DRAFT Simsbury Evalu			Tariffiilla Aliannant Altarastius																	
Criteria	Available Points	Scoring Rubric																		
					Data 1				Data								Data 4			
<u>off-Road</u>			pa	30	pa	30	Pa	30	D	23	pa	5	pe	23	pa	13	pe	13	pa	8
rioritizes options that provide edicated facilities for walking, biking, nd other recreation uses		Proportion of facility that is separated from traffic: 20 45% of the route requires travel on a shared local roadway or a bike lane/shoulder on a busier roadway: 20 5-15% of the route requires travel on a shared local roadway or a bike lane/shoulder on a busier roadway: 10 15-50% of the route requires travel on a shared local roadway or a bike lane/shoulder on a busier roadway: 5 50% of the route requires travel on a shared local roadway or a bike lane/shoulder on a busier roadway: 0	96.2% fully separated 3.8% On-road	20	96.7% fully separati 3.3% On-road	20	96.1% fully separate 3.9% On-road	20	51% fully separate 45.4% side path 3.6% On-road	20	27.3% fully separate 50.6% side path 22% On-road	5	70.4% fully separate 26.3% side path 3.3% On-road	20	61.5% fully separate 27.7% side path 10.8% On-road	10	57.8% fully separati 30.4% side path 11.8% On-road	10	69.6% fully separate 8.2% side path 20.3% On-road	5
rioritizes options which provide the nost separation from traffic IOTE - we added this to minimize oints from our sidepath alignments which match what we've heard. This is ew category, but to the same effect of rior discussions		[Proportion of fully-separated facilities min. 50-ft from roadway: 10] 95%+ of the route is fully-separated facility: 10 85-95% of the route is fully-separated facility: 6 50-85% of the route is fully-separated facility: 3 <50% of the route is fully-separated facility: 0	96.2% fully separated	10	96.7% fully separated	10	96.1% fully separated	10	51% fully separated	3	27.3% fully separated	0	70.4% fully separated	3	61.5% fully separated	3	57.8% fully separated	3	69.6% fully separated	3
raffic Safety				20		20		20		12.5		10		12.5		12.5		12.5		20
Prioritizes options that have the fewest vehicular interruptions	0-20	Fewest number of driveway crossings: 5] Option has average 0-2 residential driveway crossings per 1,000 feet: 5 Option has average between 3 to 7 residential driveway crossings per 1,000 feet: 2.5 Option has average >7 residential driveway crossings per 1,000 feet: 0 Fewest number of commercial driveways or at-grade roadway crossings: 15 Option has 0-1 commercial driveways or at-grade roadway crossings per 1,000 feet: 15	1.87	5	1.87	5	0.55	5	1.87	7.5	5.08	2.5	0.79	7.5	1.03	7.5	1.55	7.5	0.62	5
		Option has between 2 to 5 commercial driveways or at-grade roadway crossings per 1,000 feet: 7.5 Option has >5 commercial driveways or at-grade roadway crossings per 1,000 feet: 0	Ů		1.40		1.20		1.76		2.33		1.32		1.09		4.03		1.25	
Connectivity				40.97		39.34		41.46		42.77		32.39		31.91		24.61		25.96		7.50
Prioritizes options with the most connectivity to town centers, the most accessible paths, for the most residents	0-45	[Shortest distance to access / egress point: 5] Average per mile connection to >2 trail heads, cross streets, or parking areas: 5 Average per mile connection to 1-2 trail heads, cross streets, or parking areas: 2.5 Average per mile connection to <1 trail head, cross street, or parking area: 0	2.6	5	3.4	5	2.7	5	3.7	5	4.4	5	3.1	5	4.2	5	5	5	3.8	5
		[Shortest distance from Simsbury Center to Tariffville Center: 20] Point total (20 maximum) is based on a maximum score of 20 for the shortest possible route (2-miles as measured between Rte 315/202 and Tariffville Town Green) and a minimum score of 0 points for the longest route evaluated	2.3	18.47	2.6	16.8	2.2	19.0	2.4	17.8	2.5	17.4	2.6	16.9	3.1	14.6	2.8	16.0	6	0.0
