ore. 99W. <i>Reduced congestion under the Build Alternatives would reduce fuel consumption. This compares to 55,000 gallons per day consumed under the No Build Alternative.</i>
	9. Acres of vacant and redevelopable land inside urban growth boundaries that are within one kilometer of traveling distance of a bypass interchange or intersection. <i>Evaluates access to buildable lands (i.e. commercial, industrial, waterfront etc.).</i>
5: Improve Social/Cultural Quality	
5a: Minimize Community Fragmentation	
	1. Fragmentation by bypass (number of locations where access and circulation are potentially affected). <i>By definition, "limited access" highways block access to and from local streets. The exceptions are overcrossings and undercrossings. This blockage can fragment communities. Among the Build Alternatives, the highest number of potential local streets that could be blocked is nearly twice that of the lowest number. Impacts can be partially mitigated with additional crossings.</i>
	2. Fragmentation due to traffic in Newberg (vehicle trips on Ore. 99W). <i>Traffic on Ore. 99W in Newberg fragments the community by delaying crossings at intersections without traffic signals. The highest volume of traffic resulting from the Build Alternatives is nearly 40 percent higher than the lowest volume.</i>
	3. Fragmentation due to traffic in Dundee (vehicle trips on Ore. 99W). <i>Traffic on Ore. 99W in Dundee fragments the community by delaying crossings at intersections with no traffic signals. The highest volume of traffic resulting from the Build Alternatives is nearly twice the lowest volume of traffic.</i>
5b: Minimize Impacts to Community Character	
	1. Residential displacements (estimated number of displacements for each Build Alternative). <i>This estimates the number of residences that would be displaced. Displacements range from 111 to 175, depending on the Build Alternative. Mitigation includes relocation assistance and compensation for property.</i>
	2. Changes in community atmosphere (Qualitative information, high/medium/low, measured by potential changes in jobs/housing ratio per community). <i>Addresses whether the Build Alternatives would lead to a change in community character. For example, would the project create "bedroom communities" for workers that commute to work in the Portland metropolitan area?</i>
	3. Effects of traffic on downtown character of Newberg (Number of vehicle trips on Ore. 99W). <i>Considers how congested conditions deter community use of downtown. Average daily traffic in Newberg varies from 28,000 to 39,000.</i>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
5b: Minimize Impacts to Community Character (Cont.)	4. Effects of traffic on downtown character of Dundee (number of vehicle trips on Ore. 99W). <i>Considers how congested conditions deter community use of downtown. Average daily traffic in Dundee varies from 13,000 to 25,000.</i>
	5. Acres outside urban growth boundary within a 45-minute commute to Portland metro area. <i>This measure was selected to help understand how much land outside urban growth boundaries could be subject to development pressure. For the Build Alternatives, this amount varies from 19,901 acres to 51,089 acres.</i>
	6. Number of access points to each bypass, inside and outside the urban growth boundary.
	(a) Inside <i>Pressure to convert land use is measured by the number of access points. From zero to three accesses would be provided inside the urban growth boundary. Impacts can be mitigated.</i>
	(b) Outside <i>Pressure to convert land use is measured by the number of access points. From two to three accesses would be provided outside the urban growth boundary. Impacts can be mitigated.</i>
5c: Enhance Community Integrity	
	1. Enhancement of community integrity (qualitative information, high/medium/low, with input from local jurisdictions). <i>Evaluates how well the alternatives improve or detract from a sense of community. "Integrity" refers to completeness and unity.</i>
6: Minimize Total Project Costs	
6a: Estimate Cost of Alternatives	
	1. Estimated total cost of construction and right of way. <i>The Build Alternatives are estimated to cost between \$187.2 and \$233.6 million (in current dollars).</i>

Objectives and Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Measures; Comments (in italics)
7: Maximize Likelihood of Implementation	
7a: Regulatory Approval Likelihood	
	<p>1. Wetland permitting (high/medium/low). <i>Considers the likelihood that the Build Alternatives would receive state and federal permits for fill and removal in wetlands. These permits are issued by Oregon's Department of State Lands and the US Army Corps of Engineers.</i></p>
	<p>2. Section 4(f) approval (high/medium/low). <i>Considers the likelihood that the Build Alternatives would receive approval by the Federal Highway Administration under Section 4(f), a law that protects parks, historic properties and wildlife refuges.</i></p>
	<p>3. National Historic Preservation Act (high/medium/low.) <i>Considers the likelihood that the Build Alternatives would satisfy requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act to protect important historic properties and archaeological sites. The Oregon State Historic Preservation Office advises ODOT regarding this law.</i></p>
	<p>4. Endangered Species Act (high/medium/low). <i>Considers the likelihood that the Build Alternatives would satisfy requirements of the Endangered Species Act. The project must not jeopardize the continued existence of species that are listed as threatened or endangered.</i></p>
	<p>5. Water quality certification (high/medium/low). <i>The project will require water quality certification, demonstrating that potential impacts to water quality are mitigated.</i></p>
	<p>6. Environmental Justice (high/medium/low). <i>The project must not cause disproportionate impacts to protected groups, such as low income or minority communities.</i></p>
	<p>7. Goal exception/plan amendment/ability to meet land use regulations (high/medium/low). <i>The likelihood that any Build Alternative qualifies for a goal exception for construction of a bypass and/or interchanges on agricultural land outside urban growth boundaries. The relevant local jurisdiction approves this.</i></p>
7b: Stakeholder Support Likelihood	
	<p>1. Overall stakeholder support (high/medium/low). <i>This will be summarized after review of the public comment recorded during the Newberg-Dundee Transportation Improvement Project.</i></p>

