

Trail evaluation criteria provide a checklist of factors to consider when analyzing the proposed trail routes/corridors for prioritization. Community preference dictates whether the criteria are assigned scores and weighting factors; high – medium – low rankings; or provide guidance for discussion.

During the evaluation process, there should be an overriding goal of sustainability for each trail. Trails must be physically and environmentally sustainable. Consider impacts to the trail surface and the ROW corridor.

AZTEC TRAILS PRIORIZATION EVALUATION FORM

Name of Route: _____
 Date Evaluated: _____
 Name of Evaluator: _____

Instructions:

Mark the appropriate score (0,1, or 2) for each attribute in the score column. Use the Evaluation Criteria below to score for each attribute.

Attributes	Score	(X) Weight	Total Score
1. Land Availability / Development Approvals	_____	5 pts	_____
2. Physical / Environmental Constraints	_____		_____
3. Need/ Demand/Public Support	_____		_____
4. Stage of the Project	_____		_____
5. Local Links & Connections	_____		_____
6. Loop	_____		_____
7. Critical Connections	_____	10 pts	_____
8. New Connections	_____	10 pts	_____
9. Existing level of Use	_____		_____
10. Safety	_____		_____
11. Ease of Maintenance	_____		_____
12. Trail / Traffic relationship	_____		_____
13. User Experience	_____		_____
14. Partnerships	_____	5 pts	_____

Evaluation Criteria

- 1) Is the proposed route in City ownership. Are there any approved plans referencing the trail.**
 0 – No, the trail route is on private property and the ROW is not secured.
 1 – Yes, the corridor is owned by the City fee simple or thru easement agreements.
 2 – Yes, the corridor is owned by the City and other development plans reference the proposed trail.



- 2) Are there any physical (narrow corridor, excessive slopes), natural (T&E, sensitive plants) or archeological constraints to constructing the trail?**
0 – Yes, the trail has significant issues related to physical, natural or archeological constraints
1 – Yes, the trail has some constraints that can be mitigated
2 – No, there are no constraints
- 3) Does the demand for the trail, based on population density and proximity to public facilities exist now, or is the trail needed primarily to serve future growth in the area?**
0 – The trail is not near neighborhoods nor is growth projected in the area.
1 – The trail serves a neighborhood community.
2 – The trail corridor is in a heavily populated area, could serve as a Safe Route To School / or there is a planned development within 3-5 years.
- 4) What is the stage of the project?**
0 – There has been no scoping or planning done for the trail corridor.
1 – Some conceptual planning has been completed.
2 – Some conceptual planning is completed along with agreement on the general alignment.
*** Conceptual planning is defined as some drawings, visual graphics, and community ideas have been collected and shared with the public.*
- 5) Does the proposed route offer links to local destinations? (e.g. a neighborhood park, equestrian center, neighborhood school, local park, neighborhood commercial center, Animas River, etc.?)**
0 - No, the trail would not provide any links to local destinations.
1 - Yes, the trail links indirectly to local destinations, or has the potential to link to local destinations.
2 - Yes, the trail links directly to local destinations and/or no other alternate routes exists.
- 6) Does the proposed route form or facilitate completion of a loop? (incl. bike lanes)**
0 - The trail is isolated and not likely to form any larger loops.
1 - The trail has the potential to form part of a local loop.
2 - The trail completes a portion of an existing loop.
- 7) Does the establishment of the proposed route prevent the loss of a critical connection?**
0 - No, the route is entirely within the public right-of-way or is already secured by easement.
1 - Yes, establishment of a trail through land purchase, easement acquisition, or license agreement would secure an existing informal connection.
2 - Yes, establishment of a trail through land purchase or easement acquisition would prevent an imminent loss of connectivity through planned or likely development or reestablish a historic connection; or remedy a closed off access point/easement; or re-establish a historic connection
- 8) Does the proposed route provide a critical connection opportunity where there is currently no physical access or connection? (e.g. bridge or ditch crossing or a blocked)**
0 - No, the route does not provide a new connection opportunity.
1 - Yes, establishment of a trail would provide a new public connection to an existing or proposed facility; or clearly identify an existing public trail connection.
2 - Yes, establishment of a trail would provide a new public connection to an existing or proposed facility where there are no other connection opportunities within a ¼ mile.

9) What is the existing use level of the corridor?

- 0 - The corridor is not being currently used extensively by any specific user group.
- 1 - The corridor is primarily used by one known type of user group (e.g. only equestrians).
- 2 - The corridor is currently being used by multiple different user groups (equestrian, pedestrian, bicycle, strollers, etc.); or the route may be single-use that has historically formed an important connection.

10) What is the current condition of the route? (perception of safety)

- 0 - The corridor is overly constricted or includes numerous hazards that might create a sense of danger to trail users (such as industrial areas, walls or fences, abandoned properties, etc).
- 1 - The corridor has existing or potential safety problems that could be mitigated with reasonable effort or an easement acquisition.
- 2 - The corridor is free of hazards and fosters a sense of safety and security.

11) What is the ease of maintenance/volunteer support?

- 0 – Corridor has steep grades, sandy terrain, or other condition that would indicate a high level of maintenance required.
- 1 – Corridor has flat grades and no issues which would require special maintenance; or, there is the potential for a volunteer group to maintain.
- 2 – Corridor has low maintenance requirements and volunteer groups or landowners who actively maintain trail.

12) Trail/traffic relationship

- 0 - There is significant existing or potential conflict resulting from trail proximity to high-speed traffic or forced at-grade crossing without a signal or sign.
- 1 - There is some existing or potential conflict resulting from relative trail proximity to some traffic or at-grade crossing with stop sign or crosswalk.
- 2 - There is minimal existing or potential conflict (comfortable set-back from street and connections through grade-separated crossings or low risk at-grade crossings).

13) Quality of the Visitor Experience ?

- 0 – Visitor experience quality lacking – traffic, congestion, no visual interest, limited access
- 1 – The trail offers good public access, high interest scenic features
- 2 – The trail offers easy access, visual interest, and opportunities for education and resource interpretation.

14) Partnerships

- 0 – There are no partners identified beyond ATOS
- 1 – The project involves one other community partner (health, school, etc)
- 2 – Two or more partners are identified supporting trail planning, development, interpretation)