		ITotal grade climbed /f lattest route: 5] Ratio of net grade increase—which equals 15' from FCHT parking lot to the Tariffville Town Green—divided by the highest point of elevation along the route. Highest/best raw score possible is 1.0, which would indicate a flat route. Ratio of 0.5 - 1.0: 5 Ratio of 0.2 - 0.5: 2.5 Ratio of 0.2 - 0.5: 2.5 Ratio of 0.2 - 0.5: 2.5	1	5	0.9	5	1	5	1	5	0.7	5	1	5	0.1	0	0.1	0	0.2	2.5
		Education opportunities via direct access to the Farmington River and within 1/4 mile walking distance to the Tariffville School: 10) Majority of trail option is located within 100 feet of the Farmington River and within 1/4 mile walk from the school: 10 -50% of the trail option is located within 100 feet of the Farmington River and within 1/4 mile walk from the school: 5 No portion of trail option is located within 100 feet of the Farmington River and within 1/4 mile walk from the school: 5	N/A	10	N/A	10	N/A	10	N/A	10	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
		Population within 1/4-mile of Trail (walking route, Tariffville Residents Only): 5] >75% of Tariffville residential area is within 1/4-mile walk of trail: 5 35% to 75% of Tariffville residential area is within 1/4-mile walk of trail: 2.5 <35% of Tariffville residential area is within 1/4-mile walk of trail: 0	55.2%	2.5	36.3%	2.5	60.8%	2.5	81.9%	5	88.0%	5	78.7%	5	88.0%	5	89.4%	5	31.8%	0
tight-of-Way				0		5		2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5
Prioritizes options that require fewer easements on or purchases of private property and have fewer constructability challenges	0-15	[Number of parcels overlapping trail: 5] Option does not overlap with private parcels: 5 Option overlaps with 1-3 parcels: 2.5 Option overlaps with >3 parcels: 0	6	0	4	2.5	5	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	9	0	5	0
		Level of right-of-way coordination: 5 Option does not require right-of-way coordination: 5 Option requires easements or acquisition across 1-3 parcels: 2.5 Option requires easements or acquisition across >3 parcels: 0	6	0	4	2.5	5	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	9	0	5	0
		[Qualitative assessment of the ease of construction access & constructability: 5] Can be built easily with little or no access or constructibility challenges: 5 Construction has some constructibility and/or access challenges: 2.5 Construction has major constructibility and/or access challenges: 0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	2.5	N/A	2.5	N/A	2.5	N/A	2.5	N/A	2.5	N/A	2.5	N/A	2.5
nvironment				10		5		25		20		20		15		15		20		30
Prioritizes options that have minimal impacts to wetlands and other environmental conditions	0-30	Linear feet of trail route option with a direct impact to wetlands: 10] <500 linear feet of impact: 10 500-1,000 linear feet of impact: 5 >1,000 linear feet of impact: 0	1,935	0	1,570	0	570	5	270	10	270	10	270	10	570	5	270	10	320	10
		<u>LUse of existing road or rail bed: 10)</u> Majority of linear length of the trail option uses existing road or rail bed: 10 Less than half of linear length of the trail option uses existing road or rail bed: 5 Trail option does not use existing road or rail bed: 0	40.3%	5	10.1%	5	64.8%	10	28.7%	5	35.6%	5	26.8%	5	15.0%	5	16.5%	5	1.5%	10
		Area of floodplain / floodway impact: 10 Less than 5% of linear length of the trail option is within floodplain/floodway: 10 from 5% to 50% of linear length of the trail option is within floodplain/floodway: 5 More than 50% of linear length of the trail option is within floodplain/floodway: 0	38.0% (3,660')	5	52.4% (4,080')	0	3.3%	10	37.7% (3,500')	5	11.8%	5	57.4% (5,854')	0	9.0%	5	10.3%	5	4.9% (710')	10
conomic Opportunity		[Max. distance to businesses: 10]		10		10		10		10		10		10		10		10		10
Prioritizes options that can help bring customers to existing Simsbury	0-10	[IMAX. DISTANCE TO DUSINESSES: 1U] Option is https://doi.org/10.0016/j.com/remails-ses-10 Option is 200 to 500 feet distance from at least one area business: 5	60	10	60	10	60	10	60	10	60	10	60	10	60	10	60	10	60	10

