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Executive Summary

The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) initiated a study of the I-90 Exit 387 Interchange & Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridor in order to develop and evaluate potential improvements within the study area. As part of the study, this Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) was developed to provide a technical evaluation of the operational feasibility of the proposed improvements. This document also determines whether the proposed I-90 Exit 387 Interchange & Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridor improvements satisfy requirements established by the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) policy concerning additional or revised access to the Interstate Highway System.

This IMJR document was developed using the methodology and approach outlined in Figure 3 of Section 3.5 of the Interstate System Access Information Guide. This IMJR was developed concurrently with the preparation of an Environmental Document.

Improvements are needed at Exit 387 to provide greater clearance over the I-90 mainline. Two significant crashes have been noted within history where the bridge superstructure was damaged by collisions by vehicles on the I-90 mainline. Additional collisions will result in the need to replace at least one of the main support beams and require full closure of the interchange during construction and subsequent long-distance traffic diversions.

The following alternatives were developed and analyzed to determine which best met the project needs:

Interchange Alternatives
- No Build
- 1. Standard Diamond
- 2. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts
- 3. Standard Diamond – Western Avenue Shifted West
- 4. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts – Western Avenue Shifted West
- 5. Standard Diamond with Lowered I-90
- 6. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts and Lowered I-90
- 7. Standard Diamond with Lowered I-90 – Western Avenue Shifted West
- 8. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts and Lowered I-90 – Western Avenue Shifted West
- 9. Standard Diamond with I-90 over Western Avenue

Corridor Concepts
- A. 2-Lane Rural Section (North of Interchange only)
- B. 3-Lane Urban Section (North of Interchange only)
- C. 2-Lane Rural Section with Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)
- D. 2-Lane Rural Section without Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)
- E. Southwest Quadrant Frontage Road Realignment

Operations analysis showed that all alternatives provided the required levels of service in 2025 for all intersections and segments in the study area. In 2050, the stop-controlled ramp terminal
intersections at the adjacent interchange (Exit 390) showed levels of service of E and F. While Exit 390 is not the subject of this IMJR and would experience these levels of service regardless of which alternative is chosen at Exit 387, it appears that the levels of service at Exit 390 could be improved with Transportation System Management measures, like addition of turn lanes and possible signalization.

The interchange alternatives were evaluated through a detailed screening analysis in a Concept Evaluation memo (Appendix J) and public input in 2018. The evaluation determined that concepts 5 – 9 posed additional costs related to lowering the I-90 mainline, requiring additional right-of-way and drainage facilities. Interchange alternatives 1 – 4 were carried forward for further evaluation and public comment. That evaluation determined that alternatives 1 and 2 required full closure of the interchange during construction, resulting in long detours and severe impacts to businesses and other property owners in the study area. Alternatives 3 and 4 were then compared against each other to determine their relative life-cycle costs.

Corridor concept A required considerable additional right-of-way compared to concept B, while concept D did not provide the shared-use path favored by the stakeholders and public. For those reasons, concepts B, C, and E were carried forward for implementation.

Based on the analysis contained herein, the IMJR-recommended alternative that best meets the established transportation needs within the study area is as follows:

- **Interchange Build Alternative 3:** Standard Diamond interchange, crossroad shifted west to allow maintaining traffic during construction.
- **Corridor Build Alternative B:** Western Avenue – 3-lane urban section north of Jeffrey Street.
- **Corridor Build Alternative C:** Western Avenue – 2-lane rural section with shared-use path south of Jeffrey Street.
- **Southwest Quadrant Frontage Road Realignment.**

This request is to modify the existing I-90 Exit 387 Interchange. No additional access to the Interstate system is being requested.

The proposed improvements at Exit 387 will result in a full interchange, providing all movements normally found at Interstate interchanges. The interchange improvement will not result in additional access to the Interstate system and will be designed to meet all current standards.
1. Introduction
The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) initiated a study of the I-90 Exit 387 Interchange and Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridor in order to develop and evaluate potential improvements within the study area. As part of the study, this Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) was developed to help determine if the proposed interchange improvements satisfy requirements established by the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) policy concerning additional or revised access to the Interstate Highway System. This IMJR was developed concurrently with the environmental analysis process.

This document was developed on behalf of the SDDOT, for submittal to FHWA as a request to modify Interstate access at the I-90 Exit 387 Interchange.

1.1. Background
The bridge structure at the I-90 Exit 387 interchange has been hit multiple times, requiring repairs that are costly and imposing traffic delays from the time damage occurs until repairs can be completed. Each time the bridge has been hit, the SDDOT has been able to utilize heat strengthening to repair the bridge to the SDDOT standards for a safe structure. However, this application can only be utilized a limited number of times until the repair method is no longer effective. If the structure were to sustain another bridge strike, the likely repair methodology would require a partial girder replacement. This method would carry substantial cost and would require an emergency partial or full closure of the bridge.

Because of numerous bridge strikes, the South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) has determined that the I-90 Exit 387 (Hartford) interchange will need to have a new overpass structure in the near future. The SDDOT in conjunction with the City of Hartford, Minnehaha County, the Sioux Falls Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has concluded that a study is needed to determine the proper interchange configuration that will be needed to handle current and future traffic levels. A previous comprehensive Interstate system study, the 2010 Decennial Interstate Corridor Study, found no deficiencies at Exit 387, but forecast that the existing interchange may reach operational capacity after 2030. Since that study, the structure collisions have forced consideration of replacing the interchange.

