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Executive Summary

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) District 6 is conducting the Interstate 15 (I-15) and United States Highway 20 (US-20) Safety and Mobility Study (Project No. A020(065), Key No. 20065). ITD along with the Bonneville Metropolitan Planning Organization (BMPO) and its member agencies have identified the need to improve the I-15/US-20 connection and the adjacent six interchanges. The Project Team includes ITD and their consultants for technical resources, BMPO, and member agencies.

The project study includes two phases of work.

Phase A collected existing data and studies from previous work and started a public outreach program. Phase A was completed in summer of 2018.

Phase B, the current phase, includes development of a Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study. The PEL represents a collaborative and integrated approach to transportation decision-making that;

1. Considers environmental, community, and economic goals early in the transportation planning process, and
2. Uses the information, analysis, and products developed during planning to inform the environmental process as the project moves into a NEPA document.

The PEL will include three levels of screening for alternatives to develop a recommended list of three to five alternatives to advance into a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, once funding allows. A screening level reviews each alternative against the screening criteria questions developed with the purpose and need and project goals considerations.

Utilizing the data collected from Phase A, Phase B began, which includes development of the evaluation criteria matrix, concept level alternatives, alternative analysis and screening, on-going public outreach and the PEL. This report summarizes the Universe of Alternatives development and Level One alternatives screening process and results.

Level One Summary

Detailed notes of the universe of alternatives brainstorming meeting and the Level One screening meeting are included in Appendices. Below is a summary.

- The universe of alternatives brainstorming exercise developed fourteen alternatives. At this brainstorming exercise, the Project Team included nineteen individuals representing ITD, BMPO, City of Idaho Falls, Bonneville County, BYU-Idaho professor, a Citizen and consultant team members.
- The fourteen concept alternatives were categorized as either “on-alignment” or “off-alignment” and each was given a unique name and shown over aerial maps as sketches.
The purpose and need and project goals, sketch concept alternative maps, alternative descriptions and the evaluation criteria matrix were provided to the Project Team to be used for review prior to for the Level One Screening meeting.

At the Level One screening meeting, nine of the fourteen alternatives were recommended to advance to Level Two analysis.

The Level One alternatives and the results from the screening meeting were presented to the public at an open house public meeting.

Input from Community Working Group Meeting #3 was used in developing a new alternative (US-20 one way couplet) that will be added to the other nine concept alternatives and considered in Level Two, for a total of ten concept alternatives.

Next Steps

For Level Two, the Project Team will:

- Complete a design criteria matrix to aid in the coarse development of geometrical layouts of each alternative.
- Complete the travel demand modeling for the planning year, 2045, for each concept alternative.
- For each alternative, identify bridge locations, major utility conflicts, ped/bike/multi-modal routing/connections, right of way needs, local access roads connections; review of land use planning, freight plans, identify environmental concerns/constraints, future developments/economics.
- Meet to review and screen the alternatives against the Level Two evaluation criteria matrix.
- Present a draft Level Two alternatives and draft screening results to the public in the spring of 2019.
Appendices

Draft Purpose and Need
Introduction
This Purpose and Need Statement for potential transportation improvements on I-15 and U.S. 20 in or near Bonneville County and Idaho Falls was developed after analysis of existing conditions and in coordination with stakeholder agencies and the public.

The primary users of these corridors include:

- North-south through traffic (i.e. coming and going from the south toward Yellowstone)
- Traffic destined for central Idaho Falls
- Local crosstown traffic (moving from one side of the city to the other using the interstate)

All three user groups, which include travelers of all types (auto, freight, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian) are increasing in volume, and demand is expected to increase into the near future. The project is being conducted to figure out how to accommodate these now and into the future, with improved capacity, safety, and mobility.

In the following section we will define a Purpose and Need as well as additional project goals.

- The “Purpose” is a concise statement defining the transportation problem to be solved.
- The “Needs” identify the specific deficiencies recognized through analysis of existing and projected conditions and provide data to support the Purpose statement. The needs are summarized here and will be fully documented in the Existing Conditions Report (in development, to be completed summer 2018), prepared as part of this PEL study.
- “Additional Goals” are also included to identify related and important objectives identified by project stakeholders that may be considered during project development, but are not the reason the project is being developed.

Project Purpose (indicates how the project action proposes to address the problem)
The purpose of the PEL study is to identify and analyze improvements to address safety, congestion, mobility and travel time reliability for efficient movement of people, goods and services on I-15 and US-20 in or near Bonneville County and Idaho Falls.

Project Needs (details the problem, today and in the future)
The PEL will study multi-modal connections and capacity improvements to I-15 and US-20 as well as potential new roadway linkages in order to:

1. Address unsafe travel conditions on I-15 and US-20
   a. Traffic backs up at exit ramps
b. Substandard lane change / merge space between exits

c. Interchanges are spaced too closely together

2. Reduce congestion at the I-15/US-20 interchange, particularly for traffic exiting US-20 towards southbound I-15 at the onramp, and for northbound traffic on I-15 exiting at US-20 eastbound exchange, which both operate at a current LOS D

   a. High volumes of freight traffic
   
   b. High volumes of peak hour local commuter traffic
   
   c. Limited crossings of railroad and river funnel traffic to the I-15/US-20 corridor

3. Provide pedestrian and bicycle mobility within the I-15 and US-20 corridors

   a. Built and natural barriers limit safe connectivity to adjacent facilities and the river and adjacent multiuse trails
   
   b. According to the 2008 BMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian plan the corridor’s “existing facilities are either inadequate, deficient, or associated with various problems.”

4. Address future travel demand forecasts

   a. Current infrastructure will not accommodate travel demands of increasing local growth and regional tourism
   
   b. Current infrastructure is projected to operate at Level of Service E or F at the interchange of I-15/US-20 by the year 2045, which will not appropriately provide for future growth as identified in adopted local (City, County, and MPO) land use and comprehensive plans.

Additional Goals

1. Provide transportation facilities that improve access to local schools, recreation facilities and commercial areas that support local land use plans while also reducing the negative impacts of the existing infrastructure on those community resources.

2. In addition to improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the corridor, seek to provide additional connections to the surrounding multi-modal network.

