



Comparative (Level 2) Screening Summary

Level 2 Evaluation Criteria	No Action	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	No Action	Pedestrian/Bicyclist Crossing Modifications	Signing, Striping, and Signal Progression Modifications	Signing and Signal Modifications with Overhead Lane Control	Added Turn Lanes	Added Turn Lanes with Signal Phasing Modifications	Added Turn Lanes with Quincy Widening	Southbound Parker Loop and Smoky Hill Modifications
Traffic Operations								
Safety								
Multimodal Connectivity								
Implementability								
<b>SUMMARY OF RESULTS</b>	<b>CARRIED FORWARD</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>CARRIED FORWARD</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>CARRIED FORWARD</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
<b>Notes</b>	Further analysis as the No Action Alternative for comparison to recommended improvements.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because it does not reduce congestion or provide adequate operational performance benefits at the study area intersections and impacts area pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because it does not reduce congestion or provide adequate operational performance benefits at the study area intersections.	This alternative is carried forward as a potential improvement project because it reduces delay and queue lengths at the study intersections with a relatively low to moderate cost.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because it does not reduce congestion or provide adequate operational performance benefits at the study area intersections with relatively moderate to high cost.	This alternative is carried forward as a potential improvement project because it reduces delay and queue lengths at the study area intersections with reasonably moderate to high cost.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because it would result in comparably higher property impacts and relatively high cost without substantially better traffic operations and safety benefits.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because it would result in comparably higher property impacts and relatively high cost without substantially better traffic operations and safety benefits.

- = Comparatively beneficial and/or minor impacts
- = Comparatively neutral benefits and/or moderate impacts
- = Comparatively minor or no benefits and/or major impacts

CARRIED FORWARD = Alternative will be evaluated further with conceptual design as a potential improvement project  
 NOT RECOMMENDED = Alternative will not be evaluated further in the study due to comparatively negligible benefits and major impacts