I-70 Kipling Interchange PEL Study Level 1 Screening Matrix



		NA	1	2	3	Λ	5	6	7	8	9	10
Category	Level 1 Screening Criteria		Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)	Diamond with Roundabouts at Ramps	Diamond with	Diamond with Six- Leg Roundabout at Ramps & Frontage Roads	Diamond with Roundabouts at Frontage Roads	Fully Directional	Partial Cloverleaf with Loops SW & NE Quadrants	Partial Cloverleaf with Loop SW Quadrant	Partial Cloverleaf	Improved Tight Diamond - Added Lanes on Kipling & Ramps
									×××	W.X	XX.	
	Can the alternative meet current and future traffic demands?	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Traffic Operations	Does the alternative improve operations by addressing the interaction of the Kipling interchange with the frontage road intersections?	NO issues with close signal spacing on the ramp and frontage road intersections level remain	YES	NO issues created by queues from frontage road signals remain	YES roundabouts reduce queues between intersections	YES roundabouts reduce queues between intersections	NO issues created by queues from ramp signals remain	YES	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing on north side remain	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain
Safety	Does the alternative improve existing and future No Action conditions that contribute to higher than expected crash rates?	NO issues with close signal spacing on the ramp and frontage road intersections level remain	YES	NO issues created by queues from frontage road signals remain	YES	YES	NO issues created by queues from ramp signals remain	YES	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing on north side remain	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain
Multimodal	Can the alternative accommodate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections through the interchange?	NO No change with connections through the existing interchange	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
SUMMARY OF RESULTS		Carried Forward: Baseline Comparison	Carried Forward	Eliminated: Does not address the operational and safety issues of the frontage road signals with ramp intersections		Carried Forward	Eliminated: Does not address the operational and safety issues of the frontage road signals with ramp intersections	Carried Forward	Carried Forward	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Carried Forward	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative
NOTES			Spacing between ramps and frontage roads signals increased; Wide footprint of ramp terminals generally not pedestrianfriendly	Roundabouts generally not pedestrian-friendly; May impact ability to maintain Kipling signal progression; May have issues with more lanes on	Roundabouts generally not pedestrian-friendly; May impact ability to maintain Kipling signal progression; May have issues with more lanes on Kipling south of I-70 as shown in local plans	May impact ability to maintain Kipling signal progression; May have issues with more lanes on	Roundabouts generally not pedestrian-friendly; May impact ability to maintain Kipling signal progression; May have issues with more lanes on	created with speed differential on Kipling Street	signals; Loop ramps can be confusing for	Requires modification of south frontage road intersection without a signal; Loop ramp can be confusing for driver expectancy	Loop ramp for freeway exit movement (NW loop ramp) typically not desirable; Loop ramps can be confusing for driver expectancy	

I-70 Kipling Interchange PEL Study Level 1 Screening Matrix



		11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Category	Level 1 Screening Criteria	Texas Frontage Road Diamond	Traditional Diamond	Double Crossover Diamond	Three-Level Diamond	Half Diamond to East at Garrison	New WB Off Ramp West of Kipling		SB to EB Flyover Ramp	Bike Path I-70 Grade Separations at Interchange	Local Road I-70 Grade Separation	Michigan Lefts for Ramps
			××						×			
	Can the alternative meet current and future traffic demands?	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange	YES	YES	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange	YES
Traffic Operations	Does the alternative improve operations by addressing the interaction of the Kipling interchange with the frontage road intersections?	YES	YES	NO configuration does not improve operations with close adjacent signals	NO issues with close signal spacing on the ramp and frontage road intersections level remain	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	
Safety	Does the alternative improve existing and future No Action conditions that contribute to higher than expected crash rates?	YES	YES	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing on the ramp and frontage road intersections level remain	NO issues at existing interchange configuration remain	NO issues at existing interchange configuration remain	YES	NO issues with congestion along Kipling remain	NO issues with existing interchange configuration remain	NO issues at existing interchange configuration remain	YES
Multimodal	Can the alternative accommodate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections through the interchange?	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO No change with connections through the existing interchange	NO No change with connections through the existing interchange	YES	YES	YES	NO No change with connections through the existing interchange	YES
SUMMARY OF RESULTS		Carried Forward	Carried Forward	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated: Traffic operation and safety concerns not addressed	Eliminated: Does not address needs at the interchange	Eliminated: Does not address needs at the interchange	Carried Forward	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated: Does not address needs at the interchange	Carried Forward
NOTES		Frontage roads would be one-way operations at Kipling and may be two-way upstream from slip ramps; May be safety issues where frontage roads and ramps meet	Requires modification of frontage road intersection without signals	Frontage road intersections need to be modified without signals to address traffic operation issues; Crossover movements can be confusing for driver expectancy	does not substantially reduce	Removing minor amount of local traffic to/from east of Kipling does not substantially reduce interchange volumes	traffic bound for west of Kipling does not substantially	Button hook ramps may also be used for the north or south ramps as an element of an alternative; Button hook off ramps can be confusing for driver expectancy	the interchange does			Intersections at frontage roads will need to be relatively large intersections to accommodate uturn movements

I-70 Kipling Interchange PEL Study Level 1 Screening Matrix



		22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
Category	Level 1 Screening Criteria	Added Turn Lanes for Ramps	Ramp Meter Modifications		Close West Side of	Remove 49th Avenue Signal (closure or RIRO)	Realign South Frontage Road Further South	Close South Frontage Road at Kipling	Widen/Improve	Bus Pullouts	Single Roundabout Interchange	Close Driveways Between Ramps
					×			**				××
	Can the alternative meet current and future traffic demands?	YES	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange	YES	NO does not meet traffic demands at the interchange							
Traffic Operations	Does the alternative improve operations by addressing the interaction of the Kipling interchange with the frontage road intersections?		NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain			YES	YES	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain
Safety	Does the alternative improve existing and future No Action conditions that contribute to higher than expected crash rates?	_	_	_	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain					NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain	YES	NO issues with close signal spacing between ramps and frontage roads remain
Multimodal Connections	Can the alternative accommodate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections through the interchange?	YES	NO No change with connections through the existing interchange	NO No change with connections through the existing interchange	YES	YES						
SUMMARY OF RESULTS		Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative	Carried Forward	Eliminated as a Stand-Alone: May be carried forward as an element of another alternative
NOTES											Roundabouts generally not pedestrian-friendly; May have issues with more lanes on Kipling south of I-70 as shown in local plans	frontage roads