3. Provide improvements that serve all types of travelers including local commuters, freight, and regional tourism.

4. Consider new infrastructures impacts to local roads through coordination with Idaho Falls and Bonneville County.

5. In addition to identification and mitigation of any direct environmental impacts of the proposed improvements, seek to provide additional opportunities for the project to enhance local environmental resources.
# I-15/US-20 Connector – Level 1 PEL Evaluation Matrix

## Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Improves Safety</th>
<th>Improves Congestion</th>
<th>Enhances Opportunity</th>
<th>Accommodates Future Travel Demand</th>
<th>Minimizes Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Economic, Demographic, and Market Impacts</th>
<th>B/C Analysis and/or comparison of lifecycle costs and constructability</th>
<th>Improves Access</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 Screening Question</strong></td>
<td>Does the alternative improve bike, pedestrian, and vehicle safety on I-15 and US-20 including the interchange on and off-ramps?</td>
<td>Does the alternative reduce congestion on I-15 and US-20?</td>
<td>Does the alternative enhance or improve bicycle, pedestrian, transit and vehicle connectivity throughout the I-15/US-20 study area?</td>
<td>Does the alternative improve travel time reliability on I-15 and US-20 in the study area?</td>
<td>Does the alternative meet the purpose and need of the project?</td>
<td>Does the alternative enhance or improve economic, demographic, and market conditions in accordance with City, County, and MPO land use and comprehensive plan objectives and goals?</td>
<td>Does the alternative provide options for phased improvements?</td>
<td>Does the alternative improve access to local resources including schools, recreational facilities, and commercial areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## No Action Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.A On Alignment</th>
<th>Split Access for IC 118/119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I.B On Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.B On Alignment</th>
<th>Free Flow for 118/119 Interchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I.C On Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.C On Alignment</th>
<th>Free Flow for 118, 119 &amp; Fremont Interchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# I-15/US-20 Connector – Level 1 PEL Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.D On Alignment</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>I.A Off Alignment</th>
<th>Anderson Street Connector</th>
<th>I.B Off Alignment</th>
<th>33rd Avenue/Iona Rd Connector</th>
<th>I.C Off Alignment</th>
<th>49th N/Telford Rd Connector</th>
<th>I.D Off Alignment</th>
<th>49th N/Telford Rd Connector with West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodates Future Travel Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimize Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic, Demographics, and Market Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B/C Analysis and/or comparison of lifecycle costs and constructability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates Future Travel Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic, Demographics, and Market impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/C Analysis and/or comparison of lifecycle costs and constructability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I.E Off Alignment**
65th N Connector with West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26

**I.F Off Alignment**
73 N Connector with West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26

**I.G Off Alignment**
81 N Connector with West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26
Universe of Alternatives
Brainstorming Meeting
Summary; Evaluation
Questions; Alternative
Descriptions and Exhibits
Meeting Minutes

Project: I-15/US-20 Connector

Subject: Level 1 Universe of Alternative Brainstorming Meeting

Date: June 7-8th, 2018

Location: ITD District 6 office, Rigby

Attendees:
- Lance Bates – Bonneville County
- Nick Contos – Bonneville County
- Chris Canfield – City of Idaho Falls
- Curtis Calderwood – ITD
- Tim Cramer – ITD
- Mark Layton – ITD
- Brad Richards – ITD
- Jesse Barrus – ITD
- Jim Lawrence – BYU Idaho
- Karen Hiatt, ITD
- Drew Meppen – ITD
- Ryan Day – ITD
- Darrell West – BMPO
- Derek Noyes - ITD
- Kelly Hoopes – Horrocks
- Ben Burke – Horrocks
- Tracy Ellwein – HDR
- Cameron Waite - HDR
- Jason Longsdorf – HDR

Day 1 – June 7th (10:30 – 4:30)

The purpose of the meeting was for the Analysis Team to identify a universe of alternatives to address the study’s purpose and need and goals. To prepare the analysis team, the team was provided background information ahead of the meeting. The information provided included:

1. Project Purpose and Need (KN20065-M_20180314_Purpose and Need.pdf)
2. Aerial maps of project study area
3. Environmental Scan Document by HDR, dated May 29th, 2018
4. Meeting Agenda

The meeting started with Tracy explaining what we need to accomplish in identifying alternatives, at a very high level, to meet the project purpose and need and goals. This is the initial step of the range of alternatives development. Jason next discussed the screening process which includes three levels of alternative screening leading to several recommended alternatives to be advanced into a NEPA study. Jason provided an overview of the environmental scan and environmental resource that were identified.
These include wetlands and water resources, land use, Section 4(f) properties, cultural resources, environmental justice, hazardous material, recreational areas, and biological resources.

Kelly and Cameron provided an overview of the existing traffic conditions, planning year forecast and the level of service for the planning year 2045 no build condition. Included in the traffic study was an origin and destination study that shows that split between local and regional traffic is 60% local and 40% regional. Consideration in alternative development needs to include supporting the regional (pass-through) traffic. They also discussed the sensitivity analysis of possible interchange locations north of Exit 119 and connector roads to the east that would have an impact on the study area traffic models.

Three groups were created with three to four team members in each group. Team members were a diverse mix to include agency staff and design team staff. The three teams spent the rest of the meeting brainstorming and exploring alternatives and sketching them on the provided maps. At the end of the day, each team presented their ideas to the group.

Following the group presentation, Tracy, Kelly, Cameron and Jason took all the alternatives and categorized them into broad concept ideas, combining those that were similar and assigned each distinct alternative a name.

Day 2 – June 8th (8:30 – 3:00)

The group was asked to share any new ideas they may have considered since the previous day. The groups were mixed up to refine the broad range of concepts developed the previous day, different than the ones they were involved with the day before. Each group advanced the concepts further, developed a list of hybrid alternatives and developed alternative descriptions.

