

6-27-2003

## **Gorham Bypass Study, Appendix A, Part Two : Comparative Non-Traffic Evaluation Matrix, June 2003**

Maine Department of Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalmaine.com/mdot\\_docs](https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Maine Department of Transportation, "Gorham Bypass Study, Appendix A, Part Two : Comparative Non-Traffic Evaluation Matrix, June 2003" (2003). *Transportation Documents*. 722.  
[https://digitalmaine.com/mdot\\_docs/722](https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs/722)

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Transportation at Digital Maine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Transportation Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Maine. For more information, please contact [statedocs@maine.gov](mailto:statedocs@maine.gov).

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
CORRIDOR	Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor		3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
NATURAL RESOURCES:	NUMBER OF STREAMS WITHIN CORRIDOR		1	4	3	4	5	6	4	5
- SURFACE WATER QUALITY	AMOUNT OF STREAMS WITHIN CORRIDOR	linear meter; linear m/km	308 linear m; 83 m/km	1,061 linear m 168 m/km	1,012 linear m; 158 m/km	1,323 linear m; 155 m/km	1,615 linear m; 157 m/km	2,072 linear m; 163 m/km	1,871 linear m; 292 m/km	3,083 linear m; 385 m/km
		linear feet; linear f/tmi	1,010 linear ft 440 linear ft/mi	3,480 linear ft 892 linear ft/mi	3,320 linear ft; 830 linear ft/mi	4,340 linear ft; 820 linear ft/mi	5,300 linear ft; 830 linear ft/mi	6,800 linear ft; 860 linear ft/mi	6,140 linear ft; 1,535 linear ft/mi	10,114 linear ft; 1,264 linear ft/mi
- GROUND WATER QUALITY	EXTENT OF AQUIFERS WITHIN CORRIDOR									
	-high yield	Hectares; % of Corridor	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none
	-high yield	Acres; % of Corridor	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none
	-medium yield	Hectares; % of Corridor	78; 69%	48; 25%	none	48; 19%	48; 15%	48; 12%	87; 45%	87; 36%
	-medium yield	Acres; % of Corridor	193; 69%	120; 25%	none	120; 19%	120; 15%	120; 12%	216;45%	216;36%
- FLOODPLAINS 100 YEAR	EXTENT OF FLOODPLAINS WITHIN CORRIDOR	Hectares; % of Corridor	3.6; 3%	6; 3%	6.5; 3%	7; 3%	10; 3%	12; 3%	11; 6%	11; 5%
		Acres; % of Corridor	9; 3%	15; 3%	16; 3%	18; 3%	24; 3%	31; 3%	28;6%	28;5%
-LAKES AND PONDS	EXTENT OF LAKES AND PONDS IN CORRIDOR	Hectares; % of Corridor	none	0.2; <1%	0.01; <1%	0.2; <1%	0.2; <1%	0.2; <1%	0.3; <1%	0.3; <1%
		Acres; % of Corridor	none	0.4; <1%	0.03; <1%	0.4; <1%	0.4; <1%	0.4; <1%	0.7; <1%	0.8;<1%

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)									
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9		
<b>CORRIDOR</b>												
<b>Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor</b>			3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha		
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac		
- FISHERIES AQUATIC HABITAT	EXTENT OF FISHERIES HABITAT WITHIN CORRIDOR (At corridor level assume fisheries habitat in all streams per MDIF&W)	linear meters; linear meter/km	308; 83	1,061; 168	1,012; 158	1,323; 155	1,615; 157	2,072; 163	1,871; 292	3,083; 385		
			linear feet; linear feet/mile	1,010; 440	3,480; 892	3,320; 830	4,340; 820	5,300; 830	6,800; 860	6,140; 1,535	10,114; 2023	
- THREATENED ENDANGERED SPECIES Upland Sandpiper	PRESENCE OF FEDERAL AND STATE LISTED SPECIES IN CORRIDOR	Location	none present	none present	present around the Main St and Mosher Rd area	none present	none present	present around the Main St and Mosher Rd area	none present	present around the Main St and Mosher Rd area		
- WETLANDS	AMOUNT OF WETLANDS IN CORRIDOR; based on approx. ROW	Hectares; % of Corridor	17; 15%	1.1; <1%	6.5; 3%	2.7; 1%	5.3; 2%	7.3; 2%	11.7; 6%	12; 5%		
			Acres; % of Corridor	41; 15%	2.6; <1%	16; 3%	6.6; 1%	13; 2%	18; 2%	29; 6%	30; 5%	
- WILDLIFE	PRESENCE OF KNOWN SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITATS IN CORRIDOR		Present; Terminates Adjacent to Deer Wintering Area	none	none	none	none	none	Present: Located North of Deer Wintering Area	Present: Located North of Deer Wintering Area		
- LAND USE	WELLHEAD PROTECTION DISTRICTS IN CORRIDOR	Number	1	none	none	none	none	none	1	1		

