Appendix D

Alternatives Development and Screening Details

Segment 1 Conceptual Strategies (Route Z to Route K)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)								Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Reduce/eliminate conflict points at interchanges	●	◒	◒	○	○	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	○
For Segment 1, this might involve configuration changes (DDI, SPUI, roundabouts), reconfiguring outer roads/service roads at interchanges, or lengthening ramps, and could necessitate small amounts of additional ROW. Most bike/ped incidents occurred at Route K.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 65% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes; however, some configurations are not bike/ped friendly (e.g., high-volume roundabouts).	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges if they are reconfigured.	Could improve LOS at interchanges.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	No high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment, but could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could improve access if bike/ped facilities are improved or added during interchange reconfigurations.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to require substantial property acquisition/relocations due to ample ROW and relatively sparse development surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Could result in substantial traffic or utility disruption.
Address weave sections	●	◒	◒	○	○	◒	○	○	●	●	◒
For Segment 1, this would likely involve adding auxiliary lanes, which likely could be done within ROW.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 44% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur in weave sections. Would not address bike/ped.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Could improve LOS on mainline.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	No high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment, but could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources exist adjacent to the interstate.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Bring facility to standards (address substandard curves, narrow shoulders, etc.)	◒	●	○	○	◒	●	○	◒	●	●	◒
Some bridge heights in this segment are substandard.	If bridges are replaced, may reduce the potential for bike crashes related to poor bike/ped facilities or poor pavement conditions at interstate crossings.	Would address needs for infrastructure repair/ replacement along the corridor.	Not likely to result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	May improve efficiency of access to freight hubs by raising low-clearance bridges.	Bringing infrastructure to standards would reduce impediments for large commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources exist adjacent to the bridges.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 1 Conceptual Strategies (Route Z to Route K)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)								Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Improve operations of interchanges	◒	◒	●	○	○	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	○
For Segment 1, would likely involve interchange reconfigurations, such as changing standard diamonds to DDI or SPUI – this could likely occur within ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through capacity improvements.	Would improve LOS at interchanges to meet MoDOT standards.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	No high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment, but could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW surrounding the interchanges in this segment and relatively few sensitive natural resources.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to require substantial property acquisition/relocations due to ample ROW and relatively sparse development surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.
Add mainline capacity (general purpose lanes or managed lanes)	◒	◒	◒	◒	○	◒	○	○	◒	○	◒
Assumes one additional lane in each direction, with impacts beyond existing ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on the mainline through capacity improvements.	Could improve LOS on mainline.	Could reduce congestion on parallel road system if reduced congestion on the interstate draws more trips.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	No high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment, but could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion and improving pavement conditions.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	There are relatively few sensitive natural resources abutting the interstate, but adding travel lanes could result in moderate impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Adding additional lanes could require substantial property acquisition with some relocations.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.
Implement TSM measures	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	○	○	●	●	●
For Segment 1, this might include signal timing optimization, ramp metering, or signing/striping improvements.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Could improve LOS on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	No high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment, but could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area and could reduce VMT, which would reduce emissions and non-point source pollutants.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area.	TSM measures could be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 1 Conceptual Strategies (Route Z to Route K)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)								Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Upgrade infrastructure to better accommodate freight (including implementation of MoDOT and Freightway priority projects)	◒	◒	○	○	●	●	○	◒	●	●	◒
Freight needs in this segment consist of pavement rehabilitation and increasing bridge clearance.	If bridges are replaced, may reduce potential for bike crashes related to poor bike/ped facilities or poor pavement conditions at interstate crossings.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would reduce impediments for large commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Not likely to adversely impact the surrounding natural environment.	Not likely to result in physical impacts to the surrounding built environment.	Could result in moderate traffic and utility disruption.
High-cost transit enhancements (commuter rail, light rail)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒	○	○
Ratings assume this would be a facility parallel to I-70 and would require additional ROW.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement and may increase them.	Would improve access to public transportation. Due to low density development in this segment, most residents would need a car to access stations.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to stations and offer regional access to households without access to vehicles.	There are relatively few sensitive natural resources abutting the interstate, but adding rail transit could result in moderate impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Adding rail transit could require substantial property acquisition with numerous relocations.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.
Moderate-cost transit enhancements (BRT, bus only lanes, larger capacity buses/trains)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒
Assumes BRT could be implemented mostly within the existing ROW.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation. Due to low density development in this segment, most residents would need a car to access transit.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to BRT stations and may offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	There are relatively few sensitive natural resources abutting the interstate, but adding BRT or bus-only lanes could result in moderate impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Transit enhancements may have impacts, but they are not likely to require substantial property acquisition/relocations since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 1 Conceptual Strategies (Route Z to Route K)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)								Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Low-cost transit enhancements (add express routes, increase service frequency, bus priority)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	◒	●	●	●
Expansion of local transit system.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation. Due to low density development in this segment, most residents would need a car to access transit.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to transit stations and offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources and may have benefits through reduced VMT.	Not likely to impact adjacent land use and would increase accessibility to adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Add and/or improve bike/ped facilities crossing I-70 and improve bike/ped connections to the larger bike/ped network	●	◒	○	○	○	○	◒	●	●	●	●
In Segment 1, this would likely include improvements at existing crossings.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Bike/ped enhancements could improve public transportation access if combined with transit system expansion in this area.	Would directly improve active transportation connectivity and access.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources and may have benefits through reduced VMT.	Not likely to impact adjacent land use and would increase accessibility to adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Improve local/parallel road system	◒	◒	◒	●	◒	○	○	◒	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 1, this would include improving capacity, improving operations at intersections, and managing access of the outer road system.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve ped/bike facilities when roads are improved.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and interchanges.	Would improve LOS on parallel road system.	Could improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer the opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities as part of outer road improvements	Could have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial.	Connecting route improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial since there is ample ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 2 Conceptual Strategies (Route K to Highway 94)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Reduce/eliminate conflict points at interchanges	●	●	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	○
