Segment 1 Evaluation Summary

US 169 to CR 2

			Corridor Function		Right-of-Way		Safety			
С	Concept Alternatives	Reduce congestion	Increase travel speed	Reduce access	Minimize property impacts	Improve intersection safety (i.e.turn lanes, R-cut, roundabout, passing lanes)	Improve bicycle connectivity	Improve pedestrian/ bicycle comfort/ safety	Public Preference	Minimize Cost
No Build - Two Lane	No Build (Two Lane Pavement Resurfacing)	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	5
Concept A	Two Lane Pavement Resurfacing with Trail	1	1	1	4	1	5	5	1	4
Concept B	Three Lane	3	3	3	3	4	1	1	3	3
Concept C	Three Lane with Trail	3	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	2
Concept D	Four Lane Divided	5	5	5	1	5	1	1	3	2
Concept E	Four Lane Divided with Trail	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	1	1
	Weight Factor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
		-	_	-	-	_	_	_	_	_

Total	Customized Weight
17	23
23	28
24	30
33	40
28	33
33	35

Good; meets criteria well	5
Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5	4
Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics	3
Less desirable; considering criteria	2
Poor; fails to meet criteria	1

Segment 2A Evaluation Summary

CR 2 to CR 26 (227th Street) and Hwy 83/CR 60 to CR 90

			Corridor Function		Right-of-Way		Safety			
С	Concept Alternatives	Reduce congestion	Increase travel speed	Reduce access	Minimize property impacts	Improve intersection safety (i.e.turn lanes, R-cut, roundabout, passing lanes)	Improve bicycle connectivity	Improve pedestrian/ bicycle comfort/ safety	Public Preference	Minimize Cost
No Build - Two/Four Lane	No Build (Two/Four Lane Pavement Resurfacing)	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	5	5
Concept A	Two/Four Lane Pavement Resurfacing with Trail	1	1	1	4	1	5	5	1	4
Concept B	Three Lane	3	3	3	3	4	1	1	4	3
Concept C	Three Lane with Trail	3	3	3	3	4	5	5	4	2
Concept D	Four Lane Divided	5	5	5	1	5	1	1	3	2
Concept E	Four Lane Divided with Trail	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	1	1
					1					
	Weight Factor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2

Total	Customized Weight
21	31
23	28
25	32
32	38
28	33
33	35

Good; meets criteria well	5
Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5	4
Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics	3
Less desirable; considering criteria	2
Poor; fails to meet criteria	1

	Segment 2B Evaluation Summary									
	CR 26 (227th Street) to Hwy 83/CR 60									
			Corridor	Function		Safety				
C	Concept Alternatives	Reduce congestion	Potential for reduction in speeds	Reduce access	Improve corridor aesthetics	Increase greenspace between roadway and trail/sidewalk	Improve pedestrian crossing safety by reducing crossing distance	DICVCIA COMBINE	Public Preference	Minimize Cost
No Build - Four Lane Divided	No Build (Four Lane Pavement Resurfacing)	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5
Concept A	Four Lane Divided with Sidewalk Improvements	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	5	5
Concept B	Four Lane Urban Divided with Sidewalk	3	4	1	5	5	5	5	3	1
	Weight Factor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2

Total	Customized Weight
15	21
21	31
32	36

Good; meets criteria well	5
Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5	4
Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics	3
Less desirable; considering criteria	2
Poor; fails to meet criteria	1

Segment 3 Evaluation Summary Mapleton Right-of-Way **Corridor Function** Safety Public Improve Improve Minimize **Concept Alternatives** Potential for Improve business Improve corridor Minimize property Improve bicycle pedestrian/ Preference Cost intersection reduction in (i.e. provide turn aesthetics impacts safety (i.e. turn connectivity bicycle comfort/ lanes) speeds lanes) safety No Build (Two Lane No Build - Two 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 5 Lane Pavement Resurfacing) Two Lane Pavement Resurfacing 2 4 5 5 3 4 Concept A with Trail Two Lane Urban with 5 5 4 5 5 2 Concept B Sidewalk/Trail Concept C Three Lane Rural 3 5 2 2 5 1 1 3 3 3 5 3 1 5 5 5 5 2 Concept D Three Lane Rural with Trail Three Lane Urban with Concept E 5 5 5 3 5 5 5 1 1 Sidewalk/Trail

1

1

1

1

1

2

2

Total	Customized Weight
17	23
26	33
29	32
25	31
34	41
35	37

Scoring Criteria

1

rell 5	Good; meets criteria well
15 4	Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5
ics 3	Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics
ria 2	Less desirable; considering criteria
ria 1	Poor; fails to meet criteria