In summary,

- The Analysis Team developed 14 alternatives
- The alternatives were categorized as either “on-alignment” or “off-alignment”
- Each alternative was given an unique name and a description
- Each concept was then drawn over aerial maps with the alternative name
- The sketch concept alternative maps and alternative description was sent to the analysis team and others from the agencies to be used for the Level One Screening meeting (July 24, 2018).
## I-15/US-20 PEL DRAFT Evaluation Questions

### Needs, Goals, and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 2 Responses</th>
<th>Level 3 Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative improve safety on I-15 and US-20, including the interchange on or off-ramps?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>How well do ramp signals operate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative provide adequate weave distance?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>What is the total weave distance provided between consecutive ramps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative provide standard 12-foot lane widths?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>What is the total number of corridor lane-miles that are narrower than 12 feet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative address substandard interchange spacing on I-15 and US-20?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the design option provide adequate distance between ramps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are changes in access (closures or relocations) expected to reduce crashes?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative reduce the number of predicted crashes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative reduce congestion on I-15 and US-20?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>What is the capacity of I-15/US-20 in the alternative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative separate regional through trips and local destination trips?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative reduce end-to-end travel times through the corridor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative improve freight movement?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>How does the alternative affect freight traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative provide improved, alternative, or additional crossings of railroad and river?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Is there an alternative or redundant crossing provided in the alternative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative support current and future bicycle connection needs across I-15 and US-20?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative support current and future bicycle connection needs in the Study area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative provide current and future pedestrian connection needs across I-15 and US-20?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative support current and future pedestrian connection needs in the Study area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative provide current and future transit connection needs across I-15 and US-20?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative support current and future transit connection needs in the Study area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative provide current and future local vehicle connection needs across I-15/US-20?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative support current and future local vehicle connection needs in the Study area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Needs, Goals, and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 1 Responses</th>
<th>Level 2 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 2 Responses (all responses include qualitative discussion)</th>
<th>Level 3 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 3 Responses (quantitative data and qualitative discussion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative improve connections/transfers to surrounding multi-modal network?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative provide capacity improvements to address projected population and tourism growth?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative address 2045 peak hour congestion?</td>
<td>What connections are supported?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Travel Demand</td>
<td>Does the alternative improve travel time reliability on I-15 and US-20 in the Study area?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative provide LOS improvements to adequately address future growth as identified in adopted City, County, and MPO land use and comprehensive plans? <em>(Acceptable LOS per BMPO Long Range Transportation Plan = LOS A-D)</em></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Does the alternative operate at a 2045 LOS consistent with existing BMPO planning documents (LOS A-D is acceptable)/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Does the alternative meet the purpose and need of the project?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Will the environmental impacts require additional agency approvals or permits?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>What environmental impacts have been identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Constructability</td>
<td>Does the alternative provide options for phased improvements?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Would phased improvements include throwaway improvements?</td>
<td>Identify improvements might be thrown away at a later phase of design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>Does the alternative create any controversial issues?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>What are the obvious public concerns the project will have to address?</td>
<td>Identify public perception/support issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Does the alternative improve access to local resources including schools, recreational</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Is the improved access to local resources beneficial to the intent/use of the local resource?</td>
<td>Describe the change to the access and the likely impact on the resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the alternative reduce access to local resources?</td>
<td>Describe how the access is reduced and the likely impact on the resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Needs, Goals, and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 1 Responses</th>
<th>Level 2 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 2 Responses (all responses include qualitative discussion)</th>
<th>Level 3 Criteria Questions</th>
<th>Level 3 Responses (quantitative data and qualitative discussion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facilities, and commercial areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### I. On Alignment Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exits 118 and 119 become one single split interchange with one-way collector – distributor (CD) roads that connect Broadway and Grandview/US-20. The CD roads would be one-way traveling in the same direction as the I-15 divided lanes (east side CD travels northbound [NB], west side CD travels southbound [SB]).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Same as I.B with the addition of a high capacity interchange at Fremont and extension of the free-flow connector ramps beyond the Fremont interchange.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Texas turnarounds provided for U-turns between the NB and SB CD roads at each exit. Vehicles can access Grandview or Broadway at signalized intersections.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lindsay Blvd. Interchange is removed and a new local road connection from Lindsay to the system is provided. Two potential locations are shown in the drawing.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>This system can be combined with direct connection flyover ramps from I-15 to US-20 or any options to reconfigure the Fremont and Science Center interchanges.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>May be accompanied and/or staged with other options presented.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>New Pedestrian Crossing over I-15 between 118 and 119.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eliminates weaving and acceleration issues on I-15 between Exits 118 and 119.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moves queues from the Exit 119 NB off-ramp so they do not back up onto I-15.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removes Lindsay interchange ramps, increasing weaving and acceleration distances between interchanges in the system.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Lindsay connections allow new, separate ped/bike facilities away from I-15 and US-20.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD roads allow traffic going to different destinations to weave and change lanes at lower speed (35-45 mph vs. 65 mph), separate from I-15 traffic.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduces traffic on the NB 119 off-ramp, which removes the potential for queuing back to I-15.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduces volume of traffic at the weaving location between Exits 118 and 119.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversion of existing US-20 at the connection to I-15 allows for improved ped/bike accommodations.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Same alternative as I.B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove pedestrian conflict points with the at-grade ped/bike crossings at the ramps with new Fremont interchange.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Remove U-turns at each exit for full access to CD roads, improves mobility through the system.** | | | *
| **Signal timing with adjacent signals on Broadway to move traffic.** | | | *
| **CD roads allow traffic going to different destinations to weave and change lanes at lower speed (35-45 mph vs. 65 mph), separate from I-15 traffic, reducing conflict.** | | | *
| **Allows dual left turn lanes from WB US-20 to SB CD and from Broadway to NB CD, reducing queues and moving more cars per signal cycle.** | | | *
| **Removes through traffic accessing US-20 from 118/119 interchanges.** | | | *
| **Reduces travel times.** | | | *
| **Same alternative as I.B** | | | *
<p>| <strong>Can be a short term solution to serve demand until it grows, then in 2030 or 2035 add flyovers, NB connector, etc., to move I-15 to US-20 demand from the split diamond. The split diamond would serve the reduced demand for local connections.</strong> | | | <strong>Long-Term solution through however not expandable at Science Center interchange.</strong> |
| <strong>Limited by the number of turn lanes provided at signalized intersections.</strong> | | | <strong>The free flow connector ramps can be expanded to travel through Fremont and Science Center (Att IC).</strong> |
| <strong>Need to evaluate need for additional capacity on local “US-20 alignment.”</strong> | | | <strong>Long-term solution however not expandable at Exits 118 and 119.</strong> |
| <strong>Potential new crossing over river and railroad for a Lindsay connection alternative.</strong> | | | <strong>The free flow connector ramps can be expanded to travel through Fremont and Science Center (Alt IC).</strong> |
| <strong>Temple View Elementary on west and industrial area and railroad on the east could be impacted by CD roads.</strong> | | | <strong>Same as I.B</strong> |
| <strong>Noise impacts</strong> | | | <strong>Same as I.B</strong> |
| <strong>Visual effects</strong> | | | <strong>Same as I.B</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost/Constructability</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>I.D Increase Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Could be built mostly within existing ROW, require significant staging of existing traffic during construction. Replace I-15 bridge over Broadway to allow more lanes and Texas turnaround lanes. Expand or replace Grandview bridge over I-15 to allow more lanes and Texas turnaround lanes. One Lindsay Alternative (north) requires 2 new bridges over railroad and river. Addresses immediate needs and allows more time to develop flyovers, NB connector, etc., to move I-15 to US-20 demand. The split diamond can continue to serve the reduced demand that is more &quot;local&quot; traffic while the long term solution serves &quot;regional&quot; traffic.</td>
