

## Step 3 Evaluation Results

In Step 3, the performance of each alternative was evaluated and the results were reported using good, fair, and poor ratings corresponding to the social, environmental, and economic (SEE) criteria being considered. The objective of Step 3 was to identify a preferred alternative.

The following alternatives were recommended for dismissal based on the impact evaluation conducted:

- Alternative 5-a: Double Roundabout Interchange
- Alternative 5-b: Double Roundabout Interchange with Right Turn Ramps at CSAH 17
- Alternative 7: Tight Diamond Interchange
- Alternative 10: Single Roundabout Interchange

While all four alternatives were evaluated on a number of SEE criteria, property impacts is the differentiating factor prompting the recommendation for removal from further consideration. A summary of the ratings and reasons for dismissal is provided below, with a table on the last page.

### **Alternative 5-a: Double Roundabout Interchange**

Alternative 5-a received a Poor rating on the Property Impacts criterion, as it would result in the removal of the church and one commercial building in the City of Lake Elmo.

### **Alternative 5-b: Double Roundabout Interchange with Right Turn Ramps at CSAH 17**

Alternative 5-b received a Poor rating on the Property Impacts criterion, as it would result in the removal of the church and one active business in the City of Lake Elmo.

### **Alternative 7: Tight Diamond Interchange**

Alternative 7 received a Poor rating on the Property Impacts criterion, as it would result in the removal of four active businesses in the City of Grant, which represents a substantial portion of the entire Grant business district.

### **Alternative 10: Single Roundabout Interchange**

Alternative 10 received a Poor rating on the Property Impacts criterion, as it would result in the removal of the church in addition to five active businesses, which represents a substantial portion of the entire Grant business district.

While the Step 3 evaluation clearly points to removal of Alternatives 5-a, 5-b, 7, and 10 based on property impacts, it does not differentiate between Alternatives 4-a and 4-b. However, the design variations do indicate important differences in expected safety performance, as described below.

### **Interchange Ramp Spacing**

Alternative 4-b provides greater separation between the new ramps and the Manning Avenue interchange, which provides a safety benefit.

### **Driver Expectation**

Alternative 4-b provides a more intuitive ramp arrangement for drivers.

Based on these differences, and with all other criteria substantially the same, Alternative 4-b is recommended over 4-a. The preferred alternative is 4-b.

Alternative ID		No Build	4-a	4-b	5-a	5-b	7	10
Property Impacts	New right-of-way (acres)	0	12.4	14.4	19.4	15.5	25.0	29.9
	Parcels impacted	0	17	20	17	17	25	17
	Potential relocations	0	0-1 (Possibly 1 church)	0-1 (Possibly 1 church)	2 (1 church, 1 business)	2 (1 church, 1 business)	4-5 (Possibly 1 church, 4 businesses)	6 (1 church, 5 businesses)
	Rating	Good	Good/Fair	Good/Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor
Wetlands	Impacts	None	0.003	0.240	0	0	0	0
	Rating	Good	Fair	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Good
Environmental Justice (EJ)*	Impacts	No impact	no impacts					
	Rating	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Threatened & Endangered Species	Vegetation removal (acres)	0	15.5	8.7	11.3	10.5	8.6	8.8
	Anticipated Section 7 determination	No effect	May affect, but not likely to adversely affect	May affect, but not likely to adversely affect	May affect, but not likely to adversely affect	May affect, but not likely to adversely affect	May affect, but not likely to adversely affect	May affect, but not likely to adversely affect
	Rating	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Financially Responsible Implementation	Estimated Costs (millions of dollars)	\$0	\$33	\$33	\$43	\$37	\$36	\$38
	Rating	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Recommendation</b>		<b>Dismiss</b>	<b>Retain*</b>	<b>Retain*</b>	<b>Dismiss</b>	<b>Dismiss</b>	<b>Dismiss</b>	<b>Dismiss</b>

\*Preferred Alternative: 4-b.