

3.0 BASIS FOR THE CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN

3.1 NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT

To facilitate upcoming study activities, primarily the identification of the CMEA elements that will be combined to form study alternatives, I-10 deficiencies have been summarized in terms of the following:

- Design deficiencies - how well the facility complies with FDOT design standards,
- Mobility deficiencies - how well the facility satisfies the LOS standards overtime, and
- Safety deficiencies - how well or to what degree the facility complies with current safety standards.

3.1.1 Design Deficiencies

Design deficiencies refers to the how well the facility complies with current FDOT and FIHS standards. As a FIHS facility, these standards are the minimum engineering and planning criteria that apply to Segment 3 of I-10:

- A policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets, 2001 American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO),
- FDOT Roadway Plan Preparation Manual, 2003 (PPM), revised January 2005,
- FDOT Design Standards for Design, Construction, Maintenance and Utility Operations on the SHS, January 2004, and
- FDOT Manual of Uniform Minimum Standards for Design, Construction and Maintenance for Streets and Highways, May 2002.

Exceptions to and / or updated design standards applicable to Segment 3 of I-10 were reviewed and established in conjunction with FDOT.

Along the mainline of I-10 in Segment 3, twenty-one vertical curves do not meet the current FDOT standards. Of these 21 vertical curve deficiencies, 12 occur on crest curves and 9 occur on sag curves. In addition, four horizontal curves of the I-10 mainline do not meet super-elevation requirements. These deficiencies are illustrated on Figure 2-1.

According to the FDOT Interchange Handbook, Technical Resource Document 1, Department Engineering Standards, the minimum desired spacing for interchanges is six miles for rural areas, three miles for urban areas, and two miles for urbanized areas. Along the urban portion of the corridor, the distance between existing interchanges is generally large enough to conform to the FDOT spacing standard; however, the spacing distance between the Marietta Interchange and I-295 creates problems due to its short length. The planned BFCR Interchange is 1.8 miles west of the Chaffee Road Interchange and 6.5 miles east of the US 301 Interchange.

Design Deficiencies identified at interchanges, located within Segment 3, are listed below and provided in the appendices to this document.

I-10 and CR 125 Interchange

- Eastbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.

I-10 and SR 121 Interchange

- Eastbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound exit ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Low clearance on bridge structure going over I-10.

I-10 and SR 228 Interchange

- Eastbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Low clearance on bridge structure going over SR 228.

I-10 and US 301 Interchange

- Westbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Low bridge clearance on bridge structure going over US 301.

I-10 Mainline between US 301 and Chaffee Road

- A small segment (1,050 feet) exceeds the FDOT grade standard.
- Low bridge clearance on bridge structure going over I-10 (Yellow Water Road).
- Low bridge clearance on bridge structure going over I-10 (Halsema Road) – corrected by new SR 23 interchange.

I-10 and Chaffee Road Interchange

- Eastbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Low bridge clearance on bridge structure going over I-10.
- Eastbound exit ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound exit ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.

I-10 Marietta Interchange

- Minimum spacing standards not met between the interchange and the I-295 interchange.
- Eastbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Westbound entrance ramp length insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Low bridge clearance on bridge structure going over Cahoon Road.

I-10 and I-295 Interchange

- Eastbound and Westbound entrance ramp lengths from I-295 insufficient to meet FDOT standards.
- Low bridge clearance on three bridge structures going over I-10.

3.1.2 Mobility Deficiencies

A major concept central to understanding transportation is mobility. Mobility refers to the ability to move between different activity sites (e.g., from home to a grocery store). The range of mobility is identified as the extent to which the roadway meets the FDOT LOS standards for the given area type. Segments of the mainline of I-10 that do not meet the minimum LOS standard for the given area type are considered mobility deficient.

The FDOT maintains minimum acceptable operating LOS standards for the SHS as well as the FIHS. The statewide minimum LOS for the SHS differs according to area type. The three broad area types identified in the FDOT Quality / LOS Handbook include urbanized, transitioning and rural areas. Urban areas are also subdivided into urbanized areas under 500,000 or over 500,000. The Jacksonville area is over 500,000 in population.