For Segment 2, this might involve configuration changes (DDI, SPUI, roundabouts) or lengthening ramps and could necessitate small amounts of additional ROW. Two ped fatalities in this segment, but not at interchanges.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 74% of vehicular crashes in the segment occur at interchanges.	Would address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through improvements to eliminate conflict points.	Could improve LOS at interchanges.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Could improve efficiency of freight movement at interchanges that serve freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could improve access if bike/ped facilities are improved or added during interchange reconfigurations.	Could improve interstate connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements could result in moderate impacts due to number of creek crossings and area of floodplain abutting the interstate in this segment.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW.	Could result in substantial traffic or utility disruption.
Address weave sections	◒	◒	◒	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	●	◒
For Segment 2, this would likely involve adding auxiliary lanes, which likely could be done within ROW.	Could address a potential source of vehicular crashes, but none occurred in weave sections between 2012 and 2016. Would not address bike/ped.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Could improve LOS on mainline.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to provide interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require minor widening. Impacts could be moderate due to number of creek crossings and area of floodplain abutting the interstate in this segment.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Bring facility to standards (address substandard curves, narrow shoulders, etc.)	◒	◒	○	○	◒	●	○	◒	○	◒	●	◒
Some bridge heights in this segment are substandard.	If bridges are replaced, may reduce the potential for bike crashes related to poor pavement conditions or other issues at interstate crossings.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Not likely to result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	May improve efficiency of access to freight hubs by raising low-clearance bridges on access routes.	Bringing infrastructure to standards would meet requirements for large commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Not likely to provide interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require minor widening. Impacts could be moderate due to number of creek crossings and area of floodplain abutting the interstate in this segment.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 2 Conceptual Strategies (Route K to Highway 94)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Improve operations of interchanges	◒	◒	●	○	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	○
For Segment 2, would likely involve interchange reconfigurations such as changing standard diamonds to DDI or SPUI – this could likely occur within ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through capacity improvements.	Would improve LOS at interchanges to meet MoDOT standards.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Could improve efficiency of freight movement at interchanges that serve freight hubs	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Could improve connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements could result in moderate impacts due to number of creek crossings and area of floodplain abutting the interstate in this segment.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW.	Could result in substantial traffic or utility disruption.
Add mainline capacity (general purpose lanes or managed lanes)	◒	◒	●	◒	○	◒	○	○	○	○	○	◒
Assumes one additional lane in each direction with impacts beyond existing ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure when other improvements are implemented.	Would improve LOS on mainline to meet MoDOT standards.	Could reduce congestion on parallel road system if reduced congestion on the interstate draws more trips.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could address high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding travel lanes could result in substantial impacts to jurisdictional waters and floodplains.	Adding travel lanes could require substantial property acquisition with some relocations.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.
Implement TSM measures	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	○	○	○	●	●	●
For Segment 2, this might include signal timing optimization, ramp metering, or signing/striping improvements.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and interchanges.	Could reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area and could reduce VMT, which would reduce emissions and non-point source pollutants.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area.	TSM measures could be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 2 Conceptual Strategies (Route K to Highway 94)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Upgrade infrastructure to better accommodate freight (including implementation of MoDOT and Freightway priority projects)	◒	●	○	○	●	●	○	◒	○	◒	●	◒
Freight needs in this segment consist of pavement rehabilitation and increasing bridge clearance.	If bridges are replaced, may reduce potential for bike crashes related to poor pavement conditions or other issues at interstate crossings.	Would address needs for infrastructure repair/replacement along the corridor.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would improve conditions for commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Not likely to provide interstate connections.	Not likely to adversely impact the surrounding natural environment.	Not likely to result in physical impacts to the surrounding built environment.	Could result in moderate traffic and utility disruption.
High cost transit enhancements (commuter rail, light rail)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	◒	○	○	○	○
Ratings assume this would be a facility parallel to I-70 and would require additional ROW.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement and may increase them.	Would improve access to public transportation. Due to low density development in this segment, most residents would need a car to access stations.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to stations and offer regional access to households without access to vehicles.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding rail transit could result in substantial impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Adding rail transit could require substantial property acquisition with numerous relocations.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.
Moderate cost transit enhancements (BRT, bus only lanes, larger capacity buses/trains)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	●
Assumes BRT could be implemented mostly within the existing ROW.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation. Due to low density development in this segment, most residents would need a car to access stations.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to stations and offer regional access to households without access to vehicles.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding BRT or bus-only lanes could result in moderate impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Adding BRT or bus-only lanes may have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/ relocations since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Minimal disruption to traffic or utilities expected.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 2 Conceptual Strategies (Route K to Highway 94)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Low cost transit enhancements (add express routes, increase service frequency, bus priority)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	◒	○	●	●	●
Expansion of local transit system.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation. Due to low density development in this segment, most residents would need a car to access transit.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to transit stations and offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Would not have physical impacts and may benefit the natural environment through reduced VMT.	Would not have physical impacts and would increase accessibility for adjacent land uses.	No adverse effects to traffic or utilities expected.
Add and/or improve bike/ped facilities crossing I-70 and improve bike/ped connections to the larger bike/ped network	●	◒	○	○	○	○	◒	●	○	●	●	●
In Segment 2, this would likely include improvements at existing crossings.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to minimize/eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Bike/ped enhancements could improve public transportation access if combined with transit system expansion in this area.	Would directly improve active transportation connectivity and access.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources and may have benefits through reduced VMT.	Not likely to impact adjacent land uses and would increase accessibility to adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Improve local/parallel road system	◒	◒	◒	●	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 2, this would include improving capacity, improving operations at intersections, and managing access of the outer road system.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve ped/bike facilities when roads are improved.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and interchanges.	Would reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Could improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve ped/bike facilities when roads are improved.	Could provide access for current/future/ redevelopment areas, but may not be direct, and efficiency may be impacted by congestion.	Impacts could be moderate due to number of creek crossings and area of floodplain abutting the interstate in this segment.	May have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/relocations since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 2 Conceptual Strategies (Route K to Highway 94)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Add/improve interstate connections to state/local routes	◒	◒	◒	◒	○	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒	○
