

**Phase II Screening Criteria
Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility**

		Alternative						
1	Access	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
2	Would the site be efficiently accessed from Interstate 89? (Benchmarks: Location less than one mile or less than 5 minutes travel time from Interstate 89)							
3	Would the site be efficiently accessed by buses, cars, bicycles, and pedestrians? (Benchmarks: Adequacy and ease of access of existing road and sidewalk infrastructure linking the site to the interstate and other key locations in proximity to the site)							
4	Could the site allow for efficient connections to air or rail transportation? (Benchmarks: Adequacy of infrastructure linking the site to air/rail transportation hubs)							
5	Community Impacts	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
6	Would the selection of the site and subsequent operation of the Intermodal Transportation Facility minimize impacts (e.g. traffic, noise, odor, etc) to existing neighborhoods? (Benchmarks: Proximity to existing neighborhoods and adequacy of local street network)							
7	How developing the site may impact the historical or cultural resources of the community and region?							
8	Would the development of the site minimize impacts to adjacent property values? (Benchmarks: Impact of development on adjacent property values)							
9	Costs and Benefits (User)	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
10	How would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility impact highway access volumes and travel times (VMT, VHT) (Quantitative)							
11	How would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility impact transit access volume and travel times? (QMT, QHT) (Quantitative)							
12	How would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility impact Intercity bus travel times within the region? Quantitative)							
13	How would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility impact Intercity bus volumes? (Quantitative)							
14	How would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility impact bicycle and pedestrian travel times? (Quantitative)							
15	Direct Costs and Benefits	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
16	What is the direct cost of acquiring the site? (Quantitative)							
17	What is the direct cost of preparing this site for construction including the provision of community facilities? (Quantitative)							
18	What is the direct capital and O&M cost of the highway, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure necessary to link the site to the existing transportation network? (Quantitative)							
19	What is the direct capital and O&M cost associated with any unusual characteristics external to the site? (Quantitative)							
20	Environmental Impacts	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
21	How developing the site will impact on the natural environment? (Benchmarks: Are there wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, or other natural features that would be negatively impacted by the development of the site?)							
22	How would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility impact Local Transit volumes and travel times? (QVT, QHT) (Quantitative)							
23	Would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility reduce regional traffic congestion, energy consumption, air and noise pollution? (Benchmarks: VMT, VHT, QMT, QVT analyses)							

**Phase II Screening Criteria
Upper Valley Intermodal Transportation Facility**

	Planning and Land Use Considerations	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
24	Would the development of the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility be consistent with existing local and regional land use plans and zoning? (<u>Benchmarks:</u> Consistency with local and regional land use plans and zoning ordinance)							
25	Would developing the site as an Intermodal Transportation Facility be consistent with generally accepted land use principles such as Transit-Oriented Development or other compact design land use techniques, proximity to existing employment center, or parcels suitable for new commercial/industrial employment?							
26	Would the site be adequately served by existing community utilities (e.g. water/sewer infrastructure)? (<u>Benchmarks:</u> Location of existing community utilities)							
27								
28	Site Characteristics/Implementation	Do Nothing	Site #1	Site #2	Site #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6
29	Would the site accommodate initial estimates for space requirements? (<u>Benchmarks:</u> Could the site accommodate 1,000 parking spaces and 10 bus bays?)							
30	Would the site allow for potential future expansion and/or phasing of development? (<u>Benchmarks:</u> Could the site accommodate 1,500 parking spaces and 15 bus bays?)							
31	Would the site provide safe and secure passenger waiting facilities, and vehicle and bus parking? (<u>Benchmarks:</u> Necessity for extra safeguards required)							

Note: The Project Consultant shall be responsible for investigating the distributional impacts of quantitative screening on a site-by-site basis.