<td>- Maintains all existing connections from I-15 and US-20 to local streets, with the Lindsay interchange removed and new local street connections to access I-15 and US-20.</td>
<td>- Reconstruct and expand system in same corridor with lane expansion on I-15, US-20, and the interchanges. Rebuild 118 interchange, 119 interchange, and Science Center interchange into high capacity interchanges. Close Lindsay interchange and provide a new Lindsay local connection with a new local system bridge north of US-20. Convert Fremont from an interchange to an overpass. Make Science Center a full interchange. Traffic using the Fremont interchange will use the Science Center interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Difficult staging for on-alignment work High impact to mobility during construction Numerous new structures, some elevated in two and three levels over existing and proposed roadways</td>
<td>- Separates regional vs local access at three interchanges. Provide a new access for Lindsay from local road. Lindsay to become a local road connection with a new river bridge.</td>
<td>- Removes 4 conflict points with removal of 2 interchange's Eliminates weaving issues between the Exit 119, Lindsay, and Fremont interchanges. Removes vehicles slowing to exit at Fremont and Lindsay from US-20, reducing speed differences between vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Provide a system interchange to the north of Exit 119 interchange with a new river crossing, railroad crossing, Canal Crossing South of Freeman Park, and Science Center Drive.</td>
<td>New US-20 alignment travels west from the Lewsville interchange aligned with 33rd/Iona Rd and connects to I-15 with a system interchange north of Exit 119. (33rd could eventually be connected all the way across to US-26.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intent of this option is to fully separate the through I-15/US-20 traffic from the local roadway network while maintaining access for local traffic across the existing railroad, canal and river crossings. May be companioned/staged with other options presented.</td>
<td>• Exit 118 and 119 are improved together (see I.A Split Access for interchange 118/119)</td>
<td>• US-20 rejoins the current alignment at the St Leon interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Move connection of US-20 to I-15 to the north as described.</td>
<td>• WB US-20 movement flies over I-15 and then has the option to merge onto I-15 (north of Grandview) or exit at Grandview – which also provides access to CD road to exit at Broadway – only way to get to Broadway.</td>
<td>• Requires a river crossing, 5 new structures over county roads, and 2 structures over the railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-20 between the Grandview exit 119 and Science Center becomes a local road.</td>
<td>• Existing US-20 alignment becomes a new commercial route. Existing improvements remain intact across the river. Lindsay connection remains as is. US-20 comes down to grade at Fremont (could be signalized or a roundabout). Provide a similar at grade intersection treatment at Science Center Drive.</td>
<td>• Existing US-20 will be severed at 15th and connects with county roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install US-20 EB entrance ramp and WB exit ramp at Science Center to US-20.</td>
<td>• Carry existing old US-20 alignment north of Science Center Drive and provide a new connection midway between Anderson and Iona to Holmes.</td>
<td>• Existing US-20 to be downgraded to a local roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remove the connection of US-20 between Fremont Drive/Riverside and Science Center and install a frontage road to connect to Science Center.</td>
<td>• Address ped/bike crossings with all new roads and establish options for separated traffic on the old US-20 alignment between Grandview and Science Center Drive.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conversion of existing US-20 allows for improved ped and bike accommodations.</td>
<td>• Conversion of existing US-20 allows for improved ped and bike accommodations.</td>
<td>• Conversion of existing US-20 allows for improved ped and bike accommodations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminates weaving issues between the Exit 119, Lindsay, and Fremont interchanges.</td>
<td>• There will be a relatively short weaving section between Exit 119 and the new US-20 interchange on I-15</td>
<td>• Highest volumes are served without stop control or traveling through an interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion • Highest volumes are served without stop control or traveling through an interchange.</td>
<td>• Highest volumes are served without stop control or traveling through an interchange.</td>
<td>• Uninterrupted traffic flow between US-20 and I-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Travel Demand • US-20/I-15 connection could be widended in the future.</td>
<td>• Provides an alignment to eventually connect US-20 to US-26.</td>
<td>• Existing US-20 will need additional travel lanes for local traffic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional options can be implemented for weaving/merge concerns between 118 and 119.</td>
<td>• New crossings over the river and railroad.</td>
<td>• New connector provides interchange opportunities for growing development north of Idaho Falls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be implemented with Alternatives II.D-E.</td>
<td>• Temple View Elementary could be impacted by frontage road.</td>
<td>• New crossings over river and railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental • New crossings over the river, railroad, and canal.</td>
<td>• Noise impacts</td>
<td>• Prime farm ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alignment/impacts to park and low-income neighborhoods to be addressed.</td>
<td>• Visual effects.</td>
<td>• Near Hatch Pit (construction material dump).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Near golf course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Noise impacts to subdivisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 26, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost/Constructability</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Either long span or multiple bridges over I-15, railroad and river.</td>
<td>- Same as II.B except that existing US-20 connects to a local road south of the St. Leon interchange.</td>
<td>- Same as II.B except that existing US-20 connects to a local road south of the St. Leon interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The new river crossing can be constructed with no existing traffic traveling through the work zone</td>
<td>- Provides new full access system interchange for I-15 and US-20.</td>
<td>- Fremont interchange is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New overpass bridge for River Road and 5th West.</td>
<td>- Provides new full access interchange at I-15 and US-20.</td>
<td>- Lewisville interchange is modified to connect to new US-20 alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US-26 extension requires new railroad overpass and a new interchange near Hitt.</td>
<td>- Existing US-20 becomes a local access road, connecting to a local road south of the Lewisville interchange area.</td>
<td>- Lewisville interchange is modified to connect to new US-20 alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phasing issues: New US-20 alignment could be built first, frontage road and ramps would be next and require challenging intersection construction on Broadway and Grandview.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- St. Leon interchange is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>II.C Alternative with West Extension of 49th N to 45th W</td>
<td>ILE – 65th N/Telford Road Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>New US-29 alignment starting west of Idaho Falls and heading north on 45th West, connecting with 65th North, then heading east to connect with I-15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extend 65th North to the east to connect to existing US-20 with a new interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requires two new river crossings, 5 new structures over county roads and 2 structures over the railroad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New grade separated intersection at the Lewisville Highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New interchange at US-20 and US-26 if connection is desired.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• US-20 meanders to avoid farm land, golf course and landfill and then rejoin the existing alignment at Woodruff interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing US-20 alignment becomes a new commercial route. Existing improvements remain intact across the river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversion of existing US-20 to US-26 with a new interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Carrying existing US-20 alignment north to an intersection at Holmes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Eliminates stop control for NB I-15 to EB US-20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversion of existing US-20 allows for improved ped and bike accommodations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>• Highest volumes are served without stop control or traveling through an interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to evaluate need for additional capacity on local &quot;US-20 alignment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides an alignment to eventually connect to US-26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Travel Demand</td>
<td>• Need to evaluate need for additional capacity on local &quot;US-20 alignment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides an alignment to eventually connect to US-26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>• Same as II.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Same as II.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Constructability</td>
<td>• Either long span or multiple bridges over I-15, railroad and river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New overpass bridge East River Road (5th East), 5th West, System interchange at existing US-20 and 15th East.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• US-26 extension requires new railroad overpass and two more overpasses to the east to connect to US-26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phasing issues: Phasing issues:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New US-20 alignment could be built first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Same as II.D</td>
<td>Same as II.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.G – Ririe Outlet (North of 81st)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Congestion</th>
<th>Future Travel Demand</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Cost/Constructability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>- New US-20 alignment starting west of Idaho Falls and heading north on 45th West, then connecting with 81st North heading east to connect with I-15. &lt;br&gt; - New interchange with I-15 and a new connection to existing US-20 to the east. &lt;br&gt; - A new system interchange to connect US-20 and new US-26. &lt;br&gt; - Requires a river crossing and 5 new structures over county roads and 2 structures over the railroad. &lt;br&gt; - Flyover for US-26 and new US-26B connection. &lt;br&gt; - Existing US-20 will be severed at 25th and connects with county roads. &lt;br&gt; - Existing US-20 to be downgraded to a local roadway.</td>
<td>Eliminates stop control for NB I-15 to EB US-20. &lt;br&gt; Eliminates several weave movements – and extends the weaving distance for others and provides adequate accel/decel lengths. &lt;br&gt; Conversion of existing US-20 allows for improved ped and bike accommodations. &lt;br&gt; Continuity between west and east side of I-15 traffic flow for US-20.</td>
<td>Highest volumes are served without stop control or traveling through an interchange. &lt;br&gt; Uninterrupted E/W traffic flow between US-20, US-26, and I-15. &lt;br&gt; Separates local from through traffic.</td>
<td>Existing US-20 will need additional travel lanes for local traffic growth. &lt;br&gt; West leg of US-20 will need grade separated intersections as area develops.</td>
<td>Same as II.C Same</td>
<td>Either long span or multiple bridges over I-15, railroad, river and county roads. &lt;br&gt; System interchange for US-20 and US-26. &lt;br&gt; US-26 extension requires new railroad overpass and a new interchange near St. Leon. &lt;br&gt; Longest option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Lindsay Blvd Connector

