| QUANTITATIVE SCREENING ANALYSIS |  | Mainline Highway Alternatives <br> including Santa Fe interchange impacts and I-25 interchange impacts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GaolsObiectives $\quad 1 \quad$ Performance Measure(s) |  |  |  |  |  | Express Lanes |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimize congestion on C.470 fom Kipling to -25. | PM paak hour Los. | - | pm paak hour LOSE/F | $\bigcirc$ | pm peak hour LOSD or beter | $\bigcirc$ | k hour LOS C or better in express lanes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | pm peak hour LOS E/F in general purpose lanes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | composite |
| Provide a reasonable balance between arterial interchange operations and freeway operations | ${ }^{\text {Intersection LOS. }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | see intersection LOS workheet | $\bigcirc$ | see intersection LOS worksheet | $\bigcirc$ | see intersection LOS worksheet |
| Minimize deay overa a linited dimerrame (peak period). | Corridor travel lime in minutes. | - | corridor travel time 30-35 minutes | $\bigcirc$ | corridor travel time 15.18 minutes | $\bigcirc$ | time 12-14 minutes in lanes (60\% volume) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | corridor travel time 29-36 minutes in general purpose lanes ( $40 \%$ volume) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | composite |
| Reliability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provide predicatale tavel limes. | LOS and whether lanes can be actively managed or not. | $\bigcirc$ | Poor LOS and n n a ative management no no ontrol ver how GPLS are used | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { moderate LOS and no active } \\ & \text { management ; no control over how } \\ & \text { GPLs are used } \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | moderate LOS and high active management ; express lanes can be actively managed |
| Manage capacity. | Degree to which an alternative provides flexible vs. fixed capacity. | $\bigcirc$ | dins | $\bigcirc$ | , | $\bigcirc$ | flexible capacity within Els ; fixed capacity within GPLs |
| Manage incidents. | Degree to which an alternative provides incident management elements. | $\bigcirc$ | some incident management elements available | $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { at managem } \\ & \text { available } \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | more incident management elements available; better means to access <br> incidents |
| Provide erlable chices to most | Number of choices and number of uesrs. | - | provides limited choices to limited users | $\bigcirc$ | provides moderate amount ofchoices (improve LOS on GPLL ) <br> moderate amount of <br> solers (bus,SOVs) | $\bigcirc$ | provides most choices (express lanes) to most users (bus, SOVs, HOVs) |
| Inform ueres of system status. | Number of TTS elements included within alternative. | $\bigcirc$ | no current means to deliver information | $\bigcirc$ | some ITS elements included within alternative | $\bigcirc$ | Is elements included within alterative |
| Implementation ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implement ina timely fashion. | Funding availability | $\bigcirc$ | no funding needed | $\bigcirc$ | Santa Fe 35\% funding identified GPL 0\% funding identified | $\bigcirc$ | Santa $\mathrm{Fe} 35 \%$ funding identified EL 70- 80\% funding identified |
| Mininize total project osts. | Total cost range.including Santa Fe) | $\bigcirc$ | s0 M | $\bigcirc$ | 5270 M - 8250 M | $\bigcirc$ | \$365 M - 5375 M |
| Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimize impacts to adjacent bicycle and pedestrian trail system. | Linear miles trail relocation neeessary. | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{0}$ miles | $\bigcirc$ | 7.5 miles | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{8} 8.1$ miles |
| Minimize noise impacts to the buill environment. | Number of receptors that exceed the threshold in the year 2025. | $\bigcirc$ | 16 receptors | $\bigcirc$ | 24 receptors | $\bigcirc$ | 24 receptors |
| Minimize traffic idiersion on to local road network. | Degree of traffic diversion on parallel facilities to 70. | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{\text {minimal diversion }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | minimal diversion | $\bigcirc$ | Colorado T-Ramp area increases 1530\% ; County Line Road from Santa Fe to Lucent increases 10-30\% |
