

Table 2-1. IAMPs 40 & 43 Improvement Concepts – DRAFT Summary Evaluation Matrix

ID	Location	General Description	Milepoints	Purpose	Traffic Operations and Safety ^{1,2,3}	Basic Roadway Geometry and Right of Way ⁴	Environmental and Land Use ⁵	Cost Opinion ⁶	Related Concepts
ROADWAY SEGMENT IMPROVEMENTS									
RS-1	X Road	Proposed Concept description (widen, add X, modify Y) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of lanes, type of facility (rural, urban) 	X to Y	Mobility, Safety, Freight, Multimodal, Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current ADT Forecast ADT Description of how project impacts operations Description of how project impacts safety Address all related travel modes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing roadway width (ROW) Number of travel lanes, median, shoulder, total ROW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify nearby structures, environmental and/or natural elements, water bodies/flood zone, etc. Check for consistency between plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost Opinion No ROW costs included Applicable notes 	Identify nearby concepts, if any
INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS									
I-1	Roadway X & Roadway Y	Proposed Concept description (ex. install traffic signal or change traffic control when warranted, add turn lane, channelize turn lane)	MP	Mobility, Safety, Freight, Multimodal, Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current intersection control Current and proposed project v/c Forecast and proposed project v/c Identify if warrants are met Safety concerns (ex. Potential change to crash frequently including type and severity) Potential Trigger Address all related travel modes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will geometric improvements be needed Can it be installed within ROW Additional considerations (e.g., restriping) Applicable implementation notes (identified guidelines to follow) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify nearby structures, environmental and/or natural elements, water bodies/flood zone, etc. Nearby access points within influence of queues Check for consistency between plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost Opinion No ROW costs included Applicable notes 	Identify nearby concepts, if any

Notes:

- Traffic operations were evaluated for concepts that were identified to address operational deficiencies. The operational assessment focuses on the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio and level of service (LOS) for the X existing and X future condition.
- At intersections where potential changes in traffic control or turn lanes were considered, the procedures in the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual (APM) were followed. For traffic signal concepts, the ODOT preliminary traffic signal warrants^a were evaluated. For potential turn lanes on the rural sections of the highway, the APM turn lane criteria^b were evaluated. Existing traffic volumes were applied to determine if warrants for traffic signals or criteria for turn lanes might be met today. Year X traffic volumes were also evaluated to determine potential need in the future.
- Some improvements are focused on addressing safety concerns or may address safety as well as traffic operations deficiencies. Crash patterns from the five-year analysis period (X through Y) are discussed for those improvements that address safety.
- Illustrations of basic roadway geometry and right-of-way needs were developed for concepts that involve infrastructure improvements. The drawings approximate roadway centerlines, edge of roadway and right of way using available base mapping.
- Impacts to resources were qualitatively assessed based on the data assembled for the environmental and land use reconnaissance. The level of analysis of the study area is designed to identify those areas judged to have considerable potential for conflict.
- Rough order of magnitude cost opinions were developed using present day dollars and are consistent with standard estimating methods. The estimates include a contingency factor but do not include right-of-way costs. The cost opinions are intended to help differentiate alternatives by approximating the relative costs of each project.

^a Section 7.4 Traffic Signal Warrants, Analysis Procedures Manual, April 2006, Updated January 2011, online reference: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TPAU/docs/A_APM/APM.pdf

^b Section 7.2 Turn Lane Criteria, Analysis Procedures Manual, April 2006, Updated January 2011, online reference: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TPAU/docs/A_APM/APM.pdf. Note: These criteria are also consistent with the criteria in Appendix F of the Highway Design Manual.