



South Broadway NEPA Process

LEVEL 3 SCREENING CRITERIA

March 16, 2006
DRAFT

OVERVIEW

These Level 3 screening criteria are designed to utilize the more detailed level of information now available with the traffic model, engineering analysis and alternatives definition to distinguish alternative differences. For each criterion, one or more measures of effectiveness (MOE) is provided. These criteria are derived from remaining local concerns listed in the Interest Matrix, project needs, and project goals. The basis or origin of each criterion is identified. Not all of the items listed in the original Interest Matrix can be utilized in the Level 3 screening. Some interests have already been used in previous screening; others may be more appropriately applied as part of the evaluation in the EA; others may not be used at all because they do not provide information to distinguish between alternatives or because they are not measurable. **Each alternative will receive a rating for each criteria. We intend to use ratings of Best, Good, Fair, Poor and Worst. Though several of the measures of effectiveness will give us quantifiable results, the intent of this screening is not to end up with numeric scores but to compare the alternatives. From the comparison ratings we can select the best alternatives and/or components of alternatives.**

Criteria	Question	Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs)	Basis
A. Addressing South Broadway Peak Period Demand	1. Does the alternative manage anticipated traffic needs?	Percent of traffic demand served (Broadway / Lincoln corridor)	- Project Need: Broadway Congestion - Interest Matrix items C.1.a – C.1.d
		Intersection approach delays (north/south movements)	
		Maximum Broadway queue lengths (study intersections)	
		Avg. travel speed on Broadway	
		Avg. travel time on Broadway	
		Vehicle miles traveled (selected O/D pairs)	
		Vehicle hours traveled (selected O/D pairs)	
		Significance of out of direction vehicle movements	
B. Addressing Traffic Access/Connectivity	1. Does the alternative reduce intersection delay to facilitate east/west connections?	East-west street intersection LOS and maximum queue length (Center; Exposition; Ohio; Kentucky; Tennessee; Mississippi; Average travel speed and travel time (selected east/west and north/south O/D pairs)	- Project Needs: Cut-through traffic and access - Interest Matrix Items C.2.b -C.2.c
C. Minimizing Regional Traffic Cutting Through Neighborhoods	1. Does the alternative minimize cut-through/spillover traffic?	Intersection LOS and maximum queue length (Logan and Washington intersections) Rating - based on congestion on major roadways, local street access, local street continuity	- Project Need: Cut-through traffic - Interest Matrix Item C.3.a
D. Enhancing Bike/Ped Access/Mobility/Safety	1. Does the alternative improve north/south, east/west and Broadway Station pedestrian safety/accessibility?	Rating - based on number and type of routes, vehicle conflicts, significant new infrastructure, etc.	- Project Goal: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities - Interest Matrix Items: A.1.a, A.6, A.3.b., B.1.a, C.4.a
	2. Does the alternative improve north/south, east/west and Broadway Station bicycle safety/accessibility?	Rating - based on number and type of routes, vehicle conflicts, significant new infrastructure, etc.	
E. Promoting/Increasing Transit Access and Ridership	1. Does the alternative cause out of direction movement to access the Broadway Station?	Rating - based on how much out-of-direction movement	- Project Need: multimodal travel options - Interest Matrix Items: A.3.b, B.3.b, D.1.a, D.1.b, D.2.a - D.2.b
	2. Does the alternative cause out of direction movement for bus routes?	Rating - based on how much out-of-direction movement	
	3. Does the alternative include accommodations for additional transit ridership?	Rating - based on level and potential effectiveness of transit accommodations.	
	4. Does the alternative encourage transit use?	Rating - based on transit ridership potential	
	5. Does the alternative reduce parking at the Broadway station?	Quantify number of parking spaces lost	
F. Consistency with Adopted Positions of Project Stakeholders	1. How consistent is the alternative with the Cherokee and Lionstone Redevelopment Plans?	Rating - based on significance of features that are either positive or negative with respect to existing development plans.	- Project Goals: Economic viability; development opportunities; approved plans - Interest Matrix Items: G.2, E.1 - E.3
	2. How consistent is the alternative with the adopted positions of stakeholders?	Rating - based on significance of features that are either positive or negative with respect to Blueprint Denver, Comprehensive Plan 2000 and relevant supplements (including BARs Broadway streetscape plans), FasTracks, CDOT's VHEIS, and DRCOG's Metro Vision)	
G. Impact to Environmental Resources	1. Does the alternative avoid impacts to historic structures or parks? (106 and 4f)	Rating - based on level of impacts and how well impacts are minimized	- Project Goals: Environmental Resources - Interest Matrix Items: H.1, H.2, H.3, H.11, and C.1.3
	2. Does the alternative avoid disproportionate impacts to environmental justice populations?	Rating - based on level of impacts and how well impacts are minimized	
	3. What are estimated ROW impacts?	Rating - quantify estimated ROW impacts	
H. Impact to the Viability of Neighborhoods	1. Does the alternative preserve existing on-street parking in neighborhoods?	Rating - number of parking spaces lost	- Project Goals: parking; economic viability - Interest Matrix Items: F.1.a, C.3.a
	2. Does the alternative maintain existing functional roadway classification?	Rating - based on volumes, speeds, and access.	
I. Impact to Existing Businesses	1. Does the alternative preserve access to businesses along Broadway?	Rating - based on access requirements / changes	- Project Goals: parking; economic viability - Interest Matrix Item: B.1.b, G.1.b and G.1.d
	2. Does the alternative maintain existing parking for businesses along Broadway?	Rating - quantify number of parking spaces lost	
J. Funding and Construction Feasibility	1. Does the alternative have non-environmental locational issues, construction complexity, or economics that add significant cost or reduce the feasibility of it to be funded or constructed?	Rating - discussion	- Project Goals: implementation; funding
	2. How well does the alternative avoid impacts to hazardous materials sites?	Rating - based on level of impacts and how well impacts are minimized	
K. Improving Traffic Safety	1. Does the alternative meet minimum applicable standards?	Yes/no, if not where and why?	- Project Purpose: Safety

C:\Documents and Settings\weisspm\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\OLK64A\Level 3 criteria table draft 031606.xls\Sheet1