# LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 1 | | | | | | Alternative Group 2 | | | | | | Alternative Group 3 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | 1A | 1B | 1C | 1D | 1E | 1F | 2A | 2B | 2C | 2D | 2E | 2F | 3A | 3B | 3C | 3D | 3E | 3F |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 8 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 1 | | | | | | Alternative Group 2 | | | | | | Alternative Group 3 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | 1A | 1B | 1C | 1D | 1E | 1F | 2A | 2B | 2C | 2D | 2E | 2F | 3A | 3B | 3C | 3D | 3E | 3F |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 101 | 107 | 107 | 99 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 99 | 99 | 103 | 97 | 97 | 107 | 101 | 101 | 105 | 99 | 99 |
| **Rank** | | | 21 | 5 | 5 | 26 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 26 | 13 | 37 | 37 | 5 | 21 | 21 | 8 | 26 | 26 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | | Y | Y | | Y | Y | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | | Y | | |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

**LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS**

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **4A** | **4B** | **4C** | **4D** | **4E** | **4F** | **4G** | **4H** | **4I** | **4J** | **4K** | **4L** |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

## LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **4A** | **4B** | **4C** | **4D** | **4E** | **4F** | **4G** | **4H** | **4I** | **4J** | **4K** | **4L** |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 102 | 96 | 96 | 102 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 90 | 90 | 96 | 90 | 90 |
| **Rank** | | | 15 | 45 | 45 | 15 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 80 | 80 | 45 | 80 | 80 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | Y | | | Y | | | | | | | | |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

**LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS**

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **5A** | **5B** | **5C** | **5D** | **5E** | **5F** | **5G** | **5H** | **5I** | **5J** | **5K** | **5L** |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

# LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **5A** | **5B** | **5C** | **5D** | **5E** | **5F** | **5G** | **5H** | **5I** | **5J** | **5K** | **5L** |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 98 | 92 | 92 | 96 | 90 | 90 | 98 | 92 | 92 | 96 | 90 | 90 |
| **Rank** | | | 31 | 64 | 64 | 45 | 80 | 80 | 31 | 64 | 64 | 45 | 80 | 80 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

**LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS**

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | ALTERNATIVES | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Alternative Group 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **6A** | **6B** | **6C** | **6D** | **6E** | **6F** | **6G** | **6H** | **6I** | **6J** | **6K** | **6L** |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 8 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 9 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

**LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS**

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | ALTERNATIVES | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Alternative Group 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **6A** | **6B** | **6C** | **6D** | **6E** | **6F** | **6G** | **6H** | **6I** | **6J** | **6K** | **6L** |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 96 | 102 | 102 | 90 | 96 | 96 | 94 | 100 | 100 | 90 | 96 | 96 |
| **Rank** | | | 45 | 15 | 15 | 80 | 45 | 45 | 62 | 24 | 24 | 80 | 45 | 45 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | | Y | Y | | | | | | | | | |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

**LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS**

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **7A** | **7B** | **7C** | **7D** | **7E** | **7F** | **7G** | **7H** | **7I** | **7J** | **7K** | **7L** |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 8 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

## LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | **7A** | **7B** | **7C** | **7D** | **7E** | **7F** | **7G** | **7H** | **7I** | **7J** | **7K** | **7L** |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 104 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 92 | 92 | 102 | 96 | 96 | 98 | 92 | 92 |
| **Rank** | | | 12 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 64 | 64 | 15 | 45 | 45 | 31 | 64 | 64 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | Y | | | | | | Y | | | | | |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

**LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS**

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | G9 | | Alternative Group 10 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | 8A | 8B | 8C | 8D | 8E | 8F | 8G | 8H | 8I | 8J | 8K | 8L | 9A | 9B | 10A | 10B | 10C | 10D | 10E |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 10 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 10 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | Alternative Group 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | G9 | | Alternative Group 10 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | 8A | 8B | 8C | 8D | 8E | 8F | 8G | 8H | 8I | 8J | 8K | 8L | 9A | 9B | 10A | 10B | 10C | 10D | 10E |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 97 | 91 | 91 | 97 | 91 | 91 | 97 | 91 | 91 | 97 | 91 | 91 | 79 | 80 | 97 | 97 | 103 | 96 | 102 |
| **Rank** | | | 37 | 72 | 72 | 37 | 72 | 72 | 37 | 72 | 72 | 37 | 72 | 72 | 97 | 96 | 37 | 37 | 13 | 45 | 15 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Y | | Y |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

## LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | G11 | | Alternative Group 12 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1A: Purpose and Need & Key Project Goals** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | 11A | 11B | 12A | 12B | 12C | 12D | 12E | 12F | 12G | 12H | 12I | 12J |
| A. Most likely provides an efficient movement of goods and people for all modes of travel statewide. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | All alternatives appear to provide efficient movement of goods and people statewide | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| B. Most likely improves safety through the roadway widening and improvements, limiting access to the expressway facility and divided traffic lanes. | P&N states need relieve congestion which exists within Patterson City limits along the existing SCC alignment. It's assumed that the traffic congestion in Patterson is not contributed by travelers headed south because Crows Landing would be a better option than Patterson in the existing condition. Therefore, it's assumed that congestion is due to NB travelers.<br><br>3 - alignments that bypass nearest to Patterson.<br>1 - alignments that bypass furthest to Patterson. | Most alternatives appear to improve safety related to congestion due to either widening of congested routes of providing viable parallel routes.<br>Routes that would provide only limited relief as a parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 2.<br>Routes that would not provide a viable parallel route to existing congested roads i.e. Sperry were ranked a 1. | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 |
| C. Most likely enhances local, regional, interregional and statewide connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. | All alternatives appear to improve statewide interregional and regional connectivity. Local connectivity is limited to no improvement by some of these alternatives when Patterson or Turlock is bypassed. Local connectivity to Newman is only improved marginally when routes connect to SR33 north of Sperry. Local connectivity to Newman is the most beneficial when routes connect to SR33 south of Sperry. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| D. Most likely improves air quality and noise. | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| E. Most likely promotes an increase in local and regional investments. | 3 - if connected to existing planned development<br>2 - if adversely crosses a planned development<br>1 - if not connected to a planned development | Essentially only alternatives that do not connect to planned land uses receive a 1, All other alternatives are a 3 if they connect to either crows landing airport or Patterson planned expansion areas and W. Main. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| F. Most likely promotes the support of General Plans applicable within the project limits (i.e. compatible with planned zoning and land uses). | Same rationale as 1A(E). | i.e. Connects to planned land uses. Treating this with the same rational as category 1A(E) | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 9 |
| G. Most likely will reduce travel times within the corridor and the total vehicle-hours traveled in the corridor during peak traffic times | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | i.e. reduces congestion treating this with the same rational as category 1A(B) | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact

## LEVEL 1 SCREENING ANALYSIS MATRIX RESULTS

5/18/2016

*Enter 1, 2, or 3 based for each alternative per criteria based on how well alternative satisfies the criteria. See scoring legend below.*

| SCREENING CRITERIA | SCORING JUSTIFICATION (Total of 4 reviewers, but only 2 provided scoring justifications) | | G11 | | Alternative Group 12 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria 1B: Constructability / Operational Feasibility** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** | 11A | 11B | 12A | 12B | 12C | 12D | 12E | 12F | 12G | 12H | 12I | 12J |
| A. Most likely minimizes environmental impacts and concerns (i.e. jobs, corridor demographics, homes, cultural resources, population growth and distribution projections, existing and future development) | 3 - if alignment utilizes existing roads and no major residential impacts<br>2 - if minor portion of the alignment is off existing road and some residential impacts<br>1 - if a significant portion of the alignment is off existing road and significant residential impacts. | Disagree if alternative would result in the loss of jobs, change in character of community, or would be considered growth inducing.<br><br>No Alternative appears to result in job losses. Alternatives that would use existing streets between Patterson and the San Joaquin River i.e. lemon, eucalyptus, east morgan, Fulkerth would result in a change to a character of the community.<br><br>Alternatives outside planned growth are viewed as growth inducing. | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| B. Most likely reduces the amount of resources required to achieve improved conditions in the corridor by the utilization of existing local roads | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads and interchanges<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily or interchanges<br>1 - if uses new roads and interchanges | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| C. Not likely to require excessive cost to construct (i.e. floodplain impacts, right of way acquisitions, complex structures, etc.) | 3 - No new IC, no multiple grade separations, no new San Joaquin River bridge Xing, few irrigation bridges, utilize existing road alignments, minimum residential impacts.<br>2 - SR33 grade separation only, irrigation bridges, some residential impacts.<br>1 - Routes within flood plains, New IC, multiple grade separations, new SJ River bridge Xing, significant ROW impacts. | All routes have similar ROW Cost. Except routes that primarily use new roads i.e. these are rated a 1.<br><br>Routes within very large flood plains i.e. FEMA 100 year or DWR awareness.<br><br>Routes using West Keyes or South of Marshall are not behind a federal or non federal levee. Rank as a 1.<br><br>Routes through Del Puerto Creek Flood plain receive a 2 but appear to be manageable | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| D. Not likely to result in an excessive reduction to County and State inventory of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contracted lands, and active agricultural lands. | 3 - if uses primarily existing roads<br>2 - if uses either existing roads primarily<br>1 - if uses new roads | Don't think any route is excessive. Use a 3 if using existing roads and 2 if creating new roads. | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 |
| E. Not likely to result in excessive relocations/real property acquisitions of residential and/or businesses, or physically divide established communities. | Same rationale as 1B(A) | Relocation of Dairies on West Fulkerth reduces those alignments to a 2.<br><br>Impacts on Lemon, Eucalyptus, and Morgan reduces those alignments to a 2 given potential to divide established communities<br><br>Cross Country alignments are a 1. | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 |
| Utilizes Segment 19 (Fulkerth from Morgan to SR 99)<br>3 - No<br>1 - Yes | No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance. Main Street directly connects to Old Town History Turlock east of SR 99 and there is not a lot of traffic east of SR 99. Fulkerth Rd is Turlock's main east-west thoroughfare in the community. Therefore, to bring the SCC and city wide traffic to the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange would overload its capacity. The SCC through the Main St/SR 99 would most likely not result in the same traffic demands as would the Fulkerth/SR 99 interchange. | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| **Decision** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | | | 84 | 84 | 89 | 89 | 95 | 111 | 117 | 89 | 89 | 119 | 111 | 93 |
| **Rank** | | | 94 | 94 | 90 | 90 | 61 | 3 | 2 | 90 | 90 | 1 | 3 | 63 |
| **Alternative advanced to Level 2 for further consideration (Yes/No) if Rank <15?** | * No alignment containing Seg 19 can advance to Level 2. See scoring justification above. | | | | | | | * | Y | | | Y | * | |

Scoring Legend:
1 = Disagree. Low/No improvement or unacceptable/negative impact
2 = Neutral. Moderate/Marginal improvement or tolerable impact
3 = Agree. High/Substantial improvement or acceptable/positive impact