

Evaluation Screening Process

Phase 1

 Does the concept meet the Purpose & Need for the project? Completed

Phase 2

 Analyze the concepts using the Purpose & Need and other performance measures. Draft completed

Phase 3

 Develop engineering and schematic-level alternatives and study all environmental, social, and economic components. Next Phase to be performed



Phase 1 Evaluation Screening

Purpose and Need Performance Criterion	Measure	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept D	Concept E-1	Concept E-2	Concept F		TDM Concept*	2007 Mediation Alt.	No-Build
Improve mobility and operational efficiency	Reduces conflict between local and through traffic in the corridor (barrier separation, control of access, grade separation, driveway improvements)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	Reduces travel times (Signal improvements, improve loss of service, improve intersection efficiency)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Increase multimodal travel options for people and goods	Provides opportunity for multimodal travel options (transit, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Improve safety and emergency response	Reduce crashes (Reduction in conflict points, grade separation, driveway improvements)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	Serves as a reliable route for emergency response organizations (Signal improvements, control of access, adequate shoulder widths)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
CARRY FORWARD TO SECONDARY SCREENING?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes

^{*}TSM and TDM Concepts were eliminated as stand-alone concepts; however, elements of TSM and TDM can be included with any concept.



Phase 2 Evaluation Screening

Performance Measures	Criterion	Evaluation Parameters	Evaluation Parameters (Units)	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept D	Concept F	2007 Mediation Alt.	No-Build
		WESTBOUND MAIN LANES: Travel time along WB US 290 main lanes from Old Fredericksburg Rd to Circle Dr, PM Peak	Minutes	6.7	5.6	5.2	8.2	6.3	19.6	29.0
Improve mobility and operational efficiency	Improves US 290 operational efficiency - reduce travel time during peak hour for 2035 traffic	WESTBOUND FRONTAGE ROADS: Travel time along WB US 290 FTG RD from Old Fredericksburg Rd to Circle Or, PM Peak	Minutes	13.2	10.6	10.3	18.7	n/a*	12.7	29.1
		EASTBOUND MAIN LANES: Travel time along EB US 290 main lanes from Circle Dr to Old Fredericksburg Rd, AM Peak	Minutes	11.5	10.9	11.9	10.7	19.0	13.3	34.6
		EASTBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD: Travel time along EB US 290 FTG RD from Circle Dr to Old Fredericksburg Rd, AM Peak	Minutes	12.6	11.3	11.4	13.8	n/a*	18.5	35.8
	Improves SH 71 operational efficiency – reduce travel time during peak hour for 2035 traffic	WESTBOUND MAINLANES: Travel time along WB US 299 and SH 71 from Old Fredericksburg Rd to Silvermine Dr, PM Peak	Minutes	5.3	4.6	3.9	9.9	5.8	3.7	25.3
		WESTBOUND FRONTAGE ROADS: Travel time along WB US 290 and SH 71 from Old Fredericksburg Rd to Silvermine Dr, PM Peak	Minutes	9.4	6.8	6.8	9.5	n/a*	7.2	25.4
		EASTBOUND MAINLANES: Travel time along EB SH 71 and US 290 from Silvermine Dr to Old Fredericksburg Rd, AM Peak	Minutes	4.0	7.4	4.1	9.7	4.8	4.2	32.2
		EASTBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD: Travel time along EB SH 71 and US 290 from Silvermine Or to Old Fredericksburg Rd, AM Peak	Minutes	10.0	8.8	7.6	11.1	n/a*	8.8	33.4
increase multimodal travel options for people	Provides opportunity for multimodal travel options	Adds sidewalk, bike/pedestrian elements as part of the project.	Yes/No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
		Provides opportunity for high capacity transit to utilize the corridor	Yes/No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
and goods	mannoun una epaene	Provides opportunity for local bus service to utilize the corridor	Yes/No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Improve safety and emergency response	Corrects geometric deficiencies within project limits	Adds shoulders, separates through traffic from local traffic making frequent turns onto collectors, and corrects sharp horizontal curves	Yes/No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	Upgrades facility to current design standards	Proposed design meets FHWA standards for National Highway System (23 CRF 625.4) and TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual and Bridge Design Manual, including associated references	Yes/No	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	Serves as a reliable route for emergency response organizations	Adequate ramps and detour route for emergency vehicles or alternate route due to addents	Yes/No	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
Potential displacements	Minimize residential displacements	Number of residential displacements	Each	C	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Minimze commercial displacements	Number of commercial displacements	Each	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
Preliminary project cost	Minimize construction cost	Preliminary construction cost estimate	\$ Million	269	257	280	250	204	266	N/A
	Minimize ROW cost	ROW area	Acres	27.8	24.3	27.6	30.5	39.2	25	N/A
		Preliminary ROW estimated cost	\$ Million	34.8	31.1	34.6	37.3	51.1	31.6	N/A
	Minimulze utility relocation cost	Anticipated utility relocation effort	High/Med/Low	Med	High	Hiigh	High	Hìgh	Med	N/A
CARRY FORWARD TO ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT?					NO**	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES

Concept with highest score Concept with lowest score

The No-Build Alternative must be carried forward in the Evaluation score

*Concept F does not have continuous frontage roads

**Elements of this concept will be incorporated into Concept C



Phase 1 Evaluation Screening

Purpose and Need

- Concept A Meets purpose and need moving forward
- Concept B Meets purpose and need moving forward
- Concept C Meets purpose and need moving forward
- Concept D Meets purpose and need moving forward
- Concept E1 Does not meet purpose and need Not advancing
- Concept E2 Does not meet purpose and need Not advancing
- Concept F Meets purpose and need moving forward
- Concept 2007 Alternative Meets purpose and need moving forward
- Concept TSM Does not meet purpose and need Not advancing
- Concept TDM Does not meet purpose and need Not advancing
- No-Build Concept moving forward



Phase 2 Evaluation Screening

Performance Measures

- Concept A Improves mobility, increases travel options, improves safety, and minimizes displacements – moving forward
- Concept B Elements will be incorporated into Concept C Not advancing
- Concept C Improves mobility, increases travel options, improves safety, and minimizes displacements – moving forward
- Concept D Provides limited mobility improvements Not advancing
- Concept F Provides limited mobility and safety improvements, and increases displacements – Not advancing
- Concept 2007 Alternative Provides limited mobility improvements Not advancing
- No-Build Concept moving forward



Phase 3 – Schematic & Environmental Process

The study will include:

- Engineering development of schematics of Concepts A & C
- Alternatives analysis
 - Evaluate the alternatives for a wide variety of parameters
 - Include a No-Build alternative in all analyses
- Detailed description of the affected environment
 - Natural resources
 - Human environment
- Evaluation of potential impacts
- Recommend a preferred alternative