Lindsay Blvd. Exit 307 removed from US-20
New connections to local street provided as shown

Exits 118 and 119 Become on single split interchange
One-Way Connector/Distributor (CD) roads that connect them

Possible Lindsay Blvd Connector

Exits 118 and 119
TEXAS TURNAROUND
(Grade separated)

Exits 118 and 119
TEXAS TURNAROUND
(Grade separated)

LEGEND
- System to System Interchange
- Grade-Separated Intersection
- At-Grade Intersection
- Bridge/Overpass
- Additional Roadway
- Bike/Ped Improvement

I-15/US-20 SAFETY AND MOBILITY (KN 20065)
PEL: LEVEL 1 - UNIVERSE ALTERNATIVES
On Alignment Alternative (Ramp Modifications)
I.A Split Access for IC 118/119
Free-Flow connector ramps between I-15 and US-20
One-Way Connector Distribution (CD) roads that connect I-15 and US-20 traffic without stop control intersections for Exit 118, Exit 119 and Fremont Interchange

Possible Lindsay Blvd Connector

LEGEND
- Green: System to System Interchange
- Orange: Grade-Separated Intersection
- Purple: Pedestrian/Rider Improvements

System to System Interchange
Grade-Separated Intersection
At-Grade Intersection
Bridge/Overpass
Additional Roadway
Bike/Ped Improvement

I-15/US-20 SAFETY AND MOBILITY (KN 20065)
PEL: LEVEL 1 - UNIVERSE ALTERNATIVES
On Alignment Alternative (Ramp Modifications)
I.C Free Flow 118/119 & Fremont

1-15
Possible Lindsay Blvd Connector

GRANDVIEW DR

US-20/BROADWAY
I-15/US-20 SAFETY AND MOBILITY
(KN 2006)
PEL: LEVEL 1 - UNIVERSE ALTERNATIVES
Off Alignment Alternative
II.D-G Connectors with
Extension to 45th W and East
to US-26

LEGEND
System to System
Interchange
Grade-Separated
Interchange
At Grade
Intersection
Bridge/Overpass
Additional Roadway
Existing roadway
conversion to local

Note: II.D-G are not intended to show actual alignment
alternatives but rather general vicinity locations where
potential roadways could be developed. Variations of
alignment relative to actual features should be anticipated.

