



WEST OF STEAMBOAT SPRINGS

US HIGHWAY 40 - NEPA STUDY

ELK RIVER ROAD ALTERNATIVES – SCREENING DETAILS

	Traffic Signal with Single Left Turn Lanes	Diamond Interchange	Single Point Urban Interchange	Flyover	Jug Handle Interchange	Diverging Diamond Interchange	Traffic Signal with Southbound Double Left Turn Lanes	Split "T" Intersection	Roundabout
Ability to Provide Mobility Along US 40*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet traffic demand needs Three through lanes are not needed 	Meets traffic demand needs	Meets traffic demand needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets traffic demand needs Provides grade separation for the highest traffic conflict 	Meets traffic demand needs	Meets traffic demand needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides good mobility Best opportunity to coordinate with other signals in the vicinity 	Progression through the corridor would be negatively impacted because of the close signal spacing	Progression through the corridor would be negatively impacted
Level of Service*	Would not provide the necessary capacity for southbound left	Would provide high level of service	Would provide high level of service	Would provide very good level of service	Would provide high level of service	Would provide high level of service	Would provide good level of service – LOS C/D (am peak/pm peak)	Would provide good level of service	Would not provide the necessary capacity – LOS F/F (am peak/pm peak)
Access*	Consistent with the Access Control Plan	Not consistent with the Access Control Plan	Not consistent with the Access Control Plan	Not consistent with the Access Control Plan	Not consistent with the Access Control Plan	Not consistent with the Access Control Plan	Consistent with the access control plan and would have minimal impact to access to local businesses	Consistent with the access control plan; would impact business access on the north side	Consistent with the access control plan
Pedestrian/ Bicycle Connectivity	At-grade crossings typical	Interchange can accommodate grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle movements	Interchange can accommodate grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle movements	Fewer at-grade conflicts than signal only	Interchange can accommodate grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle movements	Interchange can accommodate grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle movements	At-grade crossings typical	At-grade crossings typical	Roundabouts are generally more difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists to use
Facilitates Transit	Potential to phase in transit priorities	Improves travel time but reduces connectivity	Improves travel time but reduces connectivity	Improves travel time but reduces connectivity	Improves travel time but reduces connectivity	Improves travel time but reduces connectivity	Transit lane and signal prioritization can be phased in at a later date	Transit lane and signal prioritization can be phased in at a later date	Would not accommodate future transit prioritization
Safety	Moderate safety performance	Relatively high safety performance because the major movements are grade-separated	Relatively high safety performance because the major movements are grade-separated	Relatively high safety performance because the major movements are grade-separated	Relatively high safety performance because the major movements are grade-separated	Relatively high safety performance because the major movements are grade-separated	More opportunities for conflict than both the roundabout and split-t alternatives	Provides higher safety performance than the signal, but lower than the roundabout	Provides higher safety performance than the traffic signal and split-t alternatives
Driver Expectation	Consistent with drivers' expectation	Would be only interchange in west Steamboat but consistent with interchange in east Steamboat	Would be a unique interchange in west Steamboat	Consistent with drivers' expectations	Would be a unique interchange in west Steamboat	Would be a unique interchange in west Steamboat	Consistent with drivers' expectations	Consistent with drivers' expectations	Not as consistent with drivers' expectations; roundabouts are not common within Steamboat Springs
Environmental	Potential impact to hazmat site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large intersection footprint Would require more ROW acquisition than signal and roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large intersection footprint Would require more ROW acquisition than signal and roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large intersection footprint Would require more ROW acquisition than signal and roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large intersection footprint Would require more ROW acquisition than signal and roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large intersection footprint Would require more ROW acquisition than signal and roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some impact to potential hazardous material sites Potential impact to 5 parcels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Larger impact to potential hazardous material sites Potential impact to 5 parcels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least impact to potential hazardous material sites Potential impact to 4 parcels
Cost	Medium cost	Higher cost due to bridge and walls	Higher cost due to bridge and walls	Higher cost due to bridge and walls	Higher cost due to bridge and walls	Higher cost due to bridge and walls	Medium cost	Higher cost (relative to at-grade options)	Medium cost
Maintenance and Snow Removal	Does not create unusual maintenance or snow removal challenges	More to maintain	More to maintain	More to maintain	More to maintain	More to maintain	Does not create unusual maintenance or snow removal challenges	Does not create unusual maintenance or snow removal challenges	Does not create unusual maintenance or snow removal challenges
Ability to Accommodate Trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Can accommodate trucks	Does not accommodate trucks as well as other alternatives
Other	Could be phased with future potential flyover	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Could be phased with future potential flyover	Existing R.O.W. could be developed as commercial or park	Could be phased with future potential flyover
Carry Forward?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO

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