**OGL Smart Grant Evaluation**

**Scenario 4.1 Historic Data – Corridor 1**

**Evaluator Name:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**System being Evaluated:** Vendor A, Vendor B, Vendor C & Vendor D

**Overall Objective**

The overall objective of these scenarios is to exercise the capability of each of the systems being evaluated. As you use the system, please comment on its usability (e.g. user friendliness and intuitive configuration) as you set up the scenario, and the usefulness of the resulting output. Note any concerns with data accuracy, or “wish list” items that would make the system easier to use or the output more helpful. Reviewers are also encouraged to use the system for the specific objective, as well as to explore and document the use of other related functionality.

**Scenario Objective**

Describe the general objective of the scenario here.

We want to see how a specific change may impact a corridor. Corridor changes may include but aren’t limited to signal timings, new developments, lane configurations, additional traffic control measures. We have identified a possible retiming scenario which can be used for this evaluation, but the user can select an alternative, if desired. The evaluation will include selected performance measures, such as changes to control delays, speeds, volumes, travel times, near-misses, etc., at the signals both before and after the retiming.

**Scenario Description**

Provide a detailed description of the scenario, including location, time of day, etc.

**Analysis Results**

Detailed results questions…

**Please, provide detailed feedback by answering the questions below:**

1. **On a scale from 1 (1 is the worst) to 5 (5 is the best), how would you evaluate the overall performance of the system in terms of (insert one “X” per row in the table below):**

**Effectiveness:** This refers to how well the transportation analysis system achieves its intended purpose. In other words, does the system provide accurate and reliable results that help in making informed transportation decisions?

**Usability**: This criterion assesses the coverage and availability of the necessary data within the system. It evaluates whether the system provides sufficient and relevant data to perform comprehensive transportation analyses.

**Ease of use:** This measures how simple and straightforward it is to use the system without requiring extensive training or experience. It looks at whether users can quickly learn how to use the system and perform necessary tasks with minimal effort.

**Memorability of workflow needed to complete a query:** This refers to how easily users can remember the steps and procedures to perform a specific query after not using the system for a while. It evaluates whether the workflow is logical and easy to recall.

**Functionality:** This criterion examines the range and usefulness of features provided by the system. It considers whether the system has all the necessary tools and capabilities to perform various transportation analyses effectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usability |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ease of Use |  |  |  |  |  |
| Memorability of workflow |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functionality |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Is there any additional feedback you would like to provide on the system?**

Answer:

1. **Do you have any suggested improvements or features for this system?**

Answer:

1. **If you tried to do the same thing in another system, how did they compare? Please, provide ranking where 1 is the most preferred and 4 is the least preferred. If you have not tested some of the systems, please, select N/A (insert one “X” per row in the table below).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | N/A |
| Vendor A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vendor B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vendor C |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vendor D |  |  |  |  |  |

**What is the basis/rational for providing this ranking?**

**Answer:**