Could involve improvements to Hwy 79, 370, 270, 170.	Could address factors related to bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and interchanges.	Could reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to address impediments to freight movement.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Could provide access for current/future/ redevelopment areas, but may not be direct, and efficiency may be impacted by congestion.	Impacts could be moderate due to number of creeks and area of floodplain in this segment.	Connecting route improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 3 Conceptual Strategies (Highway 94 to I-270)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Reduce/eliminate conflict points at interchanges	●	●	◒	○	○	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 3, this might involve configuration changes (DDI, SPUI, roundabouts) or lengthening ramps and probably doesn't require additional ROW. Little or no bike/ped incidents in this segment.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 60% of vehicular crashes in the segment occur at interchanges.	Would address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through improvements to eliminate conflict points.	Could improve LOS at interchanges.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could improve access if bike/ped facilities are improved or added during interchange reconfigurations.	Could improve connections to adjacent development/redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements could impact jurisdictional waters.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Address weave sections	◒	◒	◒	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	◒	○
For Segment 3, this would likely involve adding auxiliary lanes, which likely could be done within the ROW.	Would address one cause of vehicular crashes. 12% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur in weave sections. Would not address bike/ped.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Could improve LOS on mainline.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require minor widening. Impacts could be moderate due to proximity of jurisdictional waters in this segment.	Could require minor widening and may have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/relocations since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in substantial traffic or utility disruption.
Improve operations of interchanges	◒	◒	●	○	○	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	○
For Segment 3, would likely involve reconfigurations such as changing standard diamonds to DDI or SPUI – this could occur within ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through capacity improvements.	Would improve LOS at interchanges to meet MoDOT standards.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Could improve interstate connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements could have substantial impacts due to proximity of jurisdictional waters.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/relocations due to ample ROW surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 3 Conceptual Strategies (Highway 94 to I-270)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)									Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Add mainline capacity (general purpose lanes or managed lanes)	◒	◒	●	◒	○	◒	○	○	○	○	○	◒
Assumes one additional lane in each direction with impacts beyond existing ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure when other improvements are implemented.	Would improve LOS on mainline to meet MoDOT standards.	Could reduce congestion on parallel road system if reduced congestion on the interstate draws more trips.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding travel lanes could result in substantial impacts to jurisdictional waters and floodplains.	Adding travel lanes could require substantial property acquisition with some relocations.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.
Implement TSM measures	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	○	○	○	●	●	●
For Segment 3, this might include signal timing optimization, ramp metering, or signing/striping improvements.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Could reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area and could reduce VMT, which would reduce emissions and non-point source pollutants.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area.	TSM measures could be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Upgrade infrastructure to better accommodate freight (including implementation of MoDOT and Freightway priority projects)	○	●	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	●	●	◒
Freight needs in this segment consist of pavement rehabilitation.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Would address needs for infrastructure repair/replacement along the corridor.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would reduce impediments for large commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to provide transportation network connections.	Not likely to result in physical impacts to the surrounding natural environment.	Not likely to result in physical impacts to the surrounding built environment.	Could result in moderate traffic and utility disruption.
High cost transit enhancements (commuter rail, light rail)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	◒	○	○	○	○
Ratings assume this would be a facility parallel to I-70 and would require additional ROW.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement and may increase them.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to stations and offer regional access to households without access to vehicles.	Adding rail transit would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding rail transit could result in substantial impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Adding rail transit could require substantial property acquisition with numerous relocations.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 3 Conceptual Strategies (Highway 94 to I-270)		Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)								Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Reduce congestion on parallel road system	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Moderate cost transit enhancements (BRT, bus only lanes, larger capacity buses/trains)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	◒	○	◒	◒	●
Assumes BRT could be implemented mostly within the existing ROW.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to stations and offer regional access to households without access to vehicles.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding BRT or bus-only lanes could result in moderate impacts to wetlands/waters/ floodplains.	Transit enhancements may have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/ relocations since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Low cost transit enhancements (add express routes, increase service frequency, bus priority)	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	◒	○	●	●	●
Expansion of local transit or Metro System in this segment.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to stations and offer regional access to households without access to vehicles.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Enhancements to existing transit system would not have physical impacts and may benefit the natural environment through reduced VMT.	Transit enhancements would not have physical impacts and would increase accessibility for adjacent land uses.	No adverse effects to traffic or utilities expected.
Add and/or improve bike/ped facilities crossing I-70	●	◒	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	◒	●	●
	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to eliminate impediments to freight movement.	Would directly improve access to public transportation.	Would directly improve active transportation connectivity and access.	Would not improve interstate access for current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Unlikely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources and may have benefits through reduced VMT.	Not likely to impact adjacent land use and would increase accessibility for adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Improve local/parallel road system	◒	◒	◒	●	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 3, this would include adding or improving outer roads and potentially improving access between outer roads and I-70.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve ped/bike facilities when roads are improved.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and interchanges.	Would reduce congestion on parallel road system.	Could improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight movement by alleviating congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve ped/bike facilities when roads are improved.	Could provide access for current/future/ redevelopment areas, but may not be direct, and efficiency may be impacted by congestion.	Impacts could be moderate depending on proximity to river and floodplain.	May have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/relocation s since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 4 Conceptual Strategies (I-270 to Florissant Road)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)										Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Improve access to Lambert Airport for passengers, employees, and freight/cargo	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Reduce/eliminate conflict points at interchanges	●	●	●	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 4, this might involve configuration changes (DDI, SPUI, roundabouts) or lengthening ramps and probably doesn't require additional ROW. Two pedestrian fatalities at interchanges.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 58% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 58% of the vehicular crashes in this segment are at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	Would address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through improvements to eliminate conflict points.	Could improve LOS at interchanges.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could reduce impediments if substandard bridge heights are addressed through interchange reconfigurations and indirectly by addressing congestion.	Could indirectly improve access to the airport by addressing safety and improving operations at interchanges accessing the airport.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Could improve connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Consolidate and improve access points at airport and throughout segment	●	●	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 4, some interchanges could be consolidated to minimize access to/from the interstate by the use of collector/distributor lanes (i.e. Florissant/Hanley)	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 58% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 58% of the vehicular crashes in this segment are at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight by addressing congestion.	Could indirectly improve access to the airport by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	May provide opportunities to improve bike/ped	Could improve connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	May have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surround the interchanges in this segment.	May have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 4 Conceptual Strategies (I-270 to Florissant Road)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)										Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Improve access to Lambert Airport for passengers, employees, and freight/cargo	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Improve operations of interchanges	◒	◒	◒	●	○	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	○