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics,
i-cubed, USDA, USGS, AEX, GETI, Aerielog, IGN, INCREMENT FrNCs, Ltd,
Jayble, infraTerra,并将景图, Blom, LPS, USGS, DGtal, NRCAN, IGP, AEX
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Level One Screening Meeting Summary
The purpose of the meeting was for the analysis team to review the universe of alternatives developed on June 7th & June 8th against the Level One PEL Evaluation Matrix screening criteria. A conference call was held with the analysis team on June 26, 2018 to explain and orient them on evaluation questions, the screening matrix, figures and descriptions of the alternatives developed. The upfront information provided included the following:

1. Project Purpose and Need (KN20065-M_20180314_Purpose and Need.pdf)

2. Universe of Alternatives Level 1 Figures (KN20065_20180626_Level 1 Alt Figures.pdf)

3. Alternatives Description Matrix (KN20065_20180626_Alternatives Descriptions.pdf)

4. Level 1 PEL Evaluation Matrix (KN20065_20180626_L1 Evaluation Matrix.pdf)

5. Project Storymap URL link
http://iplan.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=c8dac0c590d2474bb545793110de0e43
Each member of the analysis team reviewed the provided information to complete the evaluation matrix and sent the matrix to HDR prior to the meeting on July 24.

The meeting started with an overview of each of the alternatives with a short Q & A session. Each team member received their evaluation matrix back to review their scoring based on the presentation of the alternatives. Some attendees were unclear on their initial evaluation that alternatives could be combined (such as IA and IIA), so re-visiting the evaluation matrix was valuable.

The evaluation results were compiled by alternative and by criteria to show an overall scoring. The results were shown on a PowerPoint slide show. The Analysis Team discussed the results and based on the compilation, determined of the overall scoring for each alternative relative to the evaluation criteria, what alternatives to advance to Level Two and those alternatives to not be considered further.

The Level One Screening Compilation is attached.

In Summary,

- Level One Screening reviewed 14 alternatives developed during the “universe of alternatives brainstorming”
- Of the 14 Level One alternatives, 9 alternatives were recommended to advance to Level Two analysis.
- The Level One alternatives and the results from the screening were presented to the public at a public meeting on September 5, 2018.
- Input from Community Working Group Meeting #3 was used in developing an additional Level Two alternative (US-20 one way couplet)
- Next steps for Level 2 analysis is a coarse development of geometrics, travel demand modeling, bridge locations, major utility conflicts, ped/bike/multi-modal routing/connections; right of way needs, local access roads connections; review of land use planning; freight plans; identify environmental concerns/constraints; future developments/economics.
- Following the analysis, the team will meet to review and screen the alternatives against the Level Two screening matrix.
- The Level Two results will be presented to the public in late winter/early spring of 2019.
Welcome!

I-15/US-20
Level 1 Screening Meeting
July 24, 2018
On Alignment I.A
On Alignment I.A – Evaluation Matrix

I.A On Alignment Split Access for IC 118/119

On Alignment I.B
On Alignment I.B – Evaluation Matrix

![I.B On Alignment Free Flow for 118/119 IC chart]

- **Safety**: 20
- **Congestion**: 20
- **Ped/Bike Opp**: 20
- **Future Travel**: 20
- **Enviro Impacts**: 20
- **Econ/Demo/Market**: 20
- **B/C Analysis**: 20
- **Access**: 20

Legend:
- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better

On Alignment I.C
On Alignment I.C – Evaluation Matrix

I.C On Alignment Free Flow for 118/119/Fremont IC

Safety, Congestion, Ped/Bike Opp, Future Travel, Enviro Impacts, Econ/Demo/Market, B/C Analysis, Access

N/a, Negative, Fair, Good, Better

On Alignment I.D

LEGEND
- Green: System to System Interchange
- Orange: Grade-Separated Intersection
- Red: At-Grade Intersection
- Gray: Bridge/Overpass
- Black: Existing Roadway
- Dotted: Bike/Ped Improvement

- Improve to High Capacity IC in Existing Alignment @ Exit 118
- Convert Science Center Blvd to full interchange
- Remove Firemount Exit 306
- Overpasses indicated
- Remove Lindsay Blvd. Exit 307
- New connections to local street provided as shown
- 33rd N
On Alignment I.D – Evaluation Matrix

I.D On Alignment
Increase Capacity for Interchanges

- Safety
- Congestion
- Ped/Bike Opp
- Future Travel
- Enviro Impacts
- Econ/Demo/Market
- B/C Analysis
- Access

Legend:
- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better

Off Alignment II.A
Off Alignment II.A – Evaluation Matrix

II.A Off Alignment
Anderson Street Connector

Safety  Congestion  Ped/Bike Opp  Future Travel  Enviro Impacts  Econ/Demo/Market  B/C Analysis  Access

- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better
Off Alignment II.B

I-15/US-20 Connector (33rd St Extender)
New roadway to become the new US-20, existing US-20 between Lindsay Blvd and Front St IC to be converted to local roadway.
Off Alignment II.B – Evaluation Matrix

II.B Off Alignment
33rd Avenue/Iona Rd Connector

Safety | Congestion | Ped/Bike Opp | Future Travel | Enviro Impacts | Econ/Demo/Market | B/C Analysis | Access

- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better
Off Alignment II.C

**I-15/US-20 Connector**

(49th N/Telford Rd Extension)

New roadway to become the new US-20, existing US-20 between Lindsay Blvd and Fremont ID to be converted to local roadway.

