

US 6 CLIFTON TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Level 2 Screening Matrix

Level 2 Evaluation Criteria		N/A	1	2	3	4	10	11	12	16	17
		No Action	US 6 Improved Two Through Lanes	US 6 Three Through Lanes	US 6 Four Through Lanes	Three-Lane with Reversible Lane	Front Street/US 6 One-Way Couplet, Old 32 Road to 33 Road	Front Street/US 6 One-Way Couplet at Peach Tree Center	US 6/Grand Avenue One-Way Couplet	Front Street Connection Two-Way with US 6 Improved Two Through Lanes	Front Street Connection One-Way Eastbound with US 6 Improved Two Through Lanes
Traffic Operations	Ability of the alternative to provide daily and peak hour roadway capacity to meet 2040 travel demand	Forecasted 2040 demand (22,000 vpd) exceeds capacity (16,000 vpd). No capacity improvements and poor traffic operations.	Forecasted 2040 demand (22,000 vpd) on US 6C reaches capacity of 22,000 vpd with operational benefits from intersection improvements and increased access control.	Forecasted 2040 demand (24,300 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 28,000 vpd, but WB demand (11,100 vpd) reaches WB capacity of 11,000 vpd.	Forecasted 2040 demand (27,800 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 35,000 vpd.	Forecasted 2040 demand (22,000 vpd) reaches capacity of 22,000 vpd with operational benefits from additional peak hour capacity, intersection improvements, and increased access control.	Forecasted 2040 demand (15,400 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 19,000 vpd and forecasted 2040 demand (11,600 vpd) on Front St less than capacity of 16,000 vpd. Additional volume impacts on Old 32 Rd and I-70B.	Forecasted 2040 demand (15,400 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 19,000 vpd and forecasted 2040 demand (11,600 vpd) on Front St less than capacity of 16,000 vpd. Additional volume impacts on Old 32 Rd and I-70B.	Forecasted 2040 demand (14,200 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 19,000 vpd, but forecasted 2040 demand (13,600 vpd) on Grand Ave exceeds capacity of 12,000 vpd.	Forecasted 2040 demand (20,000 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 22,000 vpd and forecasted 2040 demand (6,000 vpd) on Front St less than capacity of 16,000 vpd.	Forecasted 2040 demand (20,500 vpd) on US 6C less than capacity of 22,000 vpd and forecasted 2040 demand (3,500 vpd) on Front St less than capacity of 16,000 vpd.
	Ability of the alternative to accommodate regional through travel	Regional traffic remains along existing US 6C alignment. No capacity improvements and poor traffic operations.	Regional traffic remains along existing US 6C alignment with some operational benefits.	Regional traffic remains along existing US 6C alignment with some operational benefits.	Regional traffic remains along existing US 6C alignment with operational benefits of additional capacity.	Regional traffic remains along existing US 6C alignment with some operational benefits.	EB through traffic required to travel out-of-direction with multiple turn movements to Front St, adding volume and creating additional congestion along Old 32 Rd and I-70B.	EB through traffic required to travel out-of-direction with multiple turn movements to Front Street, adding volume and creating additional congestion along Old 32 Rd and I-70B.	WB traffic remains along existing US 6C alignment with some operational benefits, but EB regional traffic travels on Grand Ave with residential properties and parking.	Regional traffic can remain along existing US 6C alignment with additional capacity provided along Front St for both EB and WB traffic.	Regional traffic can remain along existing US 6C alignment with additional EB capacity provided along Front St.
	Ability of the alternative to provide consistency with the US 6 - Clifton Access Control Plan	Maintaining all existing accesses is not consistent with Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.	Four lanes, median treatments, and increased access control as assumed in Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.	One-way operations along US 6C not consistent with Access Control Plan and Front St accesses remain.	One-way operations along US 6C not consistent with Access Control Plan and Front St accesses remain.	One-way operations along US 6C not consistent with Access Control Plan and Grand Ave residential accesses remain.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.
Multimodal Connectivity	Ability of the alternative to provide good pedestrian and bicyclist flow	Missing sidewalks and no bicycle facilities along US 6C do not accommodate pedestrian/bicyclist activity.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of three vehicular lanes would accommodate pedestrians/bicyclists, but may not encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of four vehicular lanes would accommodate pedestrians/bicyclists, but may not encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of three vehicular lanes would accommodate pedestrians/bicyclists, but may not encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C and along Front St.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C and along Front St.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C and along Grand Ave.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C and along Front St.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C and along Front St.
	Ability of the alternative to enhance bus operations	No enhancement of bus operations or facilities.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times. Traffic could pass buses stopped in right lane.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times during peak hours.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times along US 6C and Front St. Traffic could pass buses stopped in right lane.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times along US 6C and Front St. Traffic could pass buses stopped in right lane.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times along US 6C and Grand Ave. Traffic could pass buses stopped in right lane.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times along US 6C and Front St.	Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times along US 6C and Front St.
