

LEVEL 2b SCENARIOS SCREENED OUT



Scenario 1

6
Lanes

No Additional Lanes (with Complementary Alternatives)

No Main Lane Widening

- Significant lack of mobility and safety improvements outweighed benefits of low cost and lower overall environmental impacts
- Overall negative score of **-25**

Scenario 2

8
Lanes

^A Main Lane Widening (with Complementary Alternatives)

3 Main Lanes + 1 Main Lane Widening (each direction)

- Modest positive mobility and safety improvements were outweighed by costs and environmental impacts
- Overall negative score of **-26**

Scenario 4

12
Lanes

Main Lane Widening (with Complementary Alternatives)

3 Main Lanes + 3 Main Lane Widening (each direction)

- Did not provide added performance for mobility or safety over 10-lane scenarios
- Had the second-widest overall footprint
- Negatives of environmental and costs outweighed mobility and safety benefits
- Overall negative score of **-67**

All Complementary Alternatives were evaluated as a group within each scenario. For the Primary Alternatives, each scenario includes interchange improvements and I-30 Arkansas River Bridge Replacement; however Main Lane Widening and C/D Roads were evaluated as either/or scenarios for 8 and 10 lanes due to their substantial differences in ROW requirements and ability to affect mobility.