

Criteria by Goal	Measure	R a n k	Notes
Safety Goal			
Provides a Crossing at Guadalupe River	Assessment	no, yes	"Yes" if route will provide a crossing at the Guadalupe River.
Reduces Public Safety Delays (police, fire, EMS)	Assessment	no, yes	"Yes" if route will reduce public safety delays to response time.
Accommodates Bicycles and Pedestrians	Assessment	no, yes	"Yes" if route will provide accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians.
Mobility Goal			
Provides Relief Route for Congested Areas	Assessment	no, yes	"Yes" if route will provide a relief route for congested areas.
Offers Long-Term Expansion Potential for Future Needs	Assessment	no, yes	"Yes" if route will offer long-term expansion potential for future needs.
Minimizes Impacts to Existing Interchanges Along IH 35	Assessment	no, yes	"Yes" if route will minimize impacts to the operations, circulations, and access to existing land use of existing interchanges along IH 35.
Economic Development Goal			
Avoid Impacts to Future Airport Expansion	Avoids Impacts	no, yes	"Yes" if route will avoid impacts to future airport expansion.
Community and Environmental Goal			
Minimize Residential Displacements	Each	#	Residents were identified via aerial images, sight-identification, and stakeholders. Each resident was counted as "impact" if the corridor impacted a residential structure. West of IH 35: "Light Green(+)*10, 11s*Green(0)*s14, "Dark Green(+)*s15, East of IH 35: "Light Green(+)*55, 6s*Green(0)*s10, "Dark Green(+)*s11
Minimize Impacts to Vegetation/Wildlife Habitat	Acres	#	Impacts to undeveloped habitat. Undeveloped habitat does not include residential nor commercial properties. Vegetation/Wildlife Habitat will be further evaluated during the Environmental Document Phase. "Light Green(+)*s400, 401s*Green(0)*s600, "Dark Green(-)*s601
Minimize Impacts to Hazardous Material Sites	# HazMat Sites	-, +	Using existing databases, sites were identified as potential and known hazardous material sites. A rank of "+" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "-" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts to Potential Wetlands	Acres	#	Using existing databases, sites were identified as areas of potential wetland. Wetland mitigation would be based upon detailed analysis as part of future studies. "Light Green(+)*s5, 6s*Green(0)*s10, "Dark Green(-)*s11
Minimize Impacts to 100-yr Floodplains	Acres	#	FEMA floodplain data was used to determine the acreage count, based upon the proposed corridor width. "Light Green(+)*s10, 11s*Green(0)*s30, "Dark Green(-)*s31
Minimize Impacts to Sensitive Archeological Areas	Acres	#	This criterion is based on characteristics of the natural, topographic and geologic settings within the study area that have historically demonstrated the potential to contain archeological sites. The archeological sites have not been digitized to protect the location and security of the sites. "Light Green(+)*200, 201s*Green(0)*s400, "Dark Green(-)*s401
Minimize Noise Impacts to Sensitive Receivers	Each	#	Potential sensitive receivers included the study's 800 ft corridor and 300 ft outside the corridor. Noise mitigation would be based upon detailed analysis as part of future studies. "Light Green(+)*20, 21s*Green(0)*s30, "Dark Green(-)*s31
Minimize Impacts to Schools	Potential Impacts	no, yes	Schools were identified using existing databases. A rank of "Yes" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "No" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Avoid Cemeteries and Prehistoric Burial Sites	Impacts	no, yes	Using existing databases and sight-identified cemeteries. A rank of "Yes" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "No" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Avoid Impacts to Public Parks/Recreational Facilities	Impacts	no, yes	Parks and recreational facilities were identified using existing databases. No routes appear to directly impact parks and recreational facilities within the study area. A rank of "Yes" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "No" indicates that one impact was identified for the proposed corridors.
Avoid Impacts to Historic Resources	Displacements	no, yes	Registered historical sites as well as potentially eligible historical sites were identified within the study area using existing databases and sight-identified potential historical sites. A rank of "Yes" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "No" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Avoid Impacts to Landfill	Impacts	no, yes	Landfills were identified using existing databases. A rank of "Yes" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "No" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts to Farmlands/Ranchlands	Bisects to Large Parcels	#	Corridors were examined for intent to avoid bisecting 50 acre or larger parcels of farmland/ranchland. "Light Green(+)*s9, 6s*Green(0)*s9, "Dark Green(-)*s10
Minimize Impacts to Commercial Properties	# Properties	#	Commercial properties were sight-identified by the study team. Each commercial property was counted as "impacted" if corridor impacted a property. "Light Green(+)*=0, s*Green(0)*s2, "Dark Green(-)*s3
Avoids Impacts to Major Capital Improvement Projects	Avoids Impacts	-, +	Using existing databases, sites were identified as planned capital improvement projects. Upon discussions with county and city engineers and planners, no routes appear to directly impact planned capital improvement projects. A rank of "+" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "-" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts to Major Utility Features	Assessment	-, +	Major utility features were defined as water towers, communication towers, transmission lines, substations, power plants, and water/sewer facilities. A major utility feature was considered impacted if daily operations or future expansions were affected or relocation cost were prohibitive. A rank of "+" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "-" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts to Civic Organizations	Each	-, +	The civic organizations used for this count were sight-identified by the study team. A rank of "+" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "-" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts Potential Environmental Justice Areas	Potential Impact	-, +	Environmental justice concerns include disproportionate impacts to low-income and minority residents. Potential environmental justice areas identified will be further evaluated during the Environmental Document Phase. A rank of "+" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "-" indicates that an impact was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts to Faith-Based Organizations	Potential Impact	-, +	The faith-based organizations used for this count were sight-identified by the study team. A rank of "+" indicates that no impact was identified for the proposed corridors. A rank of "-" indicates that one or more impacts was identified for the proposed corridors.
Minimize Impacts to Prime or Unique Farmlands	Acres	#	Corridors were examined to minimize impacts to soil types typically associated with prime or unique farmlands. Unique Farmlands will be determined during the Environmental Document Phase. "Light Green(+)*s0s*Green(0)*s75, "Dark Green(-)*s76
Minimize Impacts to Potential Golden-cheeked Warbler Habitat	Acres	#	Potential Golden-cheeked warbler habitat areas were identified within the study area. Mitigation would be based upon detailed analysis as part of future studies. "Light Green(+)*s200, 201s*Green(0)*s300, "Dark Green(-)*s301
Minimize Impacts to Potential Sensitive Geologic Areas	Acres	#	Areas mapped as cave-bearing formations on a geologic map (Collins 2000) were identified within the study area. Mitigation would be based upon detailed analysis as part of future studies. "Light Green(+)*s500, 501s*Green(0)*s700, "Dark Green(-)*s701
Engineering Goal			
Affords Potential River Crossings	Design parameter	no, yes	"Yes" if route can afford a potential river crossing.
Conforms to AASHTO Design Criteria	Design parameter	no, yes	"Yes" if route conforms to terrain and is viable.
Cost Effectiveness Goal			
Costs will be determined during future planning and environmental studies.			