

EVALUATION MATRIX

LEGEND				
More Negative Impact		Neutral	More Positive Impact	
--	-	0	+	++



Criteria	
ITEM	UNIT
Mobility (2035 Measures)	*(Legend)
Overall System LOS Rating (Compilation of Intersection and Weaving LOS Measures)	*(Legend)
* Total Delay/Veh (Reduction in Veh. Delay from No-Build: a Positive % is an Improvement)	% Reduction
* Total Travel Time (hr) (Reduction in Travel Time from No-Build: a Positive % is an Improvement)	% Reduction
Access	*(Legend)
Property Access (# Occurrences of Changes to Existing Access)	# of
Increase in Street Crossings (from No-Build: a Negative Numeric Value is an Improvement)	# of
Safety	
Improved Conformance to Horizontal Design Standards	
Provides Protected FM 1810 Turning Movements	Y/N
Property (ROW) Impacts (Developed Property)	
Additional ROW Needed (Acres)	acres
Number of Parcels Impacted	# of
Number of Buildings Displaced	# of
Project Cost and Efficiency	
Construction \$ Cost (Millions)	\$M
Alignment Length	miles
ROW Aquisition Costs	*(Legend)
Construction Impacts	
* Driveways Impacted (Beyond Existing ROW)	# of
Cross-streets Impacted (Beyond Existing ROW)	# of
Impacts to Existing Drainage Structures	# of
Impacts to Major Utilities (Linear and Facility Crossings)	# of
System Compatibility	
Compatibility with Local/Regional Thoroughfare Plans	*(Legend)
Compatibility with Other Projects	*(Legend)
Design Flexibility (Allows for Future Expansion)	*(Legend)
Compatibility with Existing/Planned Development	*(Legend)
Environmental Impacts	
Community Impacts (Community Land Use, Residential, and SEE Impacts)	*(Legend)
Commercial Land Use Impact	# properties impacted
Residential Impacts	# properties impacted
Socio-Economic (SEE)	*(Legend)
Natural Resource Impacts (Sect. 4(f), Sect 404, Floodplain, Biological, Farmland, Agri.)	*(Legend)
Section 4(f) Impacts	# parks impacted
Section 404 impacts	# water crossings
100-Year Floodplain	# acres in floodplain
Biological	% of corridor
Farmland (FPPA)	% of corridor
Agricultural (Crop and Ranch) Land Use Impacts	% of corridor
Cultural Impacts (Historical, Archaeological)	*(Legend)
Historical	# of sites
Archaeological	# of sites
Air Quality Impacts	*(Legend)
Traffic Noise Impacts	*(Legend)
Hazardous Material Site Impacts (Landfills, Abandoned Landfills)	*(Legend)
Agency and Stakeholder Input	
Level of Public Support	*(Legend)
Level of Agency Support	*(Legend)
Overall Alternative Ratings	

First Public Meeting (Preliminary Alternatives)							
Alt 1	Alt 2a (Interim)	Alt 2b (Grade Sep)	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5a (Interim)	Alt 5b (Grade Sep)	Alt 6
++	-	0	+	++	-	0	++
+	-	0	+	+	0	+	+
37%	/	15%	30%	34%	/	20%	36%
13%	/	1%	9%	13%	/	-5%	8%
-	0	-	0	+	0	0	0
1	0	4	1	0	0	2	1
1	0	-1	0	-2	0	-1	0
+	0	++	+	+	0	++	++
0	++	++	0	0	++	++	++
Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
-	-	-	--	-	-	-	-
21.30	17.52	18.11	15.66	10.42	23.68	30.48	32.03
19	9	10	34	28	5	12	18
3	1	1	4	7	0	3	1
--	-	--	--	--	-	--	--
\$32.31	\$6.02	\$39.81	\$38.35	\$36.33	\$7.33	\$38.38	\$30.48
2.25	1.19	2.46	2.14	2.25	1.40	2.69	2.95
--	-	-	--	--	-	--	--
-	0	-	--	--	0	-	-
9	4	7	22	23	1	10	14
1	2	2	2	1	0	1	3
1	0	2	1	1	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
+	+	0	0	+	++	++	++
-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
+	-	0	+	+	++	++	++
+	+	+	-	+	++	++	++
+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	--	-	0	0	-
10	5	5	19	16	2	2	13
8	13	13	19	9	4	4	9
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	5	5	4	2	7	7	6
5.5	4.2	4.2	2.2	2.4	5.7	5.7	0
30%	33%	33%	0%	0%	39%	39%	46%
8%	30%	30%	18%	10%	18%	18%	42%
19%	19%	19%	0%	0%	19%	19%	33%
-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
--	-	-	--	--	-	-	-
0	-	0	--	++	-	-	++
-	0	0	--	++	-	-	+
+	-	0	-	+	-	0	++
0	-	0	-	+	0	0	++

Second Public Meeting (Refined Alternatives)		
No Build	Alt 4	Alt 6
--	++	++
-	+	+
0%	91%	89%
0%	53%	52%
0	0	0
0	0	1
0	0	0
-	+	++
0	+	++
N	Y	Y
0	-	-
0.00	8.77	28.40
0	24	20
0	6	1
0	--	-
\$0.00	\$41.49	\$28.89
0.00	2.46	3.20
0	--	--
0	--	-
0	24	23
0	1	3
0	1	1
0	0	0
-	+	++
--	-	+
-	+	++
0	+	++
-	+	+
0	-	-
0	-	-
0	15	10
0	9	10
0	-	-
0	0	-
0	0	0
0	2	4
0	1.8	0.32
0%	3%	26%
0%	10%	38%
0%	0%	22%
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
-	+	+
0	-	-
0	--	-
-	+	++

To Be Determined

* Two different traffic model platforms were used for the traffic analysis of the Preliminary Alternatives and Refined Alternatives (Synchro and VISSIM, respectively). The differences in model output measures for the Synchro and VISSIM analysis tools are a result of different levels of model size and complexity between the two platforms. There were not any comparative evaluation differences among alternatives for the final traffic analysis scoring of the Preliminary and Refined alternative evaluations.

* The difference in the number of driveways impacted for Alternative 6 from the preliminary alternative evaluation to the refined alternative evaluation is a result of the design modification to create a tangent connection between the proposed FM 1810 and existing FM 1810 to the west. The driveway impacts do not reduce the existing level of access, but would require modifications to existing driveways to maintain access to the new FM 1810 alignment.