| Compatibility with local land use plans. | Does the alternative support land use patterns that are compatible with local land use plans? | $\bigcirc$ | yes | $\bigcirc$ | yes | $\bigcirc$ | yes |
| Minimize visual impacts to neighoring communites. | elative degre of visual impact. | $\bigcirc$ | none | $\bigcirc$ | minor impact - barrier median ; <br> wider typical section; flyover a Santa Fe | $\bigcirc$ | minor impact - additional overhead signage ; barrier median ; wider typical section ; braided ramp at Quebec; T-Ramp at Colorado; flyover at Santa Fe |
| Minimize ecquisition of additional Right of Way. | Number of parcels impacted; acres of additional Right of Way needed. | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{0}$ parcel | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{56}$ partial parcels; 16.3 | $\bigcirc$ | 62 partial parcels; 99.7 ac |
| Ensure conformity with regional air quality standards. | ber of intersection LOS Dor wose. | $\bigcirc$ | 35 intersections | $\bigcirc$ | 36 interections | $\bigcirc$ | 36 inesesctions |
| Minimize floodplain impacts. | Is 100-.year flodplaini impacted? Location of impact. | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | meets FEMA floodplain regulations (under 1 ft . increase in 100 year floo $\qquad$ elevation) | $\bigcirc$ | meets FEMA floodplain regulations (under 1 ft . increase in 100 year flood elevation) |
| Minimize impacts to wetands and Waters of the U.S. | Crese of welands impacted. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 acres connected to Waters of U.S. ; 0 acres not connected to Waters of the U.S. | $\bigcirc$ | 0.8 acres connected to Waters of the U.S. ; 2.7 acres not connected to Waters of the U.S. | $\bigcirc$ | 0.7 acres connected to Waters of the U.S. 2.4 acres not connected to U.S. ; 2.4 acres not connected to Waters of the U.S |
|  | Acres of Waters of the U.S. impacted. | $\bigcirc$ | Oacres | $\bigcirc$ | 0.5 acres | $\bigcirc$ | 0.3 ac |
| Minimize impacts to critical water sources that degrade surface and ground water quantity and quality. | Acres of imperious surface area of alerative. | $\bigcirc$ | 135 acres | $\bigcirc$ | 300 acres | $\bigcirc$ | 322 acres |
| Minimize impact to potential Threatened or Endangered habitat. | Acres of Threatened or Endangered species habitat impacted, number of raptor nests impacted. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 acres, 0 nets | $\bigcirc$ | 0 acres : nests | $\bigcirc$ | 0 Ocres; 0 nests |
|  | Acres of Colorado Species of Special Concern habitat impacted. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 acres | $\bigcirc$ | 12.1 acres Black-tailed prairie dog | $\bigcirc$ | 123 acres Black-tailed prairie dog |
| Minimize encroachmenton thazardous material sties. | Number of haz-mat sites impacted, type, and severity of site impacts. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 sites | $\bigcirc$ | 4 sites (underground storage tanks, low potential for impact) | $\bigcirc$ | 4 sites (underground storage tanks, low potential for impact) low potential for impact) |
| Minimize impacts to cultural resources. (historical, <br> archaeological, and paleontological) | Number, type and severity of culural sites impa | $\bigcirc$ | no adverse impacts | $\bigcirc$ | no adverse | $\bigcirc$ | adv |
| Minimize impacts to recreation and parkland resources | Acres of recreation areas or parklands inpacted. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 ac | $\bigcirc$ | 5.1 acres (all for water quality ponds | $\bigcirc$ | 5.1 acres (all for water quality ponds) |
| Minimize impacts to itparian habitat. | Acres of riparian habiatat impacted. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 acres connected to Waters of U.S. ; 0 acres not connected to Waters of the U.S. | $\bigcirc$ | 5.0 acres connected to Waters of the U.S. $; 1.9$ acres not connected to Waters of the U.S. | $\bigcirc$ | 5.0 acres connected to Waters of the U.S. ; 1.9 acres not connected to Waters of the U.S. |
| Enhance the opportunity for wildlife movement across the corridor. | Does the alternative provide additional opportunity for, or more restrictions to, wildlife movement. | $\bigcirc$ | no additional opportunity or restrictions | $\bigcirc$ | additional wildlife movement opportunity under new $S$. Platte River bridge | $\bigcirc$ | additional wildlife movement opportunity under new S. Platte River bridge |