For Segment 4, would likely involve reconfigurations such as changing standard diamonds and cloverleafs to DDI or SPUI – this could occur within ROW.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through capacity improvements.	Would improve LOS at interchanges to meet MoDOT standards.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could reduce impediments if substandard bridge heights are addressed through interchange reconfigurations and indirectly by addressing congestion.	Could indirectly improve access to the airport by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Could improve connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.
Address weave sections	◒	●	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	○	○	○	●	●	◒
For Segment 4, this would likely involve adding auxiliary lanes, which likely could be done within the ROW.	Would substantially address a cause of vehicular crashes because 25% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur in weave sections. Would not address bike/ped.	Would improve high crash locations.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight by addressing congestion.	Could indirectly improve access to the airport by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur almost entirely within existing ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources exist adjacent to the interstate.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur almost entirely within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 4 Conceptual Strategies (I-270 to Florissant Road)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)										Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Improve access to Lambert Airport for passengers, employees, and freight/cargo	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Bring facility to current standards (address substandard curves, narrow shoulders, etc.)	●	●	●	◒	◒	●	◒	○	◒	○	◒	◒	◒
Some bridge heights and shoulder widths (mainly inside) are substandard in this segment.	Several substandard curves could be addressed in this section, which could greatly reduce potential crashes.	Several substandard curves could be addressed in this section which could greatly reduce potential crashes.	Would address needs for infrastructure repair/ replacement along the corridor.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	May improve efficiency of access to freight hubs by raising low-clearance bridges on access routes.	Bringing infrastructure to standards would meet requirements for large commercial vehicles.	Could indirectly improve access to the airport by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require widening. Impacts are not likely to be substantial since they would occur mostly within existing ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources exist adjacent to the interstate.	Could require widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Add mainline capacity (general purpose lanes or managed lanes)	◒	●	◒	◒	○	◒	◒	○	○	○	○	○	◒
Assumes one additional lane in each direction with impacts beyond existing ROW.	Would address a cause of vehicular crashes because 17 % of vehicular crashes in this segment are rear-end crashes, which are often related to congestion. Would not address bike/ped.	Would improve high crash locations.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on the mainline through capacity improvements.	Could improve LOS at interchanges and on mainline.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could address congestion and new lanes would have better pavement conditions, which both address impediments to freight movement.	Could indirectly improve access to the airport by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding lanes could have substantial impacts to natural resources.	Adding lanes could require substantial property acquisition with some relocations.	Could result in moderate traffic disruption.
Upgrade infrastructure to better accommodate freight (including implementation of MoDOT and Freightway priority projects)	◒	◒	●	○	●	●	●	○	◒	○	◒	◒	◒
Freight needs in this segment consist of pavement rehabilitation and increase bridge clearance	If bridges are replaced, may reduce the potential for bike crashes related to poor pavement conditions or other issues at interstate crossings.	If bridges are replaced, may reduce the potential of bike crashes related to poor pavement conditions or other issues at interstate crossings	Would address needs for infrastructure repair/replacement along the corridor.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would reduce impediments for large commercial vehicles.	Would improve access to the airport for freight.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require widening. Impacts are not likely to be substantial since they would occur mostly within existing ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources exist adjacent to the interstate.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 4 Conceptual Strategies (I-270 to Florissant Road)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)										Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Improve access to Lambert Airport for passengers, employees, and freight/cargo	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Improve [freight] access to the airport	◒	◒	○	◒	●	●	●	○	○	◒	◒	◒	○
Assumes interchange access would also be designed to accommodate freight and large/oversized loads.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS at interchanges.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would reduce impediments for freight access to the airport.	Would improve access to the airport for freight.	Improved freight access not likely to improve public transportation access.	Improved freight access is not likely to improve active transportation.	Could improve connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to ample ROW.	Could result in substantial traffic or utility disruption.
Improve wayfinding at the airport	◒	◒	○	◒	○	○	●	○	◒	○	●	●	●
This may include better signage at consolidated interchanges to direct patrons in and around the airport.	Better signage could reduce the potential for crashes.	Better signage could reduce the potential for crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline at the airport.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to the airport for passengers.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Would not directly improve active transportation, but may encourage use of active transportation.	Not likely to improve interstate connections of current/future development/redevelopment areas.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources.	Not likely to impact adjacent land use.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Implement TSM measures	◒	◒	○	◒	○	◒	○	○	○	○	●	●	●
For Segment 4, this might include signal timing optimization, ramp metering, or signing/striping improvements	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve access to the airport.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area and could reduce VMT, which would reduce emissions and non-point source pollutants.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area.	TSM measures could be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 4 Conceptual Strategies (I-270 to Florissant Road)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)										Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Improve access to Lambert Airport for passengers, employees, and freight/cargo	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/improve interstate connections serving current/ future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Moderate cost transit enhancements (BRT, bus only lanes, larger capacity buses/trains)	○	○	○	◒	○	○	◒	●	◒	○	◒	◒	●
Assumes BRT could be implemented mostly within the existing ROW	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Could improve access to the airport for passengers and employees.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to BRT stations and may offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	May have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial since there are relatively few sensitive natural resources adjacent to the interstate in this segment.	Transit enhancements may have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/ relocations since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Unlikely to result in notable traffic disruption.
Low cost transit enhancements (add express routes, increase service frequency, bus priority)	○	○	○	◒	○	○	◒	●	◒	○	●	●	●
Assumes adding express routes, improving bus connections to MetroLink stops at airport, increasing service frequency, bus priority, etc	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Could improve access to the airport for passengers and employees.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Would offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Enhancements to the existing transit system would not have physical impacts and may benefit the natural environment through reduced VMT.	Transit enhancements would not have physical impacts and would increase accessibility for adjacent land uses.	No adverse effects to traffic or utilities expected.
Add and/or improve bike/ped facilities crossing I-70 and improve bike/ped connections to the larger network and airport	●	●	◒	○	○	○	◒	●	●	○	●	●	●
Allow for planned bike/ped improvements across I-70	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Could improve access to the airport for passengers and employees.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Would improve active transportation.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources and may have benefits through reduced VMT.	Not likely to impact adjacent land use and would increase accessibility for adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