**Existing US-20 Extension and south of existing US-20 is to be removed.**

**Purpose:**

Level 1 - Universe Alternatives

Off Alignment Alternative

**II.C 49th/Telford Rd Connector**

**Legend:**

- Green: System to System Interchange
- Orange: Grade Separated Intersection
- Red: At Grade Intersection
- Gray: Bridge/Overpass
- Blue: Additional Roadway
- Gray: Existing road conversion to local

**Your Safety. Your Mobility. Your Economic Opportunity.**
Off Alignment II.C – Evaluation Matrix

II.C Off Alignment
49th N/Telford Rd Connector

Safety | Congestion | Ped/Bike Opp | Future Travel | Enviro Impacts | Econ/Demo/Market | B/C Analysis | Access

- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better

Off Alignment II.D-G
Off Alignment II.D – Evaluation Matrix

II.D Off Alignment
49th N/Telford Rd Connector w/West Extension to
45th W and East to US-26

Safety | Congestion | Ped/Bike Opp | Future Travel | Enviro Impacts | Econ/Demo/Market | B/C Analysis | Access

- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better

Off Alignment II.E – Evaluation Matrix

II.E Off Alignment
65th N connector w/West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26

- Safety
- Congestion
- Ped/Bike Opp
- Future Travel
- Envr Impacts
- Eco/Demo/Mkt
- B/C Analysis
- Access

Legend:
- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better
Off Alignment II.F – Evaluation Matrix

I.F Off Alignment
73rd N Connector w/West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26

Off Alignment II.G – Evaluation Matrix

I.G Off Alignment
81st N Connector w/West Extension to 45th W and East to US-26

- Safety
- Congestion
- Ped/Bike Opp
- Future Travel
- Enviro Impacts
- Econ/Demo/Market
- B/C Analysis
- Access

Legend:
- N/a
- Negative
- Fair
- Good
- Better

Discussion/Questions?

Thanks!
Level One Results
Summary Matrix and Alternative Exhibits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Level 2 Naming</th>
<th>Level 1 Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative Description</th>
<th>Outcomes of Level 1 Screening</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Next Steps to Create Level 2 Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>Split Access for Interchange 118/119 Ramp Modifications</td>
<td>With this alternative, the single-lane signal separated interchange will be replaced with a new, signal separated interchange. The new interchange will have a direct access ramp to US-20.</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Not recommended due to inability to accommodate local connectivity.</td>
<td>Possible concerns include the removal of some additional ramps.</td>
<td>Alternative may not be considered due to negative changes on the I-15/US-20 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>118/119 Split Interchange with US-20 Direct Connect with Modified Fremont IC</td>
<td>This alternative would include the removal of the existing ramp between 118 and 119 with a new ramp connecting to US-20.</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Not recommended due to inability to accommodate local connectivity.</td>
<td>Possible concerns include the removal of some additional ramps.</td>
<td>Alternative may not be considered due to negative changes on the I-15/US-20 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>118/119 Split Interchange with US-20 Direct Connect with New Fremont IC</td>
<td>This alternative would include the removal of the existing ramp between 118 and 119 with a new ramp connecting to US-20.</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Not recommended due to inability to accommodate local connectivity.</td>
<td>Possible concerns include the removal of some additional ramps.</td>
<td>Alternative may not be considered due to negative changes on the I-15/US-20 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>US-20 Re-alignment with System IV at 1-15 south of Freeman Park Improvements to 118/119</td>
<td>This alternative would include the removal of the existing ramp between 118 and 119 with a new ramp connecting to US-20.</td>
<td>Recommended to advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>US-20 Re-alignment, exit 119, improvements at 118/119</td>
<td>This alternative would include the removal of the existing ramp between 118 and 119 with a new ramp connecting to US-20.</td>
<td>Recommended to advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>US-20 One-way Couplet with Improvements to 118/119 near 33rd</td>
<td>This alternative would include the removal of the existing ramp between 118 and 119 with a new ramp connecting to US-20.</td>
<td>Recommended to advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>(no letter)</td>
<td>Alternative A: Wasatch Front Corridor</td>
<td>This alternative would include the removal of the existing ramp between 118 and 119 with a new ramp connecting to US-20.</td>
<td>Recommended to advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommended to advance

**II.C. 49th/Telford Rd Connector**

The recommended alternative is the 49th/Telford Connector due to its ability to address the purpose and need. This alternative includes the following features:

- **System**
  - At 49th St. and Telford Rd., the new roadway will be approximately 650 feet in length.
  - The new roadway will be connected to the local network.
  - The new roadway will be approximately 100 feet wide.

- **Completion**
  - By 2015

**II.D. 49th/N/Telford Rd. Extension**

The recommended alternative is the 49th/N/Telford Rd. Extension due to its ability to address the purpose and need. This alternative includes the following features:

- **System**
  - At 49th St. and Telford Rd., the new roadway will be approximately 650 feet in length.
  - The new roadway will be connected to the local network.
  - The new roadway will be approximately 100 feet wide.

- **Completion**
  - By 2015

---

### Alternatives

**II.C G - US-20 Realignment with a System Interchange at I-15 near 49th St.; Improvements to 118/119**

- **Options:**
  1. Leave as is, plus these sub-options:
     - Consider – Proximity to the dump may introduce challenges.
     - Consider – Evaluate the long-range plan for the airport access plan. Last update was 2009.
     - Consider – 49th avoided; should be evaluated.
     - Potential Location – 49th St. vicinity, to provide some room and lump the structures separate.
     - Consider – Alternative allows extension to US 18 where the majority of existing "lane-matching" large bridges between I-15 and US 18.

- **Evaluation:**
  - As a stand-alone solution, alternative does potentially address the concerns relative to the purpose and need, therefore it is recommended as an alternative that should be further investigated.

**II.C H - US-20 Realignment with a System interchange at I-15 at 49th St. with extension to US-26; Improvements to 118/119**

- **Options:**

- **Evaluation:**
  - As a stand-alone solution, alternative does potentially address the concerns relative to the purpose and need, therefore it is recommended as an alternative that should be further investigated.

**II.D 49th N/Telford Rd. Extension; Off-Alinement; Connectors with Extension to 45th W and East to US-26**

- **Options:**

- **Evaluation:**
  - As a stand-alone solution, alternative does potentially address the concerns relative to the purpose and need, therefore it is recommended as an alternative that should be further investigated.

**II.E 65th N/Telford Rd Extension**

- **Options:**

- **Evaluation:**
  - As a stand-alone solution, alternative does potentially address the concerns relative to the purpose and need, therefore it is recommended as an alternative that should be further investigated.

**II.F 73rd Street N**

- **Options:**

- **Evaluation:**
  - As a stand-alone solution, alternative does potentially address the concerns relative to the purpose and need, therefore it is recommended as an alternative that should be further investigated.