I-10 is classified as a Limited Access Highway (Freeway). Limited access highways are multilane divided highways with a minimum of two lanes for exclusive use of traffic in each direction and full control of ingress and egress. The requirements for intersecting roads also consider each county's Comprehensive Plan and the corresponding location of an interchange. The minimum LOS standards for Segment 3 of I-10, based on area type and facility classification, are summarized below in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1: Level of Service Standards

Location	Area Type	LOS Standard
I-10 Mainline from		
CR 125 to US 301 (Duval County Line)	Rural	B
Duval County Line to I-295	Urban	D(E) ¹

*Source: FDOT Quality / Level of Service Handbook (2002 Edition),
Baker and Duval County Comprehensive Plans.*

Note: 1. LOS E applies only to General Purpose Lanes when exclusive through-lanes exist.

The 2001 existing condition analysis indicates that the mainline of I-10 in Segment 3 meets or exceeds the minimum LOS standards, with the exception of the segment of I-10 between the Marietta and I-295 interchanges. On the basic freeway segment, eastbound traffic in the AM Peak Hour operates at LOS of E on I-10 between Marietta and I-295. In the evening, westbound traffic at this location operates at LOS E. The existing I-10 mainline LOS conditions are illustrated on Figure 2-15 of the I-10 Master Plan: DASR Segment 3 (July 2003) and summarized in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2: Existing Year 2001 I-10 Mainline Analysis Results

I-10 Freeway Segment	Direction	Area Type	LOS Standard	Existing 2001 LOS	
				AM Peak	PM Peak
West of CR 125	EB	Rural	B	A	A
	WB			A	A
CR 125 to SR 121	EB	Rural	B	A	A
	WB			A	A
SR 121 to SR 228	EB	Rural	B	B	A
	WB			A	B
SR 228 to US 301	EB	Rural	B	B	A
	WB			A	B
US 301 to BFCR	EB	Urban	D	C	B
	WB			B	C
BFCR to Chaffee Rd.	EB	Urban	D	C	B
	WB			B	C
Chaffee Rd. to Marietta	EB	Urban	D	D	B
	WB			B	D
Marietta to I-295	EB	Urban	D	E	C
	WB			C	E
East of I-295	EB	Urban	D	C	C
	WB			C	C

Source: RS&H, Inc. (HCS 200).

The ramp merge and diverge movements generally correspond to the mainline LOS. All the merge and diverge movements in the rural section operate at acceptable levels of service. At the Marietta interchange, the AM peak hours eastbound merge and diverge operate at a LOS D for the I-295 interchange, the I-295 northbound to I-10 eastbound merge operates at a LOS F during the AM peak hour. The existing merge and diverge LOS conditions are summarized in Table 3-3 below.

Table 3-3: Existing Year 2001 I-10 Ramp Merge/Diverge Analysis Results

Interchange	Ramp	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Density ¹	LOS	Density ¹	LOS
I-10 at CR 125	EB on	14.0	B	9.4	A
	WB on	8.4	A	12.8	B
	EB off	11.3	B	6.5	A
	WB off	7.7	A	12.8	B
I-10 at SR 121	EB on	13.8	B	8.8	A
	WB on	7.2	A	11.8	B
	EB off	11.5	B	6.5	A
	WB off	8.4	A	13.9	B
I-10 at SR 228	EB on	16.1	B	10.0	A
	WB on	9.6	A	14.6	B
	EB off	14.2	B	8.7	A
	WB off	9.3	A	15.1	B
I-10 at US 301	EB on	-0.4	A	-7.4	A
	WB on	7.8	A	13.2	B
	EB off	12.5	B	6.6	A
	WB off	11.4	B	19.2	B
I-10 at Chaffee Rd.	EB on	28.0	C	19.5	B
	WB on	15.1	B	22.1	C
	EB off	25.6	C	17.8	B
	WB off	22.0	C	31.5	D
I-10 at Marietta	EB on	38.4	F	27.2	C
	WB on	19.4	B	28.1	D
	EB off	29.3	D	19.8	B
	WB off	19.1	B	31.8	F
I-10 at I-295	NB to EB on	24.7	F	15.5	B
	NB to WB on	16.9	B	23.6	C
	SB to EB on	22.3	C	15.8	B
	SB to WB on	20.9	C	29.1	D
	EB off	32.5	D	23.3	C
	WB off	2.6	A	9.6	B

Source: RS&H, Inc. (SCS2000).