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
CORRIDOR	Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor		3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
- PRIME & UNIQUE FARMLAND	AMOUNT OF PRIME & UNIQUE FARMLAND IN CORRIDOR									
	-Prime Farmland	Hectares; % of Corridor	2.4; 2%	36.8; 19%	93; 48%	57; 22%	89; 28%	130; 33%	24; 12%	37; 15%
		Acres: % of Corridor	6; 2%	91; 19%	230; 48%	140; 22%	220; 28%	322; 33%	60; 12%	92; 15%
	-Farmland of Statewide Significance	Hectares: % of Corridor	13; 12%	20; 10%	46; 23%	55; 21%	63; 20%	66; 17%	17; 9%	21; 9%
		Acres: % of Corridor	33; 12%	50; 10%	113; 23%	137; 21%	155; 20%	162; 17%	42; 9%	52; 9%
- VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES	AMOUNT OF FORESTED TREE COVERAGE IN CORRIDOR	Hectares; % of Corridor	53; 47%	123; 64%	127; 65%	175; 67%	217; 69%	251; 64%	117; 60%	124; 50%
		Acres; % of Corridor	132; 47%	304; 64%	315; 65%	434; 67%	536; 69%	620; 64%	289; 60%	306; 50%
ENGINEERING:	DESIGN FEATURES		Bypass Links 3 State-Roads relatively level grades	Bypass Links 3 State-Roads with some steep grades	Bypass Links 4 State-Roads rolling with some steep grades	Bypass Links 4 State-Roads rolling grades	Bypass Links 5 State-Roads rolling grades	Bypass Links 6 State-Roads rolling grades	Bypass Links 3 State-Roads rolling grades	Bypass Links 4 State-Roads rolling grades
	GEOTECHNICAL		None Known	ledge	ledge	ledge	ledge	ledge	None Known	None Known
	MAJOR TRANSMISSION / UTILITY FACILITIES	crossings/ presence in Corridor	1	3	4	3	3	5	4	5
	Electric		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS							(305 m; 1,000	
			feet wide)								
CORRIDOR			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9	
Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor			3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha	
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac	
	Former Railroad Track	crossings/ presence in Corridor	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Gas Pipeline		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Water Pipeline		no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	
	Fiber Optic		no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	
	UNCONTROLLED PETROLEUM & HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES										
	Known	number	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	Potential	number	1	0	2	0	0	2	3	4	
	Estimated Cost (construction,engineering, ROW)	Millions	\$5.1	\$8.7	\$8.9	\$11.7	\$14.2	\$17.5	\$11.3	\$13.8	
	ROW REQUIRED (assume 200' ROW)	hectares	23	39	39	52	63	78	39	49	
	acres	56	96	97	129	155	193	97	121		
<b>LAND USE &amp; SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESOURCES:</b>											
- LAND USE	HOUSES WITHIN CORRIDOR	number; number/km	54; 15	45; 7	45; 7	62; 7.3	73; 7.1	90; 7.1	97; 15.1	100;12.5	