Segment 5 Conceptual Strategies (Florissant Road to end of Express Lanes)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)												Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	*Optimize the function of the existing express lanes	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Increase transportation options for households without access to vehicles	Improve travel times between St Louis City and suburban employment centers for households without access to vehicles	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/ improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Reduce/eliminate conflict points at interchanges	●	●	●	◒	○	○	◒	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒	○	◒
For Segment 5, this might involve configuration changes (DDI, SPUI, roundabouts) or lengthening ramps and probably doesn't require additional ROW. Most bike/ped incidents occur near interstate overpasses.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 70% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of vehicular crashes because 70% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	Would address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through improvements to eliminate conflict points.	Could improve LOS at interchanges.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lanes.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could help address source of high priority freight bottlenecks identified in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Could improve access if bike/ped facilities are improved or added during interchange reconfigurations.	Could improve connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to sufficient ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Interchange reconfiguration improvements may have substantial impacts.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Consolidate and improve access points	●	●	◒	●	○	●	●	○	○	○	◒	●	◒	○	●
For Segment 5, some interchanges could be consolidated to minimize access to/from the interstate by the use of collector/distributor lanes.	Reducing the density of access points in this segment would address a prevalent cause of crashes because 70% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	Reducing density of access points in this segment would address a prevalent cause of crashes because 70% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur at interchanges. Could also address source of bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges.	Would improve LOS at interchanges and along mainline.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lanes.	Would minimize impediments to high priority freight hubs. Would greatly improve access to/from Broadway freight area.	Would allow freight to move more freely with fewer conflict points and weave patterns.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Could greatly improve interstate connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas because ramps would not be located at major streets; and operations at interchanges would be improved.	Improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to relatively few sensitive natural resources abutting the interstate in this segment.	Improvements could have substantial impacts in order to add appropriate access to consolidate interchanges.	Could result in substantial traffic or utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