Notes: 1. Passenger cars per mile, per lane.

At the intersections of the ramps with US 301, several locations do not operate at an acceptable LOS. At the signalized intersection south of I-10 and US 301 (eastbound I-10 exit and entrance movements with US 301) the LOS is F in both the AM and PM peak periods. On the north side of I-10, the I-10 ramp and US 301 intersection (westbound exit from I-10) the LOS is D in the PM peak period. The unsignalized intersection of Marietta with I-10 EB and WB ramps also operates at LOS F.

Table 3-4 summarizes the 2001 LOS in the AM and PM peak hour for Ramp Terminal Intersections.

Table 3-4: Existing Year 2001 I-10 Intersection Analysis Results

Intersection	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Delay ¹	LOS	Delay ¹	LOS
CR 125 / I-10 EB ramps (unsignalized)	15.0	B	14.5	B
CR 125 / I-10 WB ramps (unsignalized)	12.4	B	12.3	B
SR 121 / I-10 EB ramps	14.6	B	14.3	B
SR 121 / I-10 WB ramps (unsignalized)	52.1	F	67.3	F
SR 228 / I-10 EB ramps (unsignalized)	16.9	C	14.8	B
SR 228 / I-10 WB ramps (unsignalized)	13.6	B	13.6	B
US 301 / I-10 EB ramps	318.00	F	356.8	F
US 301 / I-10 WB ramps	29.3	C	35.2	D
Chaffee Rd. / I-10 EB ramps	11.8	B	10.9	B
Chaffee Rd. / I-10 WB ramps	12.7	B	16.2	B
Marietta / I-10 EB ramps (unsignalized)	106.3	F	31.02	D
Marietta / I-10 WB ramps, WB approach	46.8	E	-	F
Marietta / I-10 WB ramps, EB approach	15.4	C	-	F

Source: RS&H, Inc. (HCS2000).

Notes: 1. Seconds per vehicle.

The 2030 Future Year No-Build Alternative LOS analysis assumes that the mainline of I-10 in Segment 3 remains a four-lane section. Traffic forecasts for future years utilized the same four-lane existing plus committed roadway network used to assess existing traffic conditions. The rural section of I-10, from CR 125 to the US 301 does not meet the FDOT minimum LOS B standard. East of SR 121, the rural basic freeway segment of I-10 is projected to operate at LOS C in the AM Peak Hour (eastbound) and PM Peak Hour (westbound). The urban section of I-10, from BFCR east, does not operate at an acceptable LOS, operating at LOS F in the AM Peak Hour (eastbound) and PM Peak Hour (westbound). Future year I-10 mainline LOS conditions are summarized in Table 3-5.

Table 3-5: 2030 No Build I-10 Mainline Analysis Results

I-10 Freeway Segment	Direction	Area Type	LOS Standard	Existing 2001 LOS	
				AM Peak	PM Peak
West of CR 125	EB	Rural	B	C	B
	WB			B	C
CR 125 to SR 121	EB	Rural	B	C	B
	WB			B	C
SR 121 to SR 228	EB	Rural	B	C	C
	WB			C	C
SR 228 to US 301	EB	Rural	B	C	C
	WB			C	C
US 301 to BFCR	EB	Urban	D	D	C
	WB			C	D
BFCR to Chaffee Rd.	EB	Urban	D	F	F
	WB			F	F
Chaffee Rd. to Marietta	EB	Urban	D	F	F
	WB			F	F
Marietta to I-295	EB	Urban	D	F	F
	WB			F	F
East of I-295	EB	Urban	D	F	F
	WB			F	F

Generally the ramp merge and diverge LOS corresponds to the mainline LOS C or better west of US 301, LOS D between US 301 and proposed SR 23 (BFCR), and LOS F east of SR 23. Table 3-6 summarizes the 2030 LOS in the AM and PM peak hour for I-10 interchanges.