**II.G 81st Street N**

- **Options:**

- **Evaluation:**
  - As a stand-alone solution, alternative does potentially address the concerns relative to the purpose and need, therefore it is recommended as an alternative that should be further investigated.

---

### Additional Notes

- Alternative 12-C/12-D resulted in five total alternatives.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes three high-capacity routes.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes two at-grade intersections.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes two grade-separated intersections.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes two extended roadways.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes two modified roadways.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes two with extensions.
- Alternative 12-C/12-D includes two with extensions to US-26.
B - Exits 118/119 Split Interchange
with US-20 Direct Connection Ramps; a Modified Fremont Interchange

LEGEND
- Green: System to System Interchange
- Orange: Grade-Separated Intersection
- Red: At-Grade Intersection
- Gray: Bridge/Overpass
- Gray Dots: Existing Roads to Remain
- Blue: New Roadway Lanes/Ramps
- Black Dotted: Bike/Ped Improvement

Free-Flow connector ramps between I-15 and US-20
One-Way Connector-Distributor (CD) roads that connect I-15 and US-20
Traffic without stop control intersections for Exit 118 and Exit 119

Possible Lindsay Blvd Connector
North

Lindsay Blvd, Exit 307 removed
from US-20
New connections to US-20 provided as shown
C - Exits 118/119 Split Interchange with US-20 Direct Connection Ramps; with New Fremont Interchange
I-15/US-20 Connector (Anderson St Extension)
New roadway to become the new US-20, existing US-20 between Lindsay Blvd and Fremont IC to be converted to local roadway

Provide System to System Interchange

I-A: Exits 118 and 119 Become on single split interchange May be used in conjunction with I-15/US-20 Connector

Ramps added to Science Center IC. Converted to full interchange

Two-Way Frontage Road connected to converted SB 20

Existing divided US-20 connection between Fremont and Science Center to be removed

Existing US-20 to be converted to local city street for local traffic

Improve bike/ped facilities at Pkwy crossing. Maintain as overpass structure only

LEGEND
- System to System Interchange
- Grade-Separated Intersection
- At-Grade Intersection
- Bridge/Overpass
- Existing Roads to Remain
- New Roadway
- Lanes/Ramps (All Solid Lines)
- Bike/Ped Improvement

Source: EPL, Digitally printed, December 1996

I-15/US-20 SAFETY AND MOBILITY (KN 20065)
PEL: LEVEL 2

D - US-20 Realignment with a System Interchange at I-15 south of Freeman Park; Improvements to Exits 118/119
I-15/US-20 Connector (Anderson St Extension)
New roadway to become the new US-20, existing US-20 between Lindsay Blvd and Fremont IC to be converted to local roadway.

I-A: Exits 118 and 119 Become on single split interchange
May be used in conjunction with I15/US-20 Connector

Ramps added to Science Center IC. Converted to full interchange.

Two-Way Frontage Road
Connected to converted SB 20

Existing divided US-20 connection between Fremont and Science Center to be removed

Existing US-20 to be converted to local city street for local traffic

Entrance/Exit: Weaving distance likely not sufficient and must be evaluated before determining viability of merging before Grandview.

Improve Bike/Ped facilities at this crossing. Maintain as overpass structure only.

LEGEND
- System to System Interchange
- Grade-Separated Intersection
- At-Grade Intersection
- Bridge/Overpass
- Existing Roads to Remain
- New Roadway
- Lanes/Ramps (All Solid Lines)
- Bike/Ped Improvement

Source: EAL, DigitalGlobe, Google, Esri, TomTom, Esri • City of San Diego

I-15/US-20 SAFETY AND MOBILITY (KN 20065)
PEL: LEVEL 2

E- US-20 Realignment, Relocate Exit 119, Improve Exit 118 and Grandview Dr.
I-15/US-20 Connector (Anderson St Extension)
New roadway to become the new US-20, existing US-20 between Lindsay Blvd and Fremont IC to be converted to local roadway.

I-A: Exits 118 and 119 Become on single split interchange
May be used in conjunction with I-15/US-20 Connector.

- Ramps added to Science Center IC. Converted to full interchange.
- Improve bike/ped facilities at this crossing. Maintain as overpass structure only.

**LEGEND**
- Green circle: System to System Interchange
- Orange circle: Grade-Separated Intersection
- Red circle: At-Grade Intersection
- Gray square: Bridge/Overpass
- Dashed line: Existing Roads to Remain
- Solid line: New Roadway
- Lanes/Ramps (All Solid Lines): Bike/Ped Improvement

**Source:** EPL, DigitalGlobe, Siemens Transportation Systems, AECOM

**F- US-20 One Way Couplet with Improvements to Exits 118/119 near Anderson**

**LEVEL 2**
G – US-20 Realignment with a System Interchange at I-15 near W 49th N; Improvements to Exits 118/119

I-15/US-20 Connector (49th N/Telford Rd Extension)
New roadway to become the new US-20, existing US-20 between Lindsay Blvd and Fremont IC to be converted to local roadway

Provide System to System Interchange

Existing US-20 corridor in this reach to be converted to a local city street

Existing divided US-20 connection just south of existing St Leon IC to be removed.

LEGEND
System to System Interchange
Grade-Separated Intersection
At-Grade Intersection
Bridge/Overpass
Existing Roads to Remain
New Roadway
Lanes/Ramps (All Solid Lines)
Bike/Ped Improvement

Source: Earl, Digitalvision, Surveying, Intermedia, Inc.
I-15/US-20 Connector
(49th N/Telford Rd Extension)
New roadway to become the new
US-20, existing US-20 between
Lindsay Blvd and Fremont IC to be
converted to local roadway

Provide System to System Interchange

Existing US-20 corridor in this reach
to be converted to a local city street

LEGEND
- System to System Interchange
- Grade-Separated
- At-Grade
- Intersection
- Bridge/Overpass
- Existing Roads
to Remain
- New Roadway
- Lanes/Ramps
- Bike/Ped

Source: Ead, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, TomTom, MapmyIndia
Note: Roadways are not intended to show actual alignment alternatives but rather general vicinity locations where potential roadways could be developed. Variations of alignment relative to actual features should be anticipated.