* Options to optimize or repurpose express lanes will be evaluated in detail in a separate study.

Segment 5 Conceptual Strategies (Florissant Road to end of Express Lanes)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)												Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	*Optimize the function of the existing express lanes	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Increase transportation options for households without access to vehicles	Improve travel times between St Louis City and suburban employment centers for households without access to vehicles	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/ improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Address weave sections	◒	◒	◒	◒	○	○	◒	○	○	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒
For Segment 5, this would likely involve adding auxiliary lanes, which likely could be done within the ROW.	Would substantially address a cause of vehicular crashes because 24% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur in weave sections. Would not address bike/ped.	Would substantially address a cause of vehicular crashes because 24% of vehicular crashes in this segment occur in weave sections. Would not address bike/ped.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources exist adjacent to the interstate.	Could require minor widening. Impacts are likely to be minor since they would occur mostly within existing ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Improve operations of interchanges/provide full access interchanges	●	●	◒	◒	○	●	●	○	○	○	◒	◒	◒	◒	○
Assumes improvements would include providing full access where there is currently only one direction. This could involve reconfigurations if deemed viable to accommodate freight vehicles.	Would address factors related to vehicular crashes. Could reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	Would address factors related to vehicular crashes. Could reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at interchanges through capacity improvements.	Would improve LOS at interchanges, but adding full access interchanges could impact LOS on mainline.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would greatly improve conditions at high priority freight bottlenecks in this segment.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if interchanges are reconfigured.	Could improve interstate connections to adjacent development/ redevelopment areas through improved operations at interchanges.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to sufficient ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Interchange improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to sufficient ROW at interchanges.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