Safety Concerns	Ability of the alternative to reduce unsafe physical (roadside hazards) or operational (congestion, lack of access control, and driver expectancy) conditions along US 6	No changes to existing roadside hazards, lack of access control, and operational conditions.	Improvements address operational and safety issues associated with peak hour congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements.	Improvements address operational and safety issues associated with peak hour congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements.	Improvements address operational and safety issues associated with peak hour congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements.	Increased access control provides safety improvements, but congestion benefits limited to peak hours. New safety concerns introduced with driver expectancy issues related to reversible operations with relatively short section, lack of barrier/median separation, pedestrian crossing activity, and intersection operations at corridor entry points.	Increased capacity provides safety improvements related to congestion, but new safety concerns introduced with accesses along Front St, driver expectancy issues related to EB traffic traveling out-of-direction, and additional congestion along Old 32 Rd and I-70B.	Increased capacity provides safety improvements related to congestion, but new safety concerns introduced with accesses along Front St, driver expectancy issues related to EB traffic traveling out-of-direction, and additional congestion along Old 32 Rd and I-70B.	Increased capacity for WB traffic along US 6C provides safety improvements related to congestion, but new safety concerns introduced with residential accesses and pedestrian flows along and across Grand Ave.	Improvements along US 6C address operational and safety issues associated with peak hour congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements, but new safety concerns introduced with accesses along Front St.	Improvements along US 6C address operational and safety issues associated with peak hour congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements, but new safety concerns introduced with accesses along Front St.
	Ability of the alternative to reduce the number of potential multimodal conflict points	Missing sidewalks, no bicycle facilities, and lack of access control along US 6C force pedestrians and bicyclists close to autos.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes and increased access control substantially reduces conflict points.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points, but pedestrians/bicyclists must cross three vehicular lanes.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points, but pedestrians/bicyclists must cross four vehicular lanes.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points, but reversible lane operations during peak hours introduces additional conflicts with lack of median refuge area and pedestrian confusion with change in vehicular direction during peak hours.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points along existing US 6C alignment, but overall conflicts are increased with additional traffic along Front St.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points along existing US 6C alignment, but overall conflicts are increased with additional traffic along Front St and within Peach Tree Center.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points along existing US 6C alignment, but overall conflicts are increased with additional traffic along residential area of Grand Ave.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points along existing US 6C alignment, but some additional conflicts with added traffic along Front St.	Designated space for pedestrians and bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points along existing US 6C alignment, but some additional conflicts with added traffic along Front St.
Community	Relative property impacts based on number of residential and business properties impacted	No right-of-way impacts.	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 10 residential and 22 business/non-residential properties with no assumed total property acquisitions or buildings impacted.	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 10 residential and 22 business/non-residential properties with 4 assumed total property acquisitions (1 residential and 3 business) and 2 assumed buildings impacted (1 business and 1 residential).	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 10 residential and 22 business/non-residential properties with 14 assumed total property acquisitions (2 residential and 12 business) and 3 assumed buildings impacted (2 business and 1 residential).	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 10 residential and 22 business/non-residential properties with no assumed total property acquisitions or buildings impacted.	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 20 residential and 28 business/non-residential properties with no assumed total property acquisitions. Right-of-way may be required from UPRR.	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 20 residential and 28 business/non-residential properties with no assumed total property acquisitions. Right-of-way may be required from UPRR.	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 25 residential and 31 business/non-residential properties with 6 assumed total property acquisitions (1 business on US 6C and 5 residential along Grand Ave).	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 22 residential and 28 business/non-residential properties with 1 assumed total property acquisitions (1 business on Front St). Right-of-way may be required from UPRR.	Right-of-way would be acquired from approx. 21 residential and 28 business/non-residential properties with no assumed total property acquisitions or buildings impacted. Right-of-way may be required from UPRR.
	Relative local street circulation and volume impacts	No changes in local street circulation and no increase in US 6C traffic volume traveling on local streets.	No changes in local street circulation and no increase in US 6C traffic volume traveling on local streets.	No changes in local street circulation and no increase in US 6C traffic volume traveling on local streets.	No changes in local street circulation and no increase in US 6C traffic volume traveling on local streets.	No changes in local street circulation and no increase in US 6C traffic volume traveling on local streets.	Circulation to/from properties along US 6C and between US 6C and Front Street substantially impacted by one-way operations, resulting in increased US 6C traffic volumes on local streets.	Circulation to/from properties along US 6C and between US 6C and Front Street substantially impacted by one-way operations, resulting in increased US 6C traffic volumes on local streets.	Circulation to/from properties along US 6C and Grand Ave substantially impacted with one-way operations, resulting in increased US 6C traffic volumes on local streets.	No changes in local street circulation, but potential for some increase in traffic volume on local streets south of US 6C with new Front St connection.	Circulation to/from properties along Front Street substantially impacted with one-way operation, resulting in potential for increased traffic volumes on local streets south of US 6C.
