

LEVEL 3 SCREENING MATRIX



No Action and Reasonable Alternatives

Measures

Mobility
Safety
Cost
Environmental

		Color Codes for Measures			8-Lane C/D Reasonable Alternative		10-Lane GP Reasonable Alternative		10-Lane C/D Reasonable Alternative
			Mobility		3 GP Lanes + 1 C/D Lane Widening (each direction)		3 GP Lanes + 2 GP Lane Widening (each direction)		3 GP Lanes + 2 C/D Lane Widening (each direction)
			Safety						
			Cost						
			Environmental						
		Maximum Width (Sq. Ft. of Pavement)	No Action 102(2.55M)	190 (3.74M)		166(4.15M)		214(4.54M)	
Goals		Bridge Location Measures		West	East	West	East		
Enhance Mobility	Mobility in PEL Study Area		9.67/120	5.85/120		.67/60		0/0	
	Mobility in PEL Study Area		9.67/120	5.31/120		.67/45		0/0	
	Total travel time		16/18	15/22.4		6/6		6/6	
Access to Downtown	Average peak hour travel speed through corridor		22/20	24/15		58/58		59/59	
	Mobility of key intersections within PEL Study Area		20/19	13/10		4/3		5/3	
	Travel time to key destinations in PEL Study Area		24/39	23/24		8/8		8/8	
East-West Connectivity	Locations allowing for local street connectivity		--	+	+	+	+	+	
	Designs that allow for open spaces across I-30		--	+	+	+	+	+	
Connect Bicycle/Pedestrian Friendly Facilities	Grade separated bike / ped accommodations across I-30 (East-West Connectivity)		0	+	+	+	+	+	
Accommodate Existing Transit and Future Transit	Transit ridership in the PEL Study Area		-	++	++	+	+	+	
Minimize Roadway Disruptions	Severity of I-30 lane closures, detours during construction		++	-	-	-	-	-	
Minimize River Disruptions	Severity of river closures during construction		++	-	-	-	-	-	
	Location of navigational impediments (Bridge Piers)		--	++	++	++	++	++	
Opportunity for Economic Development	Access to existing / potential business sites within the PEL Study Area		--	-	-	+	+	+	
Commitment to Voters	Mobility on I-30 Main Lanes (qualitative)		--	-	-	+	+	+	
System Reliability	Potential accident reductions		0	175		159		229	
	Emergency Vehicle Travel Time		7	11		4		4	
	I-30 PEL conflict points in weaving / merge / diverge areas - Main Lanes		31	20		26		19	
Improve Safety	I-30 PEL conflict points in weaving / merge / diverge areas - C/D Lanes		--	6		--		7	
	Total Conflict Points (Main Lanes and C/D)		31	26		26		26	
	Number of ramps on I-30 in the study area - Main Lanes		15/15	13/11		14/12		12/10	
	Number of ramps on I-30 in the study area - C/D		--	3/3		--		3/5	
	Ramp acceleration, deceleration and weaving lengths		26	6		6		7	
	I-30 Roadway and bridge structural conditions		--	++	++	++	++	++	
	Arterial connection conflict points		411	515		515		515	
Maximize Cost Efficiency	Construction Cost		0	less		Base		more	
	Total cost of ROW acquisition		0	less	less	more	Base	more	
	Total Cost To AHTD		0	less	less	more	Base	more	
	Total investment required by others		0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
Community Impacts	ROW Impacts		0.00	7.5	8.7	8.6	8.9	9.0	
	Parcels Impacted		0	39	47	48	46	46	
	Displacements		0	16: 5 Residential 5 Commercial 6 Billboards	17: 5 Residential 6 Commercial 6 Billboards	20: 5 Residential 8 Commercial 7 Billboards	19: 5 Residential 7 Commercial 7 Billboards	19: 5 Residential 7 Commercial 7 Billboards	
EJ/LEP	Are EJ/LEP populations present in the study area?		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Is there a potential for displacements to EJ/LEP populations?		0	6: 5 Residential 1 Commercial*	6: 5 Residential 1 Commercial*	6: 5 Residential 1 Commercial*	6: 5 Residential 1 Commercial*	6: 5 Residential 1 Commercial*	
	If YES to displacements, is there a potential for mitigation to offset displacements to EJ/LEP populations - Replacement properties of similar value in same area (count)	Homes for sale under \$50,000	N/A	8 homes for sale	8 homes for sale	8 homes for sale	8 homes for sale	8 homes for sale	
		Apartment rent of \$500 - \$600 per month	N/A	8 homes/apts for rent	8 homes/apts for rent	8 homes/apts for rent	8 homes/apts for rent	8 homes/apts for rent	
		Section 8 housing - all considered decent, safe and sanitary	N/A	33 Section 8 properties	33 Section 8 properties	33 Section 8 properties	33 Section 8 properties	33 Section 8 properties	