| Minimize impacts to minority and low-income populations. | Number and type of population impacted ; type and quantity of impact. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 communities impacted | $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 1 \text { community impacted (Wolhurst); } \\ \text { visual and noise impacts } \end{array}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 community impacted (Wolhurst) ; visual and noise impacts |
| Minimize economic impacts to local businesses and residencies. | Net loss to businesses, relocation costs. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 impacts | $\bigcirc$ | 0 impacts | $\bigcirc$ | 0 impacts |
| Ease of Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provide eppropriate acees to C 470 . | Number of access points. Provides access for most users | $\bigcirc$ | cest to C470 does not change | $\bigcirc$ | access to C 477 does not change | $\bigcirc$ | s to C-470 improves with acc to Colorado Blyd. |
| Provide approp ritue aceess across C 4770 . | Number f frossing. | $\bigcirc$ | access across $C-470$ does not change | $\bigcirc$ | Cess across C 477 does not change | $\bigcirc$ | ceess across C-470 does not change |
| Integrate multimodal solutions. | Availability of Transit Service. Effective ridership potential. Coordination with supporting elements. | - | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { no corridor specific transit } \\ \text { service fecture improvement of } \\ \text { adjacent arterial bus service only } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\bigcirc$ | bus service operates in general purpose lanes on C-470 ; ridership potential low to moderate; easy coordination of corridor service with any park-n-ride location | $\bigcirc$ | commuter bus service operates in express lanes ; one direct service from Kipling/Wadsworth, another direct service from Lucent ; ridership moderate because limited by location; coordination with arterial bus services at Lucent |
| Provide tansportaion chices to most users. | Mode choice fom interchanges on the corridor. | - | no mode choice available on C-470 Corridor | $\bigcirc$ | mode choice available from park-nride locations at any interchange, as demand warrants | $\bigcirc$ | mode choice available from park-nride Icoations at interchanges with express lane access; Wadsworth, Kipling Kipling, Lucent |
| Provide a transportation system that is consistent with regional transportation plans | Conformity with regional transportaion plans. | $\bigcirc$ | complete consistency with regional plans | $\bigcirc$ | additional service than defined in regional plans, but not inconsistent | $\bigcirc$ | additional service than defined in regional plans, but not inconsistent |
| Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Address pavement condition deficiencies. | Will the alternative reconstruct deficient pavement areas. | $\bigcirc$ | currently contains deficient pavement areas throughout entire project limit | $\bigcirc$ | will rehabilitate all deficient pavement areas | $\bigcirc$ | will rehabilitate all deficient pavement areas |
| Addrese exising maininine safety issues. | Does the alternative meet all/desirable/minimum project design criteria at selected locations. | $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { currently does not meet criteria } \\ \text { some locations } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\bigcirc$ | will meetall proect desigg criteria | $\bigcirc$ | will meetall project design criteria |
| Summary of each alternative: |  |  |  | Acceptable levels of service and average travel times ; poor relaiblity and no active a available ; some environmental impacts improvement in access to C-470 ; some integration with multi-modal services increase in safety on the corridor |  | Acceptable levels of service and best travel times ; best reliability and most active management ; higher costs but funding is available ; some environmental impacts improvement in access to C-470; some integration with multi-modal services ; increase in safety on the corridor. |  |
| Disposition: $\quad$ 年 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GENERAL PURPOSE LANES: 6 lanes Kipling to Wadsworth; 8 lanes Wadsworth to Santa Fe; 8 lanes plus auxiliary lanes Santa Fe to I-25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXPRESS LANES: 2 lanes Kipling to Wadsworth ; 4 lanes Wadsworth to I-25 ; access at Kipling, at Wadsworth, between Lucent and Broadway, between Broadway and University, at Colorado, at Quebec, at Yosemite, and at I-25 |  |  |  |  | O <br> most desirable $\qquad$ |  | $\longrightarrow \quad$ least desirable |