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
CORRIDOR	Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor		3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
	HOUSES WITHIN CORRIDOR	number; number/mile	54; 23	45; 12	45; 11	62; 12	73; 11	90; 11	97; 24	100; 20
	BUSINESSES WITHIN CORRIDOR	number; number/km	6; 1.6	1; 0.1	6; 1.0	1; 0.1	3; 0.3	7; 0.5	9; 1.4	10; 1.2
	BUSINESSES WITHIN CORRIDOR	number; number/mile	6; 2.6	1; 0.3	6; 1.5	1; 0.2	3; 0.5	7; 0.9	9; 2	10; 2
	COMMUNITY FACILITIES WITHIN CORRIDOR	number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRESENCE OF DEVELOPABLE LAND WITHIN CORRIDOR: Vacant Land	hectares; % of Corridor	48; 42%	55; 28%	32; 16%	66; 25%	74; 24%	81; 21%	66; 34%	162; 66%
	PRESENCE OF DEVELOPABLE LAND WITHIN CORRIDOR: Vacant Land	acres; % of Corridor	118; 42%	135; 28%	80; 16%	163; 25%	182; 24%	200; 21%	162; 34%	400; 66%
	PRESENCE OF IDENTIFIED POTENTIAL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT LAND WITHIN CORRIDOR	hectares; % of Corridor	54; 48%	none	30; 15%	none	28; 9%	28; 7%	53; 27%	59; 24%
		acres; % of Corridor	134; 48%	none	69; 15%	none	69; 9%	69; 7%	130; 27%	145; 24%

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
<b>CORRIDOR</b>										
<b>Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor</b>			3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
<i>- LAND USE</i>	COMPATIBILITY WITH LAND USE PLANS <sup>1,2</sup>	type of zoning hectares; percentage of corridor	residential 96;85% commercial 17;15%	residential 169;88% commercial 24;12%	residential 187;95% commercial 8;5%	residential 236;90% commercial 24;10%	residential 289;92% commercial 24;8%	residential 356;92% commercial 33;8%	residential 198;91% commercial 17;9%	residential 182;75% commercial 28;12% industrial 32;13%
	COMPATIBILITY WITH LAND USE PLANS <sup>1,2</sup>	type of zoning acres; percentage of corridor	residential 236;85% commercial 42;15%	residential 418;88% commercial 60;12%	residential 463;96% commercial 21;5%	residential 584;90% commercial 60;10%	residential 715;92% commercial 60;8%	residential 880;92% commercial 82;8%	residential 489;91% commercial 42;9%	residential 450;75% commercial 70;12% industrial 80;13%
		Compatible w/ Comprehensive Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan	yes; but TSM measures may conflict with Village Plan
	ACCESS/ ACCESSIBILITY TO AREAS TARGETED FOR POTENTIAL FUTURE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT	Parcel within or near corridor	within Narragansett District;	near Narragansett District	within Gorham Savings Bank Property	near Narragansett District	within Gorham Savings Bank Property	within Gorham Savings Bank Property	within Narragansett District	within Narragansett District
1. Gorham Comprehensive Plan: 2. Gorham Main Street Master Plan										
<i>-NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY COHESION</i>	POTENTIAL EFFECTS ON NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER	Neighborhoods within corridor; neighborhoods/km	4; 1.1	3; 0.48	3; 0.47	5; 0.59	5; 0.49	6; 0.47	6; 0.94	7; 0.88

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
 SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
 GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
 CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
CORRIDOR			3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
	POTENTIAL EFFECTS ON NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER	Neighborhoods within corridor; neighborhoods/mi	4; 1.7	3; 0.77	3; 0.75	5; 0.94	5; 0.78	6; 0.76	6; 1.5	7; 1.4
	TRAFFIC IMPACTS	Local road traffic impacts								
	Day Road 1999 Existing Volume=900 vehicles/day; 150 vehicles/hr 2025 No Build Volume=360 vehicles/day; 65 vehicles/hr	Vehicles/Day	1,870	1,330	330	1,310	700	660	160	160
		Vehicles/Hr	320	240	60	240	130	120	30	30
	Cressey Road 1999 Existing Volume=1,325 vehicles/day; 165 vehicles/hr 2025 No Build Volume=2,010 vehicles/day; 245 vehicles/hr	Vehicles/Day	1,340	1,190	1,740	1,250	1,180	1,180	1,210	1200
		Vehicles/Hr	140	120	200	130	120	120	125	120



