

Project Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria for Corridors

Goal	Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Measures
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the potential frequency and severity of crashes involving people walking and biking on or parallel to TV Highway. Reduce the potential frequency and severity of crashes involving people walking and biking across TV Highway, intending to access the potential trail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the trail alternative reduce the potential frequency and severity of crashes involving potential trail user compared to existing facilities? (yes/no, to what extent?). Does the trail alternative maximize separation between vehicles and trail users at crossings where potential users will access the trail or minimize the number of needed crossings? (yes/no, to what extent?). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of intersection crossings by type and number of lanes (i.e. stop control vs. signalized crossing, dedicated phasing for crossing, number of lanes to cross).
Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide new and improved access to daily needs and services. Increase connections to community destinations including schools, transit stops, parks and recreation facilities, employment areas, regional centers, and the broader trail network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the trail alternative provide new connections to enhance access to daily needs and services for people walking, biking, and taking public transit? (yes/no, to what extent?). Does the trail alternative increase the number of destinations accessible by walking, biking, or public transit for residents? (yes/no, to what extent?). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to essential destinations/daily needs (# of destinations adjacent to trail and within ¼ mile). Number of transit stops within ¼ and ½ mile.
Health/Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate design elements that increase community livability by maximizing access to recreation. Minimize exposure for people walking and biking to air toxins and particulate matter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the trail alternative located to maximize recreation access for people within a ¼ mile of the trail? (yes/no, to what extent?). Is the trail alternative located to minimize exposure to air toxins and particulate matter? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to parks/open space/schools (# of schools and parks adjacent to trail and within ¼ mile). Adjacent traffic volumes.
Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate and build from previous plans for the study area. Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions and area partners to provide consistency with other area plans. Provide a clear plan for the area, including an implementation strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the trail alternative considered previous planning efforts within the TV Highway corridor? (yes/no, to what extent?). Neighboring jurisdictions and area partners providing comments on the plan during development (yes/no, to what extent?). Does the trail alternative identify cost, timeline, and potential funding strategies (yes/no, to what extent?). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning level cost estimate. Coordination agencies and issues (i.e. railroad, Washington County, Aloha, Hillsboro, Beaverton by # and type of coordination issues).
Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately and clearly identify the feasibility of potential alternatives. Consider anticipated costs, funding sources, environmental impacts, right-of-way, and permitting. Consider potential impacts to railroad and potential railroad relocation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the alignment alternative feasible from a funding, environmental, right-of-way, and permitting perspective? (yes/no, to what extent?). Concept has concurrence from the railroad (yes/no). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant Impacts (i.e. environmental, right-of way, railroad, etc. by # and type).
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a comfortable trail facility that meets the needs of all users and abilities. Provide equitable access to the trail for transportation disadvantaged populations underserved by recreational facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the alignment alternative provide for a comfortable facility that can meet the needs of all users and abilities by providing the lowest stress facility possible? (yes/no, to what extent?). Does the alignment service higher portions of transportation disadvantaged populations than the average for the area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffer space and adjacent traffic volumes. Traffic speed and noise levels. Percent of population within ¼ mile of facility considered transportation disadvantaged.