* Options to optimize or repurpose express lanes will be evaluated in detail in a separate study.

Segment 5 Conceptual Strategies (Florissant Road to end of Express Lanes)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)												Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	*Optimize the function of the existing express lanes	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Increase transportation options for households without access to vehicles	Improve travel times between St Louis City and suburban employment centers for households without access to vehicles	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/ improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Bring facility to standards (address substandard curves, narrow shoulders, etc.)	●	●	◒	◒	○	◒	●	○	○	○	◒	○	◒	○	◒
The majority of the bridge heights and should widths (both inside and outside) are substandard in this segment. Shoulder widening to provide refuge for disabled vehicles and straightening of reverse curve sections would likely necessitate additional ROW.	Several substandard curves could be addressed in this section, which could greatly reduce potential crashes.	Several substandard curves could be addressed in this section, which could greatly reduce potential crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure on mainline.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	May improve efficiency of access to freight hubs if low-clearance bridges are raised.	Bringing infrastructure to standards would meet requirements for large commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Would impact areas beyond existing ROW. Impacts are not likely substantial due to relatively few sensitive natural resources adjacent to the interstate.	Could require major widening. Impacts are likely to be significant since they would require additional ROW.	Could result in moderate traffic or utility disruption.
Add mainline capacity (general purpose lanes or managed lanes)	◒	●	◒	●	●	○	◒	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Assumes one additional lane in each direction with impacts beyond existing ROW. This would also involve the reconfiguration of the express lanes.	Would address a cause of vehicular crashes because 24% of vehicular crashes in this segment are rear-end crashes, which are often related to congestion. Would not address bike/ped.	Would improve high crash locations.	May address deteriorating infrastructure when other improvements are implemented.	Would improve LOS on mainline to meet MoDOT standards.	Would optimize function of existing express lanes.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Could address congestion and new lanes would have better pavement conditions, which both address impediments to freight movement.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Adding travel lanes could result in substantial impacts to jurisdictional waters and floodplains.	Adding lanes could require substantial property acquisition with some relocations.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

* Options to optimize or repurpose express lanes will be evaluated in detail in a separate study.

Segment 5 Conceptual Strategies (Florissant Road to end of Express Lanes)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)												Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	*Optimize the function of the existing express lanes	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Increase transportation options for households without access to vehicles	Improve travel times between St Louis City and suburban employment centers for households without access to vehicles	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/ improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Upgrade infrastructure to better accommodate freight (including implementation of MoDOT and Freightway priority projects)	◒	◒	●	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	◒	○	◒	◒	○
Freight needs in this segment consist of pavement rehabilitation, increased bridge clearances, and interchanges that can accommodate freight vehicles.	If bridges are replaced or interchanges reconfigured, may reduce the potential for bike crashes related to poor pavement conditions or other issues at interstate crossings.	If bridges are replaced or interchanges reconfigured, may reduce the potential for bike crashes related to poor pavement conditions or other issues at interstate crossings.	Would address needs for infrastructure repair/ replacement along the corridor.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Would improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Would reduce impediments for large commercial vehicles.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped facilities if bridges are replaced or interchanges reconfigured.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to sufficient ROW and relatively few sensitive natural resources surrounding the interchanges in this segment.	Improvements may have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to sufficient ROW at interchanges.	Could result in substantial traffic and utility disruption.
Improve safety and function of collector/distributor roads	◒	◒	◒	○	○	○	○	◒	○	○	◒	◒	●	●	●
Support the multiple functions of the collector/distributor road system in Segment 5. Includes traffic calming measures and intersection improvements to safely distribute traffic while preserving neighborhood functions.	Traffic calming measures may reduce the potential for bike/ped crashes.	Could improve safety at intersections.	May address deteriorating infrastructure at intersections and on collector/ distributor roads.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Not likely to improve access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Creating a safer environment for bike/ped activity could improve accessibility to existing public transportation stops.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Creating a safer environment for bike/ped activity could improve active transportation access.	Intersection improvements could improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources.	Not likely to impact adjacent land uses and could increase accessibility to adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

* Options to optimize or repurpose express lanes will be evaluated in detail in a separate study.