	Ability of the alternative to support local and regional plans	No improvements to US 6C corridor is not consistent with previous local and regional planning efforts.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, access control, and improved traffic operations along US 6C generally support local and regional transportation and community plans.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, access control, and improved traffic operations along US 6C generally support local and regional transportation and community plans.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, access control, and improved traffic operations along US 6C generally support local and regional transportation and community plans.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, access control, and improved traffic operations along US 6C generally support local and regional transportation and community plans.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and access control along US 6C support local and regional transportation and community plans, but one-way operations and Front St as a regional arterial are not consistent with previous planning efforts.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and access control along US 6C support local and regional transportation and community plans, but one-way operations and Front St as a regional arterial are not consistent with previous planning efforts.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and access control along US 6C support local and regional transportation and community plans, but one-way operations and Grand Ave as a regional arterial are not consistent with previous planning efforts.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and access control along US 6C support local and regional transportation and community plans, but traffic volumes along Front St are not consistent with previous planning efforts.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and access control along US 6C support local and regional transportation and community plans, but one-way operations on Front St are not consistent with previous planning efforts.
Environmental Resources	Ability of the alternative to avoid and minimize impacts on environmental resources	No impacts to environmental and cultural resources.	POTENTIAL MINOR IMPACTS Potential impacts to listed NRHP site (church). Potential noise impacts to church and Clifton Elementary.	POTENTIAL MINOR IMPACTS Potential impacts to listed NRHP site (church). Potential noise impacts to church and Clifton Elementary.	POTENTIAL MINOR IMPACTS Potential impacts to listed NRHP site (church). Potential noise impacts to church and Clifton Elementary.	POTENTIAL MINOR IMPACTS Potential impacts to listed NRHP site (church). Potential noise impacts to church and Clifton Elementary.	POTENTIAL HIGH IMPACTS Same potential impacts as Alts 1-4. Additional hazard site - medium potential. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Additional potential noise impacts to residences and church. Prime Farmland impacts.	POTENTIAL HIGH IMPACTS Same potential impacts as Alts 1-4. Additional hazard sites - high and medium potential. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Additional potential noise impacts to residences and church. Prime Farmland impacts.	POTENTIAL HIGH IMPACTS Same potential impacts as Alts 1-4. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Additional potential noise impacts to residences and church. Prime Farmland impacts.	POTENTIAL MODERATE IMPACTS Same potential impacts as Alts 1-4. Additional hazard site - medium potential. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Additional potential noise impacts to residences and church.	POTENTIAL MODERATE IMPACTS Same potential impacts as Alts 1-4. Additional hazard site - medium potential. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Disproportionately higher EJ impacts than Alts 1-4. Additional potential noise impacts to residences and church.
Implementability	Ability of the alternative to minimize cost based on relative conceptual-level probable cost	No construction cost and no right-of-way acquisition.	Relatively moderate cost due to potential for right-of-way acquisition.	Relatively high cost due to potential for right-of-way acquisition with full property acquisitions.	Relatively high cost due to potential for right-of-way acquisition with full property acquisitions.	Relatively moderate cost due to infrastructure for reversible lane operations and potential for right-of-way acquisition.	Relatively high cost due to new underpass under 32 Road and potential for right-of-way acquisition.	Relatively high cost due to access and traffic signal changes at Peach Tree Center and potential for right-of-way acquisition through the Peach Tree Center.	Relatively high cost due to potential for right-of-way acquisition with full property acquisitions.	Relatively high cost due to new underpass under 32 Road and potential for right-of-way acquisition with full property acquisitions.	Relatively high cost due to new underpass under 32 Road and potential for right-of-way acquisition with full property acquisitions.