Table 3-6: 2030 No Build I-10 Ramp Merge/Diverge Analysis Results

Interchange	Ramp	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Density ¹	LOS	Density ¹	LOS
I-10 at CR 125	EB on	26.5	C	23.0	C
	WB on	22.3	C	25.3	C
	EB off	25.3	C	22.0	C
	WB off	22.9	C	26.8	D
I-10 at SR 121	EB on	27.7	C	23.5	C
	WB on	20.9	C	24.5	C
	EB off	25.5	C	21.6	C
	WB off	24.7	C	29.5	D
I-10 at SR 228	EB on	30.2	D	26.0	C
	WB on	24.3	C	28.5	D
	EB off	29.8	D	25.1	C
	WB off	26.2	C	30.8	D
I-10 at US 301	EB on	10.1	B	5.4	A
	WB on	23.2	C	27.3	C
	EB off	28.2	D	23.6	C
	WB off	25.6	C	30.8	D
I-10 at Branan Field / Chaffee Rd.	NB to EB on	28.8	F	21.9	F
	NB to WB on	28.7	D	33.6	D
	SB to EB on	35.1	E	30.4	D
	SB to WB on	18.7	B	21.5	C
	EB off	35.1	E	29.9	D
	WB off	15.6	F	38.6	F
I-10 at Chaffee Road	EB on	50.7	F	43.7	F
	WB on	43.3	F	50.5	F
	EB off	57.1	F	49.2	F
	WB off	48.4	F	56.2	F
I-10 at Marietta	EB on	63.5	F	52.1	F
	WB on	43.3	F	50.4	F
	EB off	54.0	F	46.2	F
	WB off	50.8	F	63.7	F
I-10 at I-295	NB to EB on	33.0	F	43.0	F
	NB to WB on	41.5	F	49.8	F
	SB to EB on	48.3	F	40.3	F
	SB to WB on	49.5	F	61.0	F
	EB off	68.2	F	55.3	F
	WB off	18.7	F	28.5	F

Source: RS&H, Inc. (HCS 2000).

Notes: 1. Passenger cars per mile, per lane.

Generally, the intersections of the interstate ramps with the cross streets operate at a LOS D or better with the exception of the Marietta / I-10 WB ramp terminal intersection and Marietta / I-10 EB ramp terminal intersection that operate at LOS F. The US 301 intersections improve one LOS with the construction of the SR 23 interchange and the corresponding reduction in left turn movements at the intersections. Table 3-7 summarizes the 2030 LOS in the AM and PM Peak Hour for Ramp Terminal Intersections.

Table 3-7: 2030 No Build I-10 Intersection Analysis Results

Intersection	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Delay ¹	LOS	Delay ¹	LOS
CR 125 / I-10 EB ramps (unsignalized)	14.1	B	15.2	B
CR 125 / I-10 WB ramps (unsignalized)	15.4	B	15.7	B
SR 121 / I-10 EB ramps	14.9	B	15.1	B
SR 121 / I-10 WB ramps (unsignalized)	33.6	C	29.7	C
SR 228 / I-10 EB ramps (unsignalized)	14.6	B	13.4	B
SR 228 / I-10 WB ramps (unsignalized)	13.6	B	15.2	B
US 301 / I-10 EB ramps	57.0	E	30.0	C
US 301 / I-10 WB ramps	20.1	C	19.4	B
Chaffee Rd. / I-10 EB ramps	19.1	B	17.3	B
Chaffee Rd. / I-10 WB ramps	15.2	B	16.1	B
Marietta / I-10 EB ramps	183.0	F	58.4	E
Marietta / I-10 WB ramps	143.9	F	342.4	F

Source: RS&H, Inc. (HCS 2000).

Notes: 1. Seconds per vehicle.

3.1.3 Safety Deficiencies

Five years of crash data for this segment of I-10 were provided by the FDOT. The data includes the number of crashes by milepost for each year, the number of crashes, number of vehicles, types of crashes, number of injuries and / or fatalities, cause, economic loss and average daily traffic.

Crash rates (number of crashes per million vehicle-miles) were calculated for each year of available data. The five-year average was compared to the statewide five-year average crash rate for interstates. There are no areas along I-10 where the statewide average crash rate was exceeded in recent years, and therefore no significant safety issues.

3.1.4 Environmental Deficiencies

There are no major environmental constraints on Segment 3. A portion of the I-10 corridor passes through public lands associated with the Cecil Field Commerce Center, located south of the study area. Additionally, the City of Jacksonville's Preservation Project has a goal of connecting Jennings State Forest (located south of the study area, in southern Duval and Clay Counties) to Cecil Field and then to Cary State Forest (located north of the study area, in Duval County).

