# 40 WEST OF STEAMBOAT SPRINGS

US HIGHWAY 40 - NEPA STUDY

## CROSS-SECTION ALTERNATIVES – SCREENING DETAILS

| | 2-Lane Undivided | 4-Lane Undivided | 4-Lane with Center Barrier | 4-Lane with Raised Median | 4-Lane with Median and Managed Lanes | 4-Lane Undivided with Flush Median | 4-Lane with Depressed Median | 6-Lane with Median | 6-Lane with Median and Managed Lanes | 4-Lane with Median Reversible Managed Lane |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Capacity** | 24, 000 vpd | 35,000 vpd | 40,000 vpd | 40,000 vpd | 40,000 vpd (assumes full usage of managed lanes) | 40,000 vpd | 40,000 vpd | 65,000 vpd | 65,000 vpd (assumes full usage of managed lanes) | 50,000 vpd (assumes full usage of managed lane) |
| **Ability to Provide Mobility Along US 40*** | • Meets traffic demand needs in segment 1<br>• Does not meet traffic demand needs in segments 2, 3, & 4 | • Meets traffic demand needs in segment 1 & 2<br>• Does not meet traffic demand needs in segments 3 & 4 | Meets traffic demand needs in all segments | Meets traffic demand needs in all segments | Could meet traffic demand needs in all segments if managed lanes were fully utilized | Meets traffic demand needs in all segments | Meets traffic demand needs in all segments | Meets traffic demand in all segments | Meets traffic demand in all segments | Meets traffic demand in all segments |
| **Access*** | Less effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | Less effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | Not as effective at implementing the Access Control Plan as a raised median | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan | More effective at implementing the Access Control Plan |
| **Facilitates Transit*** | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Helps promote alternative modes of travel - ridesharing and transit | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Does not promote alternative modes of travel | Helps promote alternative modes of travel - ridesharing and transit | Helps promote alternative modes of travel - ridesharing and transit |
| **Safety** | Comparatively low safety performance | Low safety performance, compared to alternatives with medians | Good safety performance if continuous | Comparatively high safety performance because of median | Better safety performance than undivided but worse than standard 4-lane median | Comparatively high safety performance because of median | Comparatively high safety performance because of median | Comparatively high safety performance because of median | Better safety performance than undivided but worse than standard 6-lane with median | Better safety performance than undivided but worse than standard 4-lane with median |
| **Environmental** | Comparatively minor environmental impacts due to smaller footprint | Fewer environmental impacts than alternatives with raised medians | Medium environmental impacts; similar to raised median | More potential environmental impact than undivided alternatives | More potential environmental impact than undivided alternatives | More potential environmental impact than undivided, without median, alternatives | High potential for environmental impacts | • Most potential environmental impact<br>• Greater impact to Lincoln Park then 4-Lane alternative | • Most potential environmental impact<br>• Greater impact to Lincoln Park then 4-Lane alternative | • More potential environmental impact than other 4-Lane alternatives |
| **Cost** | Comparatively low cost | Lower cost than alternatives with raised medians | Similar cost as raised medians | Higher costs than undivided roadway alternatives | Higher cost then undivided roadway alternatives | Higher costs than undivided roadway alternatives | Highest cost of 4-lane alternatives | Higher cost than all 4-lane roadway alternatives | Higher cost than all 4-lane roadway alternatives | Higher cost than undivided 4-lane roadway alternatives |
| **Maintenance and Snow Removal** | Lowest maintenance or snow removal issues | Moderately low maintenance or snow removal issues | Moderate maintenance or snow removal issues | Moderately high maintenance or snow removal issues | Moderately high maintenance or snow removal issues | Moderate maintenance or snow removal issues | Moderately low maintenance or snow removal issues | High maintenance or snow removal issues | High maintenance or snow removal issues | • Highest maintenance for curb section in the median<br>• Highest level of snow removal and storage issues |
| **Other** | n/a | n/a | • Would require frequent breaks in the barrier for turning movements<br>• Less aesthetically pleasing | n/a | Would require active management to achieve good lane utilization | n/a | n/a | Projected traffic demand needs do not warrant 6 through lanes | • Would require active management to achieve good lane utilization<br>• Projected traffic demand needs do not warrant 6 through lanes | • Would require active management to achieve good lane utilization<br>• Many operational issues |
| **Carry Forward?** | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES | NO | NO | NO | NO |

* These criteria relate to the Purpose and Need for the project.