	If YES to displacements, is there a potential for avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation to offset displacements to EJ/LEP populations - displacement/relocation will follow the Uniform Relocation Act?		N/A	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Is there a potential for adverse impacts to the community cohesion of EJ/LEP populations?		no	no	no	no	no	no	
	If YES , is there a potential for avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation to offset adverse impacts to the community cohesion of EJ/LEP populations?		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Is there a potential for adverse impacts to access for EJ/LEP populations?		no	No - ramping would not eliminate access	No - ramping would not eliminate access	No - ramping would not eliminate access	No - ramping would not eliminate access	No - ramping would not eliminate access	
	If YES, is there a potential for avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation to offset adverse impacts to access for EJ/LEP populations?		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			0	6 schools, 1 church, 2 daycares and 48 residential parcels in low income areas; 1 church, 2 daycares and 96 residential parcels in high minority areas	6 schools, 1 church, 2 daycares and 48 residential parcels in low income areas; 1 church, 2 daycares and 96 residential parcels in high minority areas	6 schools, 1 church, 2 daycares and 48 residential parcels in low income areas; 1 church, 2 daycares and 96 residential parcels in high minority areas	6 schools, 1 church, 2 daycares and 48 residential parcels in low income areas; 1 church, 2 daycares and 96 residential parcels in high minority areas	6 schools, 1 church, 2 daycares and 48 residential parcels in low income areas; 1 church, 2 daycares and 96 residential parcels in high minority areas	
	Are sensitive noise receptors located in EJ/LEP areas?		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	If YES (and noise impacts are assumed), is there a potential for avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation to offset adverse impacts resulting from noise for EJ/LEP populations?		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Is there a potential for beneficial impacts to mobility for EJ/LEP populations?		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Is there a potential for beneficial impacts to safety for EJ/LEP populations?		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
	Is there a potential for beneficial impacts to E-W connectivity for EJ/LEP populations?		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Cultural Resource Impacts	Recorded archaeological sites potentially impacted		0	0	0	0	0	0	
	NRHP or NRHP-eligible sites potentially impacted		0	1	1	1	1	1	
	Number of areas along existing and proposed ROW determined to have a high probability for archeological resources		0	36	36	36	36	36	
Natural Resource Impacts	Park impacts (acres)	Park impacts	0	3	3	3	3	3	
		North Shore Riverwalk Park	0.0	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.7	
		Julius Breckling Riverfront Park	0.0	0.7	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	
		William J. Clinton Presidential Center and Park	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	
		Total Park Impacts	0.0	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.6	
	Surface water crossings / wetlands	Impacts - Acres of water features	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	
		Impacts - Acres of emergent wetlands	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	
		Impacts - Acres of forested/shrub wetlands permanent fill impacts	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	
		Impacts - Acres of non-maintained herbaceous habitat impacted	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	
	High quality vegetation/habitat	Impacts - Acres of woodland (forested/shrub) impacted	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.9	1.9	
Impacts - Acres of riparian habitat impacted		0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		
Other Impacts		Number of hazardous material sites that could have negative effect on the project		0	6	6	7	7	8
	Traffic noise receptors directly adjacent		0	184	184	184	184	184	
Public / Agency Input	Meeting comments and local resolutions		None	67%		11%		22%	