I-10 was constructed in the 1960's, prior to implementation of storm water management regulations within the state. At that time, the roadway was designed as a rural section with side ditches to convey runoff to the nearest waterway or wetland. Any construction projects would require that the improvement include stormwater management facilities design to meet the requirements in force at the time of the action. Meeting these requirements would increase costs associated with providing the collection and treatment systems and could require additional ROW.

3.1.5 Hurricane Evacuation

On Monday September 13, 1999 Hurricane Floyd approached the Bahamas and Florida. The flight of 2.5 million people from the State of Florida, nearly twice as many people as officials had asked to leave, led to massive traffic jams in which - had the hurricane's path changed only slightly - thousands of people would have been stuck at the mercy of potentially deadly high winds.

In response to these evacuation complications, FDOT in conjunction with the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) completed an operations analysis in June 2000 entitled Analysis of Florida's One Way Operations for Hurricane Evacuation: I-10 Jacksonville to Tallahassee / Monticello (US 19). The purpose of the study was to investigate the feasibility of reverse-laning I-10 from Jacksonville to Tallahassee in an effort to mitigate travel delays and the highway congestion that characterized the Hurricane Floyd evacuation in 1999.

The reversible-lane configuration is projected to service a travel flow of approximately 5,000 vehicles per hour. The beginning of the reverse-flow was planned just east of I-295. The operation was planned to end at US 19 in Jefferson County, approximately 108 miles west of CR 125, with the two contraflow lanes taken down to one lane that would exit on the existing eastbound ramp. The lane reduction was needed because geometric and topographic features will not allow for two off-lanes, thus creating a bottleneck. To reduce the significance of this bottleneck, the report states several operational elements must be in place, including various ITS components to disseminate to the public how to proceed to their destinations in a clear and understandable manner. The report implies a need for effective public dissemination of information throughout the entire corridor.

Another potential scenario considered by FDOT was an operating plan that would terminate reversible laning at the US 129 interchange in Suwannee County, approximately 50 miles west of CR 125. Under this scenario, the terminus treatment conceivably would be the same as that for the terminus at US 19 in that westbound contraflow traffic would exit onto US 129 via the eastbound entrance ramp from I-10. However, this scenario has not been modeled or studied in the same detail as those alternatives previously noted. Subsequent coordination between the participants led to the tentative intent to transition the contraflow movement back to the westbound roadway just west of the I-75 interchange.

This report also cites the need to provide and/or maintain adequate communications infrastructure along I-10 in order to effectively execute these evacuation scenarios. Such infrastructure would primarily be needed to adequately accommodate the dynamic message sign network and other mechanisms to keep the public informed throughout the evacuation. In addition, some improvements related to signing and fixed object protection would be necessary to safely serve westbound traffic flow on the eastbound roadway.

3.2 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT GOALS AND ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION CRITERIA

The adopted master plan for the I-10 study corridor reflects the policies and goals both of the state and of the region served by this roadway. The goals and corresponding objectives focus on mobility improvements, environmental protection, economic development, creation of livable communities, and the cost effectiveness of investments. By evaluating identified CMEAs against a common set of goals and objectives, a master plan that guides future corridor improvements is developed. Policy elements, corridor goals, objectives, and corresponding measures of effectiveness (MOE) that guide the development and evaluation of alternatives are summarized below.

3.2.1 Improvement Goals

FDOT Interstate Highway Policy, local and regional needs, and the five I-10 Master Plan policy elements provide the framework from which improvement goals are developed. The relationship of these goals to the five policy elements is summarized below in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8: Policy Elements and Improvement Goals

Policy Element	Goal
Mobility	Enhance mobility of corridor residents and visitors.
Regional Commerce	Support regional commerce and goods movement.
Land Use	Support land use policies and livable communities.
Environment	Support environmental quality.
Affordability and Constructability	Develop financially feasible and implementable plans.

Development and evaluation of CMEAs occurred in two steps, or tiers. In the first tier, mainline alternatives are developed to address the mobility needs of the mainline corridor. To evaluate and compare these alternatives, a set of objectives for each goal is identified, consistent with the more conceptual nature of the Tier 1 CMEAs.