1

Weight Factor

Segment 1 Evaluation Summary CR 2 to US 169 Safety Corridor Function Right-of-Way Improve intersection Improve Public Minimize **Concept Alternatives** Reduce Reduce Minimize property safety (i.e.turn pedestrian/ Preference Cost Increase Improve bicycle congestion travel speed access impacts lanes, R-cut, connectivity bicycle comfort/ roundabout, safety passing lanes) No Build 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 (Pavement Resurfacing) Three-Lane with Two-Lane 2 2 3 3 4 1 3 3 (CR 2 to CR 101) Three-Lane 3 3 3 3 4 1 1 4 2 Three-Lane with Northbound Passing Lane 3 3 5 1 5 2 1 (CR 2 to CR 101) Three-Lane with Two-Lane (CR 2 to CR 2 2 3 2 4 5 5 3 3 101) with Trail Three-Lane with Trail 3 3 3 2 4 5 5 4 Three-Lane with Northbound Passing Lane 3 2 5 5 5 1 5 4 (CR 2 to CR 101) with Trail Weight Factor 1 1 2 1 0.5 0.5 2 2

Total	Customized Weight
16	27
19	30
20	32
23	37
26	32
26	32
29	37

Cost

\$2,750,000

\$7,220,000

\$10,080,000

\$10,080,000

\$7,520,000

\$10,380,000

\$10,380,000

Cooling officia	
Good; meets criteria well	5
Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5	4
Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics	3
Less desirable; considering criteria	2
Poor; fails to meet criteria	1

CR 90 to CR 2 Safety **Corridor Function** Right-of-Way Improve Improve intersection Public Minimize Increase Improve **Concept Alternatives** Cost pedestrian Reduce safety (i.e.turn Preference Cost Reduce Improve corridor | Minimize property greenspace Increase pedestrian/ crossing safety by congestion travel speed aesthetics impacts lanes, R-cut, between roadway bicycle comfort/ access reducing crossing roundabout, and trail/sidewalk safety distance passing lanes) No Build \$5,840,000 1 1 1 5 1 5 (Pavement Resurfacing) Three-Lane (CR 57 to CR 2) Two-Lane with Trail (CR 90 to Hwy 83/CR 60) 3 3 5 \$27,170,000 Four-Lane Rural Section (Hwy 83/CR 60 to CR 57) Roundabout at CR 57 Three-Lane (CR 57 to CR 2) Two-Lane with Trail (CR 90 to Hwy 83/CR 60) Four-Lane Urban Section (Hwy 83/CR 60 to CR 26) 3 3 3 3 \$40,740,000 Four-Lane Rural Section (CR 26 to CR 57) Roundabout at CR 57 Three-Lane (CR 57 to CR 2) Two-Lane with Trail (CR 90 to Hwy 83/CR 60) 3 3 4 3 4 3 \$27,720,000 Four-Lane Rural Section (Hwy 83/CR 60 to CR 57) Continuous T at CR 57 Three-Lane (CR 57 to CR 2) Two-Lane with Trail (CR 90 to Hwy 83/CR 60) Four-Lane Urban Section (Hwy 83/CR 60 to CR 26) 3 3 4 3 \$41,290,000 Four-Lane Rural Section (CR 26 to CR 57) Continuous T at CR 57 Weight Factor 1 0.5 0.5 2 2

Segment 2 Evaluation Summary

Total	Customized Weight
18	29
24	39
38	44
25	38
39	45

Good; meets criteria well	5
Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5	4
Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics	3
Less desirable; considering criteria	2
Poor; fails to meet criteria	1

Segment 3 Evaluation Summary										
Mapleton										
	Corridor Function Right-of-Way Safety		-Way Safety							
Concept Alternatives	Potential for reduction in speeds	Improve business (i.e. provide turn lanes)	Improve corridor aesthetics	Minimize property impacts	Improve intersection safety (i.e. turn lanes)	Improve bicycle connectivity	Improve pedestrian/ bicycle comfort/ safety	Public Preference	Minimize Cost	Cost
No Build (Pavement Resurfacing)	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	5	\$1,500,000
Three Lane-Rural with Trail	3	5	3	1	5	5	5	5	2	\$7,080,000
Three-Lane Urban with Trail	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	1	1	\$8,220,000
Weight Factor	1	1	1	2	1	0.5	0.5	2	2	

Total	Customized Weight
17	27
34	37
35	35

Good; meets criteria well	5
Acceptable; but relatively less desirable than 5	4
Moderate; no distinguishing characteristics	3
Less desirable; considering criteria	2
Poor; fails to meet criteria	1