Segment 5 Conceptual Strategies (Florissant Road to end of Express Lanes)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)												Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	*Optimize the function of the existing express lanes	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Increase transportation options for households without access to vehicles	Improve travel times between St Louis City and suburban employment centers for households without access to vehicles	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/ improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Moderate cost transit enhancements (BRT, bus only lanes, larger capacity buses/trains)	○	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	●	●	◒	○	◒	◒	●
Assumes BRT could be implemented mostly within the existing ROW	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Would increase transportation options.	Would improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Could offer opportunity to add/improve bike/ped connections to BRT stations and may offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	May have impacts, but they are not likely to be substantial due to relatively few sensitive natural resources adjacent to the interstate in this segment.	Transit enhancements may have impacts, but they are unlikely to require substantial property acquisition/ relocations since they would likely occur entirely or mostly within existing ROW.	Not likely to result in traffic disruption.
Low cost transit enhancements (add express routes, increase service frequency, bus priority)	○	○	○	◒	○	○	○	●	●	●	◒	○	●	●	●
Assumes adding express routes, increasing service frequency, bus priority, etc)	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address the cause of vehicular or bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS by reducing VMT, but would not substantially address congestion.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Would increase transportation options.	Would improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Would offer regional access to some households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Enhancements to the existing transit system would not have physical impacts and may benefit the natural environment through reduced VMT.	Transit enhancements would not have physical impacts and would increase accessibility for adjacent land uses.	No adverse effects to traffic or utilities expected.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

* Options to optimize or repurpose express lanes will be evaluated in detail in a separate study.

Segment 5 Conceptual Strategies (Florissant Road to end of Express Lanes)	Alignment with Transportation Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)												Alignment with Impact Minimization Goals (Good, Fair, Poor)		
	Reduce potential for crashes (including crashes involving bike/ped)	Improve configurations to address high crash locations	Maintain/ preserve physical conditions of infrastructure	Improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges	*Optimize the function of the existing express lanes	Improve efficiency of access to freight hubs	Minimize/ eliminate impediments to freight movement along the corridor	Allow improved accessibility to public transportation	Increase transportation options for households without access to vehicles	Improve travel times between St Louis City and suburban employment centers for households without access to vehicles	Improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network	Provide/ improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas	Minimize impacts to the natural environment	Minimize impacts to the built environment	Minimize construction issues
Implement TSM measures	◒	◒	○	◒	○	○	◒	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●
For Segment 5, this might include signal timing optimization, ramp metering, or signing/striping improvements	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	May address factors related to vehicular crashes. Not likely to reduce potential for bike/ped crashes.	Not likely to address deteriorating infrastructure.	Could improve LOS on mainline and at interchanges.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Could indirectly reduce impediments to freight by addressing congestion.	Not likely to improve accessibility to public transportation.	Not likely to increase transportation options.	Not likely to improve travel times for households without access to vehicles.	Not likely to improve active transportation access to major destinations and local network.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area and could reduce VMT, which would reduce emissions and non-point source pollutants.	TSM measures are not likely to result in physical impacts beyond the current paved area.	TSM measures could be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.
Add and/or improve bike/ped facilities crossing I-70 and improve bike/ped connections to the larger bike/ped network	●	●	◒	○	○	○	○	●	●	◒	●	○	●	●	●
Allow for planned bike/ped improvements across I-70	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes.	Would substantially address a prevalent cause of bike/ped crashes.	May address deteriorating infrastructure.	Would not result in a measurable improvement in LOS.	Not likely to optimize function of the express lane areas.	Not likely to improve efficiency of access to freight hubs.	Not likely to reduce impediments to freight movement.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Would improve access to public transportation.	Could improve travel times if bike/ped improvements increase access to regional public transportation routes.	Would improve active transportation.	Not likely to improve interstate connections serving current/future development/ redevelopment areas.	Not likely to result in impacts to sensitive natural resources and may have benefits through reduced VMT.	Not likely to impact adjacent land uses and would increase accessibility to adjacent land uses.	Improvements could likely be implemented with minimal disruption to traffic or utilities.

Goal Rankings

● Good ◒ Fair ○ Poor

* Options to optimize or repurpose express lanes will be evaluated in detail in a separate study.