

Attachment C:

Evaluation Criteria Back-up information

Screening Workshop, 1 of 3: County Highway Corridor Option Fatal Flaw Analysis

The following steps document the Fatal Flaw Screening Analysis Methodology used by the consultant to develop recommendations for eliminating some corridor options from the universe of potential County Highways.

Step 1: Identification of Fatal Flaw Criteria—Completed by Consultant

Identify fatal flaws by evaluating corridor options against these criteria:

1. *Community Planning & Identity*—Is the alignment consistent with transportation and land use elements of area plans?
2. *Natural Resources & Environment*—Does the corridor support opportunities to manage and expand recreational and natural areas?
3. *Transportation Network Design & Function*—Does the corridor provide direct connections to the County transportation system?

Step 2: Identification of Corridors with Fatal Flaws—Completed by Consultant

“No” answers to any of the above questions led the consultant team to preliminarily recommend eliminating a corridor option from further consideration. The results of this process are documented in accompanying mapping and evaluation tables.

Step 3: PMT Review of Screening Recommendations—Completed by PMT

The PMT will review and discuss the Consultant’s preliminary recommendations. This discussion should address the following topics for corridors under consideration for elimination:

1. Does the PMT agree that the corridor has the stated fatal flaw?
2. Are any future opportunities lost by not building this roadway corridor? If yes, identify?
3. Would any stakeholder groups or communities consider this corridor as a potential local collector street in the future?
4. Does the PMT agree that this corridor should be removed from further consideration as a County Road?

Step 4: Incorporate PMT Recommendations—Completed by Consultant

The Consultant will update the mapping and the evaluation table based on the outcome of discussion at the May 22, 2009 PMT meeting. Remaining corridors will be evaluated in the 2nd screening exercise which will focus on additional screening criteria, and identification of potential corridor refinements and mitigation opportunities.

PMT Meeting #5 Discussion on First Screening of Candidate Corridors – North/South Corridors

| North/South Corridors | Corridors Screened Out for Fatal Flaw | Opportunities Diminished | Notes | Remaining Corridors for Second Screening |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Hwy. 3 to Akron Group</p> <p>1. Hwy. 3 2. Hwy. 3 to Akron 3. Hwy. 3 to Biscayne 4. Hwy. 3 - Biscayne - Akron 5. Biscayne to Akron 6. West edge WMA to Akron 7. Annette to Akron</p> | <p>1. Hwy. 3 – Inconsistent with Plans 3. Hwy. 3 to Biscayne – Inconsistent with Plans 7. Annette to Akron – Inconsistent with Plans; Presents Land Management Challenges</p> | <p>Corridor 1 maximizes use of the Hwy. 3 corridor (but lacks reserve capacity in developed Rosemount) System continuity north of the study area needs future consideration</p> | <p>No expansion of existing Hwy. 3 is planned, Corridors 2 and 4 have potential conflicts with aggregate mining Corridors 2, 4, and 5 present a wide range of opportunities for refinement UMore Concept Plan emphasizes Akron Avenue as a major corridor north of 170th St. Corridors 5 and 6 provide direct access to the County Park Wetlands are prevalent in Corridor 6</p> | <p>2. Hwy. 3 to Akron 4. Hwy. 3 - Biscayne - Akron 5. Biscayne to Akron 6. West edge WMA to Akron</p> |
| <p>Blaine to Clayton Group</p> <p>8. Blaine to Blaine: Direct 9. Blaine to Blaine: Reroute 10. Blaine-Clayton-Blaine 11. Clayton-Blaine 12. Clayton</p> | <p>8. Blaine to Blaine: Direct – Inconsistent with WMA Plan; Presents Land Management Challenges 12 Clayton – Lacks Adequate Continuity with County System</p> | <p>Direct route of Blaine Avenue (Corridor 8) would be shortest travel path, likely lower construction costs, and optimal for safety Corridor 12 maximizes reuse of Clayton Avenue</p> | <p>UMore Concept Plan emphasizes Blaine Avenue as a major corridor north of 170th St. Corridors 9, 10, and 11 present a wide range of opportunities for refinement Corridor 9 runs through a wetland complex in the WMA's eastern portion Clayton Avenue bridge over Vermillion River is recent construction – but perhaps lacks desirable amenities (e.g. wildlife crossing)</p> | <p>9. Blaine to Blaine: Reroute 10. Blaine-Clayton-Blaine 11. Clayton-Blaine</p> |



PMT Meeting #5 Discussion on First Screening of Candidate Corridors – East/West Corridors

| East/West Corridors | Corridors Screened Out for Fatal Flaw | Opportunities Diminished | Notes | Remaining Corridors for Second Screening |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| CSAH 42 to CSAH 46 Group A. CSAH 42 B. CSAH 46 C. CSAH 46 thru UMore D. CSAH 46 Southern Route | None | | Corridors B, C, and D pass the fatal flaw screening – from a system perspective they serve the same purpose. We should expect future screening to eliminate two of the three options. | A. CSAH 42 B. CSAH 46 C. CSAH 46 thru UMore D. CSAH 46 Southern Route |
| 170th St. to 200th St. Group E. 170 th St. F. 179 th St. – 170 th St. – CSAH 46 G. 179 th St. to New Alignment through Park, Vermillion Highlands H. 190 th St. I. 190 th St. to 200 th St. | E. 170 th St. - Lacks Adequate Continuity with County System G. 179 th St. to New Alignment through Park, Vermillion Highlands - Inconsistent with Plans; Presents Land Management Challenges H. 190 th St. - Inconsistent with Plans; Presents Land Management Challenges | Corridors E, G, and H represent lost opportunities for crossing Hwy. 52. (Note the modification to Corridor F) | The PMT modified Corridor F to remain on 170 th to Hwy. 52 | F. 179 th St. – 170 th St. – CSAH 46 I. 190 th St. to 200 th St. |
| Farmington Group J. 210 th St. K. Hwy. 50 | J. 210 th St. – Inconsistent with Plans; Lacks Adequate Continuity with County System | | | K. Hwy. 50 |