Table 3-9: Tier Corridor Evaluation Goals and Objectives Matrix

POLICY ELEMENTS	TIER CORRIDOR EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	
POLICY GOALS	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>Tier 2</i>
MOBILITY		
Enhance Mobility Of Corridor Residents And Visitors	Provide Acceptable LOS	Provide Acceptable LOS
	Provide For Safe Roadway Environment	Provide For Efficient Traffic Operations
	Facilitate Corridor Transit Plans	Provide For Safe Roadway Environment
		Facilitate Corridor Transit Plans
		Support Hurricane Evacuation
REGIONAL COMMERCE		
Support Regional Commerce And Goods Movement	Facilitate Freight Movements	Facilitate Freight Movements
	Provide Access To Intermodal Facilities	Provide Access To Intermodal Facilities
LAND USE		
Support Land Use Policies And Livable Communities	Promote Compatibility With Land Uses And Growth Management	Promote Compatibility With Land Uses And Growth Management
	Minimize Relocations And ROW Acquisition	Minimize Relocations And ROW Acquisition
		Minimize Cultural Resource Impacts
		Minimize Utility Impacts
ENVIRONMENT		
Support Environmental Quality	Minimize Wetland Impacts	Minimize Wetland Impacts
	Enhance Air Quality	Enhance Air Quality
		Minimize Contamination Site Conflicts
		Minimize Drainage Impacts
AFFORDABILITY & CONSTRUCTABILITY		
Develop Financially Feasible And Implementable Plan	Minimize Capital Cost	Minimize Capital Cost
	Facilitate Constructability	Minimize Operating And Maintenance Cost
		Facilitate Constructability

3.2.2 Measures of Effectiveness and Evaluation Criteria

The degree to which CMEAs achieve study goals and objectives is determined through application of a series of MOEs. The MOEs utilize data generated to evaluate defined objectives and range from stand-alone quantitative results, comparison against a baseline condition, and qualitative assessments tempered by study team experience and public input.

The relationship between the Tier 1 corridor evaluation objectives, MOEs and rating scale is summarized on the following page in Table 3-10 and 3-11.

Table 3-10: Tier 1 Corridor Evaluation Objectives and Measures of Effectiveness

POLICY GOAL	MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS (MOE)	RATING SCALE (SEE NOTE)		
STUDY OBJECTIVE		○	⊙	●
MOBILITY				
Provide Acceptable LOS	LOS	Below Required LOS Standard	At LOS Standard	Exceeds LOS Standard
Provide For Safe Roadway Environment	Remediation of Geometric Deficiencies	Bridges Over I-10 and Other Bridges That Have Safety Issues Remediated	Bridges Over I-10, Other Bridges That Have Safety Issues and All Other Deficiencies Remediated	All Deficiencies Remediated
REGIONAL COMMERCE				
Facilitate Corridor Transit Plans	Extent of Non-SOV Travel	<2% Reduction	2% - 5% Reduction	>5% Reduction
Facilitate Freight Movements	Traffic Access and Service Provided for Trucks	Poor Truck Access and LOS	Some Improvement to Truck Access And LOS	Quality Truck Access and LOS
	Minimize Conflicts Between Trucks and Autos	No Actions to Minimize Conflicts	Minimal Actions to Minimize Conflicts	Significant Actions to Minimize Conflicts
Provide Access To Intermodal Facilities	Adequacy of Access to Intermodal Facilities	Poor Access Provided	No Change in Access Provided	Adequate Access Provided
LAND USE				
Promote Compatibility With Land Uses And Growth Management	Quality of Access to Approved Land Use	Significant Incompatibility		Significant Compatibility
Minimize Relocations And ROW Acquisition	Number of Residential Reloc. and Acres of ROW Required	Significant Takings and Relocations		Limited Takings and Relocations
	Number of Business Reloc. and Acres of ROW Required	Significant Takings and Relocations		Limited Takings and Relocations
ENVIRONMENT				
Minimize Wetland Impacts	Extent of Wetland Encroachments	Significant Encroachments		Minimal Encroachments
Enhance Air Quality	Effect on Vehicle Miles and/or VHT	<2% Reduction	2% - 5% Reduction	>5% Reduction
AFFORDABILITY & CONSTRUCTABILITY				
Minimize Capital Cost	Conceptual Construction Cost	Highest Cost Option	Middle Cost Option	Lowest Cost Option
Facilitate Constructability	Complexity of Maintenance of Traffic and Constructability	Relatively Complicated; Large Scope, Numerous Phases or Long Duration; Requires New Temporary Facilities	Moderately Complicated; Moderate in Scope, Phases or Duration; Requires Construction of New Permanent Facilities	Relatively Simple; Limited Scope, Phases or Duration; Uses Existing Facilities