**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS							(305 m; 1,000 feet wide)		
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9		
<b>CORRIDOR</b>												
<b>Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor</b>			3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha		
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac		
<i>-NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY COHESION</i>	Morrill Avenue		Anticipate removal of greatest amount of cut through traffic with nearby bypass	Anticipate removal of cut through traffic, less than Corridor 1-1	No anticipated removal of cut through traffic	Similar removal anticipated to Corridor 1a-1a	Similar removal anticipated to Corridor 1a-1a	Similar removal anticipated to Corridor 1a-1a	Similar removal anticipated to Corridor 1-1	Similar removal anticipated to Corridor 1-1		
	Lincoln Street		Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Least reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate 2nd greatest reduction in cut through traffic due to amount of downtown traffic removed.	Anticipate greatest reduction in cut through traffic due to largest amount of downtown traffic removed.	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic		
	Preble Street		Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Least reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate 2nd greatest reduction in cut through traffic due to amount of downtown traffic removed.	Anticipate greatest reduction in cut through traffic due to largest amount of downtown traffic removed.	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic	Anticipate reduction in cut through traffic		

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS (305 m; 1,000 feet wide)							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
	<b>Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor</b>		3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
	EFFECT ON COMMUNITY FACILITIES	close to school intersection activities (buses, pedestrian, bicycles)	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none
<i>- ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</i>	ESTIMATED POPULATION WITHIN CORRIDOR	People; people/sq km	150; 40.5	125; 32	125; 19.5	172; 20.2	202; 19.6	250; 19.6	269; 42	277; 34.6
		People; people/sq mile	150; 65.2	125; 32	125; 31.2	172; 32.4	202; 31.6	250; 31.6	269; 67	277; 55
	HOUSEHOLDS IN POVERTY STATUS (as defined by Census Bureau)	Statistical Percentage Based on Census Block Data (1990)	0.0-3.4%	0.0-3.8%	0.0-3.4%	0.0-3.4%	0.0-3.4%	0.0-3.8%	0.0-10.1%	0.0-10.1%
	MINORITY POPULATIONS (as defined by Census Bureau)	Statistical Percentage Based on Census Block Data (1990)	0.0-1.1%	0.0-0.9%	0.2-0.3%	0.2-1.1%	0.2-1.1%	0.2-1.1%	0.0-1.1%	0.0-1.1%
<i>- HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGIC</i>	KNOWN PROPERTY/SITES WITHIN THE CORRIDOR	number of known sites	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>	none identified at corridor level	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>	none identified at corridor level <sub>1</sub>
			none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none
<i>- PARKS RECREATION</i>	PROPERTY/SITES WITHIN THE CORRIDOR	acres; facilities	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none

**COMPARATIVE NON-TRAFFIC EVALUATION MATRIX  
 SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING FACTORS  
 GORHAM BYPASS STUDY  
 CORRIDOR SCREENING PHASE**

CATEGORY	MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	UNITS	BUILD CORRIDORS <span style="float: right;">(305 m; 1,000 feet wide)</span>							
			1-1	1A-1A	2-2	3-3	4-4	6-6	8-8	9-9
CORRIDOR	Length of Corridor/Land Area Within Corridor		3.7 km/113 ha	6.3 km/193 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.5 km/261 ha	10.3 km/314 ha	12.7 km/389 ha	6.4 km/196 ha	8.0 km/245 ha
			2.3 mi/278 ac	3.9 mi/478 ac	4 mi/484 ac	5.3 mi/644 ac	6.4 mi/775 ac	7.9 mi/962 ac	4.0 mi/484 ac	5 mi/606 ac
<sup>1</sup> MHPC has identified the potential for archaeological resources in the southerly half of the study area.										
	EFFECTS ON GORHAM VILLAGE BUSINESSES									
	Reduction in Through Traffic	Percent compared with 2025 No-build	18%	14%	21%	14%	23%	34%	18%	19%
	Increased Hourly Customer Capacity in Gorham Village	(# vehicles per hour compared to 1999)	170	20	270	40	350	740	130	140
- VISUAL	CHANGE IN VISUAL CHARACTER: HISTORIC SITES-WITH TSM IN GORHAM VILLAGE		potential for change	potential for change	potential for change	potential for change	potential for change	potential for change	higher potential for change	higher potential for change
	CHANGE IN VISUAL CHARACTER: HISTORIC SITES-WITHOUT TSM IN GORHAM VILLAGE		none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none