

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is dedicated to providing an accessible experience for everyone. While we are continuously improving our standards, some complex items in this document, such as certain figures and images, are difficult to create with fully accessible parameters for all users. If you need help understanding any part of this document, we are here to assist and have resources to provide additional accessibility assistance to any requests. Please email us at CDOT_Accessibility@state.co.us to request an accommodation, and a member of our Interstate 270 (I-270) Engineering Program will schedule a time to review the content with you. To learn more about accessibility at CDOT, please visit the [Accessibility at CDOT webpage on the CDOT Website](#).

4.0 Alternatives Considered

4.1 Overview of Alternatives Development

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and CDOT developed and evaluated a range of reasonable alternatives to address the Purpose and Need for the I-270 Corridor Improvements Project (project) and meet the goal of minimizing environmental and community impacts. Alternatives development was informed by public, agency, and stakeholder input and considered a range of improvement strategies, including additional travel lanes, operational and safety enhancements, transit supportive elements, and bicycle and pedestrian connectivity improvements.

A detailed description of alternatives development, screening methodology, and evaluation criteria is provided in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Chapter 3, and Appendix B, Alternatives Development Technical Report.

Consistent with the abbreviated Final EIS approach, Draft EIS analyses remain valid except as updated in Chapter 2, Changes Since the Draft EIS and Errata.

4.2 Alternatives Evaluated in the Draft EIS

The Draft EIS evaluated a range of alternatives through a two-level screening process based on the project's Purpose and Need, operational performance, safety, multimodal considerations, environmental impacts, and consistency with regional transportation plans.

Following screening, the following alternatives were carried forward for detailed evaluation in the Draft EIS.

- No Action Alternative
- Three General-Purpose Lanes Alternative
- Two General-Purpose Lanes and One Express Lane that Accommodates Transit Alternative

These alternatives and their key features are described in detail in the Draft EIS Chapter 3, and Appendix B, Alternatives Development Technical Report.

Additional alternatives were considered but eliminated during screening because they did not meet the project's Purpose and Need, presented operational or feasibility constraints, or would result in greater impacts. A summary of screening results is provided in Table 4-1, with details provided in the Draft EIS and supporting documentation.

Table 4-1. Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS and Screening Results

Alternative	Key Elements	Level 1 Screening	Level 2 Screening
No Action Alternative	Ongoing maintenance only; no change to I-270 configuration	Retained (baseline as required by NEPA)	Retained (baseline as required by NEPA) and advanced to Draft EIS
Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Enhancements Alternative	Improvements to community bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities without modifications to I-270	Eliminated as a standalone alternative (does not address corridor safety/operations on I-270). Elements of this alternative were included in the other alternatives.	Not Applicable
Minimal Build Alternative	Rebuilding the existing highway to current design standards while maintaining two lanes in each direction	Advanced	Eliminated (insufficient mobility/operations benefits compared to needs)
Three General-Purpose Lanes Alternative	Reconstruction to modern standards and addition of one general-purpose lane in each direction, for a total of three lanes in each direction	Advanced	Advanced to Draft EIS
Two General-Purpose Lanes and One Transit-Only Lane Alternative	Reconstruction with one transit-only lane added in each direction, for a total of three lanes in each direction	Advanced	Eliminated (lower corridor performance compared to an Express Lane)
Two General-Purpose Lanes and One Express Lane that Accommodates Transit Alternative	Reconstruction with one Express Lane added in each direction, for a total of three lanes in each direction	Advanced	Advanced to Draft EIS
Three General-Purpose Lanes and One Express Lane that Accommodates Transit Alternative	Reconstruction with one additional general-purpose lane and one Express Lane in each direction, for a total of four lanes in each direction	Advanced	Eliminated (bottleneck/operational issues at system interchanges)
Two General-Purpose Lanes and Two Express Lanes that Accommodate Transit Alternative	Reconstruction with two Express Lanes added in each direction, for a total of four lanes in each direction	Advanced	Eliminated (greater impacts and operational drawbacks)

The Draft EIS preliminarily identified the Two General-Purpose Lanes and One Express Lane that Accommodates Transit Alternative as the Preferred Alternative. Additional information regarding this identification is provided in the Draft EIS, Section 3.4, and Appendix B, Alternatives Development Technical Report.

An additional alternative submitted during the Draft EIS public comment period was evaluated following the Draft EIS; its evaluation and disposition are documented in Chapter 2.0, Changes Since the Draft EIS and Errata, and Appendix D.