

Draft Evaluation of Alternatives
June 6, 2010
US 26: Access to Springwater Community

GOALS	EVALUATION CRITERIA	MEASURE	NO BUILD	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C2	COMMENTS
GOAL 1: Improve access and capacity for all modes of transportation into the Springwater area.	Improve connectivity to the existing and planned bicycle, pedestrian, trail, and street networks.	1 The local street system does or does not connect to the regional system, as shown in the Regional Transportation Plan.					
		2 Meets the adopted bicycle, trail, and pedestrian plans.					
	Improves transportation safety.	3 The intersection of the arterial and Springwater Trail is or is not at grade.					
		4 The alternative improves or minimizes vehicle conflict points.					
		5 Sight distance is better or not as good as the average sight distance of all alternatives.					
		6 Is there a comfortable and safe bike experience?					
		7 Is there a comfortable and safe pedestrian experience?					
		8 Distance from the interchange ramp terminals to the nearest access on the arterial meet state spacing standards (1,320 feet).					
		9 Interchange meets or does not meet planning and design mobility standards (volume-to-capacity ratios), as defined in the Oregon Highway Plan and Oregon Highway Design Manual.					
Crossroads meet state spacing standards.							
Provides adequate capacity.							
GOAL 2: Maintain mobility for regional movements along US Highway 26.	Interchange meets state spacing standards.	10 Distance from the Springwater interchange to the first full movement interchange along US 26 meets state spacing standards: 2 miles (rural) to south and 1 mile (urban) to north.					
	Provides adequate capacity.	11 US 26 through traffic meets or does not meet mobility standards (volume-to-capacity ratios) for 2035.					
GOAL 3: Protect the natural environment while providing for new opportunities for the built environment.	Avoid or reduce impacts to wetlands, streams, and the natural environment.	12 Minimizes the number of wetland acres impacted.					
		13 Minimizes number of stream crossings.					
		14 Minimize impact to ESA Critical Habitat (Johnson Creek Mainstem).					
		15 Minimizes total length of stream crossings.					
		16 Avoids/reduces impacts to identified Environmentally Sensitive Resource Area (ESRA).					
GOAL 4: Enhance community livability and increase the viability of development within the Springwater area.	Support transportation and land use objectives articulated in adopted plans.	17 Meets or does not meet the transportation and land use objectives articulated in the Springwater Community Plan and City of Gresham Comprehensive Plan.					
	Maintain developable parcels.	18 Maximizes the number of large developable parcels for industrial uses.					
GOAL 5: Ensure financial feasibility of the interchange and local circulation options.	Support lower cost projects while providing a safe and efficient facility.	19 Construction cost for the arterial, collector, and interchange is low or high in comparison to the average cost of all alternatives.					
		20 Right of way acquisition cost is low or high in comparison to the average cost of all alternatives.					
		21 Does or does not allow for moderate cost phasing of the alternative (construction only).					
		22 Phasing of the alternative minimizes rework/temporary construction.					
		23 Number of acres acquired.					
		24 Number of fully acquired properties.					
		25 Cost of mitigation is low or high in comparison to the average cost of mitigation.					
TOTAL SCORE							

Ranking Scale	1	2	3
Connections	Does not connect to regional system	Some connection to regional system	All connections to regional system
Plan consistency	Does not meet plan goals	Somewhat meets plan goals	Meets plan goals
Grade	At grade		Not at grade
Conflict points	Includes conflict points		Avoids conflict points
Sight distance	Lower sight distance	Average sight distance	Better sight distance
Bike/Pedestrian experience	Least comfortable	Comfortable	Most Comfortable
Spacing requirements	Does not meet design standards	Design exception is likely	Meets design standards
Mobility standards	<i>Pass or Fail</i>		
Spacing requirements	Does not meet design standards	Design exception is likely	Meets design standards
Mobility standards	<i>Pass or Fail</i>		
Wetlands	Higher acreage of wetland impacts	Average acreage of wetland impacts	Lower acreage of wetland impacts
Stream crossings	Higher number of stream crossings	Average number of stream crossings	Lower number of stream crossings
Stream crossings	Higher total length of stream crossings	Average total length of stream crossings	Lower total length of stream crossings
Natural environment	Higher number of natural environment crossings	Average number of natural environment crossings	Lower number of natural environment crossings
Transportation and land use objectives	<i>Pass or Fail</i>		
Large range of parcel sizes	Does not maximize number large parcels	Somewhat maximizes number of large parcels	Maximizes number of large parcels
Construction cost	High cost in comparison	Average cost in comparison	Low cost in comparison
ROW cost	High	Medium	Low
Phasing	Larger cost compared to the average	Moderate cost compared to the average	Lower Cost compared to the average
Phasing	Does not minimize	Somewhat Minimizes	Minimizes
Acquired Acres	High	Medium	Low
Acquired Properties	High	Medium	Low