

Draft Evaluation Criteria for the NW Northfield Highway Corridor Study

PREPARED FOR: NW Northfield Highway Corridor Study Project Management Team
 PREPARED BY: CH2M HILL
 DATE: January 8, 2008

The table below documents suggested evaluation criteria for transportation system alternatives that will be developed and considered for addressing the needs of the Northwest Northfield Highway Corridor Study.

DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA		
Criteria	Methodology/Unit	Suggested Threshold
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AND TRAFFIC ISSUES		
<p>Functional System Designations of Roads—roads are grouped or classified based on the primary type of trips the roadway is intended to serve.</p>	<p>Ensure highways are functionally classified to appropriately reflect the mobility and access needs of the traveling public.</p>	<p>Consistency with city/county/state plans. Consistency between roadway function and land use characteristics based on Rice and Dakota County guidelines. Both counties generally use the following road classifications for urban areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • principal arterials • minor arterials • collectors • local streets
<p>Traffic Operations—Level of Service (LOS) is reported as “letter grades” with A representing uncongested conditions, C representing average congestion, and F representing extreme congestion. LOS is applied to both sections of road, and at intersections.</p>	<p>Estimate the Level of Service (LOS) for proposed transportation alternatives to show at what LOS each facility type (e.g., 2-lane, 3-lane, etc.) will operate.</p>	<p>LOS D boundary is consistent with Rice County’s goal.</p>
<p>Safety</p>	<p>Evaluation alternatives based on known safety relationships with vehicle speeds, density of access, facility design types.</p>	<p>Subjective—to be determined</p>

DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA								
Criteria	Methodology/Unit	Suggested Threshold						
<p>Access—is any opportunity for vehicles to enter mainline travel from public streets and commercial or residential property. County and City transportation plans provide preferred density of accesses along county highways.</p>	<p>The Transportation System Alternatives will be evaluated to determine if they meet the accepted access density guidelines of the Counties. This is generally measured in # of accesses per mile.</p>	<p>Access Guidelines</p> <p>Full Access</p> <p>Restricted Access²</p> <p>Private Access</p>	Urban Core		Urbanizing		Rural	
			Minor Arterial	Collectors	Minor Arterial	Collectors	Minor Arterial	Collectors
			1/8	1/8	1/4	1/8	1/2	1/2
			1/8	1/16	1/8	1/8	1/4	1/4
			Permitted ¹		Not Permitted	Permitted ¹	Permitted ¹	
			1 Subject to Conditions					
2 Movements include Right-in/outs or 3/4 access								
Note - Guidelines apply to County roadways only. Mn/DOT has access authority on all								
<p>Supporting Road System Spacing—CSAH 23 is classified as a minor arterial highway; therefore, it is important for CSAH 23 to provide access to other distributing roads.</p>	<p>Suggested spacing (based on Dakota and Rice County Transportation Plans &/or Metropolitan Council County Plans):</p>	Spacing Guidelines						
		Urban			Rural			
		Principal Arterials	Minor Arterials	Collectors	Principal Arterials	Minor Arterials	Collectors	
		6-12 miles	1-2 miles	1/2-1 mile	6-12 miles	3-5 miles	As needed	
Local Roads for both urban and rural areas as needed								
<p>Roadway Network Connectivity— between places where trips originate and their destinations</p>	<p>Each transportation alternative will be subjectively evaluated to determine if they provide a desired level of continuity and connectivity.</p>	<p>Provide a connective and continuous supporting road system</p>						
<p>Roadway Network Continuity—of routes with road.</p>								
COMMUNITY ISSUES								
<p>Compatibility with Existing and Planned Land Uses</p>	<p>Evaluate of how well existing transportation system and proposed transportation alternatives will accommodate future land uses, based on estimates from the <i>ITE Trip Generation Manual</i></p>	<p>Subjective—to be determined</p>						

DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA		
Criteria	Methodology/Unit	Suggested Threshold
<u>Assignment of Local and Regional Trips to Appropriate Roads</u>	Evaluate how well transportation alternatives serve the surrounding land uses.	Consistency with adopted functional classification goals.
<u>Consistency with County, City, Township, and College Plans</u>	Compatibility with county/city/township/state/other community resource goals	Subjective—to be determined
<u>Multi-Modal Goals</u>	Compatibility with multi-modal transportation system (pedestrian and bicycle trails, transit) plans	Subjective—to be determined
<u>Potential for Phased Implementation</u>	Determine if the proposed transportation alternatives have the ability to be phased in over a period of time.	Subjective—to be determined
POTENTIAL IMPACTS		
<u>Right-of-Way Impacts</u>	#r of Parcels affected and acres of new right-of-way needed for each proposed transportation alternative.	Subjective—to be determined
<u>Farmland Impacts</u>	Number of farms and number of acres affected.	Subjective—to be determined
<u>Wetland Impacts</u>	Number of wetland acres adversely affected based on a review of National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data.	Subjective—to be determined
<u>Heath Creek Watershed</u>	Any encroachment into this sensitive area	Subjective—to be determined