RATING SCALE:

- Minimally satisfies criterion.
- ⊙ Moderately satisfies criterion.
- Highly satisfies criterion.

Table 3-11: Tier 2 Corridor Evaluation Objectives and Measures of Effectiveness

POLICY GOAL STUDY OBJECTIVE	MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS (MOE)	RATING SCALE (SEE NOTE)		
		○	◉	●
MOBILITY				
Provide Acceptable LOS	LOS	Below Required LOS Standard		Exceeds LOS Standard
Provide for Efficient Traffic Operations	Minimize Vehicle Miles and/or Hours of Travel	Lowest VHT/VMT Results		Highest VHT/VMT Results
Provide for Safe Roadway Environment	Remediation of Geometric Deficiencies	Few Deficiencies Remediated		All Geometric Def. Remediated
	ITS Applications for Incident Management, Traffic Management, etc.	Limited ITS Deployment		Significant ITS deployment
Facilitate Corridor Transit Plans	Extent of Non-SOV Travel	Minimal SOV Travel Reduction		Significant SOV Travel Reduction
Support Hurricane Evacuation	I-10 Corridor Evacuation Facility Requirements	Requirements Not Met		Requirements Met
REGIONAL COMMERCE				
Facilitate Freight Movements	Traffic Access and Service Provided for Trucks	Poor Truck Access and LOS		Quality Truck Access and LOS
	Minimize Conflicts Between Trucks and Autos	No Actions to Facilitate Interaction		Significant Actions to Facilitate Interaction
Provide Access to Intermodal Facilities	Adequacy of Access to Intermodal Facilities	Poor Access Provided		Adequate Access Provided
LAND USE				
Promote Compatibility With Land Uses And Growth Management	Quality of Access to Approved Land Use	Significant Incompatibility		Significant Compatibility
Minimize Relocations And ROW Acquisition	Number of Residential Reloc. And Acres of ROW Required	Significant Takings and Relocations		Limited Takings and Relocations
	Number Of Business Reloc. And Acres Of ROW Required	Significant Takings and Relocations		Limited Takings and Relocations
Minimize Cultural Resources Impacts	Number of Affected Cultural Site Impacts	Significant Impacts		Minimal Impacts
Minimize Utility Impacts	Number of Affected Utilities	Significant Impacts		Minimal Impacts
ENVIRONMENT				
Minimize Wetland Impacts	Extent of Wetland Encroachments	Significant Encroachments		Minimal Encroachments
Enhance Air Quality	Effect on Vehicle Miles and/or VHT	Minimal Reduction	Moderate Reduction	Significant Reduction
Minimize Contamination Site Conflicts	Number of Contamination Sites	Significant Contamination Site Issues		No Contamination Site Issues

Table 3-11: Tier 2 Corridor Evaluation Objectives and Measures of Effectiveness (continued)

POLICY GOAL	MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS (MOE)	RATING SCALE (SEE NOTE)		
STUDY OBJECTIVE		○	◉	●
Minimize Drainage Impacts	Permitting Requirement Satisfaction	Permitting Issues Significant		Permitting Issues Minimal
AFFORDABILITY & CONSTRUCTABILITY				
Minimize Capital Cost	Conceptual Construction Cost	Highest Cost Option		Lowest Cost Option
Minimize Operating and Maintenance Cost	Relative Cost for Facility O&M (highway, HOV, transit, etc.)	Highest Cost Option		Lowest Cost Option
Facilitate Constructability	Complexity Of Maintenance Of Traffic And Constructability	Very Difficult	Moderate	Relatively Simple

RATING SCALE:

- Minimally satisfies criterion.
- ◉ Moderately satisfies criterion.
- Highly satisfies criterion.