

Segment 1 Evaluation Summary

US 169 to CR 2

Concept Alternatives		Corridor Function			Right-of-Way	Safety			Public Preference	Minimize Cost
		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		
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

Scoring Criteria

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

Concept Alternatives		Corridor Function			Right-of-Way	Safety			Public Preference	Minimize Cost
		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		
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
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

Scoring Criteria

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

Concept Alternatives		Corridor Function				Safety			Public Preference	Minimize Cost
		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	Improve pedestrian/bicycle comfort/safety		
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

Scoring Criteria

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

Concept Alternatives		Corridor Function			Right-of-Way	Safety			Public Preference	Minimize Cost
		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		
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	2	4	1	5	5	3	4
Concept B	Two Lane Urban with Sidewalk/Trail	5	1	5	4	1	5	5	1	2
Concept C	Three Lane Rural	3	5	2	2	5	1	1	3	3
Concept D	Three Lane Rural with Trail	3	5	3	1	5	5	5	5	2
Concept E	Three Lane Urban with Sidewalk/Trail	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	1	1
Weight Factor		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2

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

Scoring Criteria

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 1 Evaluation Summary

CR 2 to US 169

Concept Alternatives	Corridor Function			Right-of-Way	Safety			Public Preference	Minimize Cost	Cost
	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			
No Build (Pavement Resurfacing)	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	5	\$2,750,000
Three-Lane with Two-Lane (CR 2 to CR 101)	2	2	3	3	4	1	1	3	3	\$7,220,000
Three-Lane	3	3	3	3	4	1	1	4	2	\$10,080,000
Three-Lane with Northbound Passing Lane (CR 2 to CR 101)	4	4	3	3	5	1	1	5	2	\$10,080,000
Three-Lane with Two-Lane (CR 2 to CR 101) with Trail	2	2	3	2	4	5	5	3	3	\$7,520,000
Three-Lane with Trail	3	3	3	2	4	5	5	4	1	\$10,380,000
Three-Lane with Northbound Passing Lane (CR 2 to CR 101) with Trail	4	4	3	2	5	5	5	5	1	\$10,380,000

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

Weight Factor	1	1	1	2	1	0.5	0.5	2	2
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	---	---

Scoring Criteria

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 2 Evaluation Summary

CR 90 to CR 2

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

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

Weight Factor	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0.5	0.5	2	2

Scoring Criteria

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

Concept Alternatives	Corridor Function			Right-of-Way	Safety			Public Preference	Minimize Cost	Cost
	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			
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

Total	Customized Weight
17	27
34	37
35	35

Weight Factor	1	1	1	2	1	0.5	0.5	2	2
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	---	---

Scoring Criteria

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