	Ability to implement as separate fundable projects	N/A	Opportunity for improvements to be constructed and opened separately as fundable projects as sections along US 6C. Projects located along existing state highway system.	Opportunity for improvements to be constructed and opened separately as fundable projects as sections along US 6C. Projects located along existing state highway system.	Opportunity for improvements to be constructed and opened separately as fundable projects as sections along US 6C. Projects located along existing state highway system.	Reconstruction of US 6C can be constructed as separate projects, but infrastructure and operations for reversible lane must be implemented as one project. Projects located along existing state highway system.	Opportunity for US 6C and Front St reconstruction and Front St bridge to be constructed in sections as separate projects, but full implementation of one-way couplet must occur together. Front St would be converted to state highway, increasing highway system cost.	Opportunity for US 6C and Front St reconstruction and Peach Tree Center connection to be constructed in sections as separate projects, but full implementation of one-way couplet must occur together. Front St would be converted to state highway, increasing highway system cost.	Opportunity for US 6C and Grand Ave reconstruction to be constructed in sections as separate projects, but connections and full implementation of one-way couplet must occur together. Grand Ave would be converted to state highway, increasing highway system cost.	Opportunity for US 6C and Front St reconstruction and Front St bridge to be constructed and opened separately in sections as fundable projects. Front St would remain local roadway and Front St improvements would be implemented by Mesa County.	Opportunity for US 6C and Front St reconstruction and Front St bridge to be constructed and opened separately in sections as fundable projects, but implementation of one-way Front Street must occur as one project. Front St would remain local roadway and Front St improvements would be implemented by Mesa County.
SUMMARY OF RESULTS		CARRIED FORWARD	CARRIED FORWARD	NOT RECOMMENDED	CARRIED FORWARD	ELIMINATED	NOT RECOMMENDED	NOT RECOMMENDED	ELIMINATED	CARRIED FORWARD	NOT RECOMMENDED
Notes		Further analysis required as the No Action Alternative for comparison to improvement alternatives.	This alternative is carried forward for further evaluation because the improvement provides adequate capacity and reasonable safety and multimodal mobility benefits with fewer impacts on the community and environmental and cultural resources than other alternatives.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the improvement would result in comparably higher property impacts with full property acquisitions without substantially better traffic operations, safety, and multimodal mobility benefits than Alternative 1.	This alternative is carried forward for further evaluation because the improvement provides substantially more vehicular capacity along US 6C and would provide traffic operational and safety benefits related to congestion and lack of access control, as well as multimodal mobility benefits with some impacts to the community and environmental and cultural resources.	This alternative is eliminated from further consideration because the alternative would not address the Purpose and Need to improve safety along the corridor due to the new safety concerns introduced with driver expectancy issues related to reversible lane operations with relatively short section, lack of barrier/median separation, pedestrian crossing activity, and intersection operations at corridor entry points, as well as additional conflicts with pedestrian and bicyclists due to lack of median refuge area and confusion with change in vehicular direction during peak hours. This alternative would not provide substantially better traffic operations than other alternatives.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the improvements create additional congestion along Old 32 Rd and I-70B and impact driver expectancy related to EB traffic traveling out-of-direction to Front St. Although the improvements would accommodate and may encourage additional pedestrian/bicyclist flows, overall multimodal conflicts are increased with additional traffic along Front St. The one-way operations would affect circulation to/from properties along and south of US 6C, impacting local streets with increased US 6C traffic.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the improvements create additional congestion along Old 32 Rd and I-70B and impact driver expectancy related to EB traffic traveling out-of-direction to Front Street. Although the improvements would accommodate and may encourage additional pedestrian/bicyclist flows, overall multimodal conflicts are increased with additional traffic along Front St. The one-way operations would affect circulation to/from properties along and south of US 6C, impacting local streets with increased US 6C traffic.	This alternative is eliminated from further consideration because the alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need to improve traffic operations and safety along the corridor due to the limited capacity of Grand Ave for EB US 6C traffic and new safety concerns introduced with residential accesses and pedestrian flows along and across Grand Ave. This alternative also has a combination of negative impacts on the community and environmental and cultural resources, requiring acquisition from 25 residential properties and 31 business/non-residential properties and having disproportionately higher EJ impacts than other alternatives, as well as impacts to Prime Farmland.	This alternative is carried forward for further evaluation because the improvement provides more east-west vehicular capacity along US 6C and Front St and would provide traffic operational and safety benefits related to congestion and lack of access control, as well as multimodal mobility benefits with some impacts to the community and environmental and cultural resources.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the improvements would result in comparably higher local circulation and street impacts due to one-way operations along Front Street without notably better traffic operations, safety, and multimodal benefits or reduced community impacts than Alternative 16.

GREEN = Comparatively beneficial and/or minor impacts
 BLACK = Comparatively neutral benefits and/or moderate impacts
 RED = Comparatively minor or no benefits and/or major impacts

CARRIED FORWARD = Alternative will be evaluated further in the PEL study as a potential improvement project
 NOT RECOMMENDED = Alternative will not be evaluated further in the PEL study due to comparatively negligible benefits and major impacts, but it may be considered during future NEPA process(es)
 ELIMINATED = Alternative will not be evaluated further because it does not meet the project Purpose and Need and it will not be considered during future NEPA process(es) unless there are changes in relevant area conditions