1.2. Purpose
The purpose for this project is to accommodate the current and future transportation needs for the I-90 Exit 387 (Hartford) Interchange and the segment of the S. Western Avenue connected to the interchange. The numerous bridge strikes in recent years have elevated the need to pursue replacement of the bridge before any major rehabilitation work will be necessary. Through the reconstruction of the facility, the needs of accommodating future traffic demand and multi-modal transportation through the interchange can also be met. The outcome of this project will be a facility demonstrating an increase to current design standards, improved safety, and an increase to the efficiency of the transportation system along the I-90 and Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridors.
1.3. Project Location

The existing I-90 Exit 387 Diamond Interchange is located along the southern edge of the City of Hartford in Minnehaha County, South Dakota. The interchange is approximately nine miles west of the I-90 & I-29 systems interchange and serves as an important regional transportation gateway for the Hartford area. While the Hartford corporate limits only include the Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridor north of I-90, the entire study area is within their growth area. The entire IMJR study area, shown in Figure 1, is within the Sioux Falls MPO planning boundary and encompasses the following limits:

- Minnehaha County 151/463rd Avenue/Western Avenue from the intersection with 261st Street to the intersection with 260th Street/Mickelson Avenue, approximately 1.0 mile (referred to as Western Avenue)
- SD38 from the I-90 Westbound Ramp Terminal to the I-90 Eastbound Ramp Terminal, approximately 0.3 miles,
- Mainline I-90 from MRM 384 west of the I-90 Exit 387 interchange to MRM 391 east of the I-90 Exit 390 interchange, approximately 7.0 miles,
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 387(Hartford) interchange, and
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 390 (SD38/Buffalo Ridge) interchange.

Within the IMJR study area, the following intersections were analyzed as part of this study (existing traffic control):

- Western Avenue corridor
  - 260th Street/Mickelson Road (stop-controlled from minor street approach)
  - Opal Lane (stop-controlled from minor street approach)
  - Diamond Trail (stop-controlled from minor street approach)
  - Westbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection (stop-controlled from off-ramp approach).
  - Eastbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection (stop-controlled from off-ramp approach).
  - Jeffrey Street (stop-controlled from minor street approach)
  - 261st Street (stop-controlled from minor street approach)

- Highway 38 corridor
  - Westbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection (stop-controlled from off-ramp approach).
  - Eastbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection (stop-controlled from off-ramp approach).

The following projects are currently under construction or are planned for construction within the study area:

- Construction of crossovers on I-90 mainline and ramps from west of Humboldt to near Hartford to accommodate later I-90 construction projects (IM 0909(89)379).
- Construction on the I-90 mainline from west of Humboldt to east of Hartford to replace surfacing, replace a structure, and correct a clearance deficiency (IM-FP 0909(90)377).

The existing I-90 Exit 387 Interchange is a diamond-type interchange configuration as shown in Figure 2. The proposed improvements would reconstruct this interchange to a diamond-type
interchange to fulfill current design standards, improve safety, and increase the efficiency of the transportation system along the I-90 Interstate and Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridors.
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2. Methodology

This IMJR document was developed using the methodology and approach outlined in the *Interstate System Access Information Guide*\(^1\), following the outline presented in Figure 3 of Section 3.5. The general IMJR study process entailed:

1. Establishment of project Methods and Assumptions document.
2. Collection of current data.
3. Identification and evaluation of existing and future needs within the study area.
4. Development of interchange and arterial corridor concepts to address established needs.
5. High-level analysis and screening of initial concepts.
6. Refinement of concepts carried forward to establish study interchange and corridor Build Alternatives.
7. Analysis and screening of Build Alternatives.

The IMJR document is prepared in conjunction with the development of the Environmental Document. The Environmental Document establishes the overall project purpose and need and provides the overarching discussion and evaluation of alternatives, environmental resources, and impacts of the proposed action with appropriate mitigation measures. The IMJR provides technical evaluation support of the alternatives to the Environmental Document and is the SDDOT’s formal request for modifying access to the Interstate system.

3. Existing Conditions

3.1. Demographics

The Sioux Falls Metropolitan Statistical Area, which includes the City of Hartford, has seen quick, yet steady growth over the last several decades illustrated in Table 1. The City of Hartford has seen growth at an even faster rate and if recent growth trends continue the population can be expected to increase to approximately 10,000 people by the 2050 planning year. Population growth in both the Sioux Falls Metropolitan Statistical Area (38 percent) and the City of Hartford (76 percent) has outpaced the statewide growth rate (15 percent) between 2000 and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls Statistical Area</td>
<td>187,093</td>
<td>228,261</td>
<td>259,094</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartford</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>754,844</td>
<td>814,180</td>
<td>869,666</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment within the statistical area has grown along with the population. Unemployment rates within the Sioux Falls metropolitan area and the State of South Dakota were 2.2 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively.

---

percent, respectively, in October 2018\textsuperscript{2}. The unemployment rate in the City of Hartford was 3.1 percent in 2016\textsuperscript{3}.

The future land use plan for the City of Hartford, as presented in the 2017-2037 Hartford Comprehensive Plan, includes further development of the area south of the I-90 Exit 387 interchange, seen below in \textbf{Figure 3}. The anticipated zoning land uses include commercial zoning immediately south of the interchange skirted by industrial zoned land uses. Residential and commercial zoned land use is expected to increase north of the interchange. Currently, the service industry is the leading employment type within the City of Hartford, followed by retail and finance occupational employment. These three employment categories have been shown to increase over the last decade at a rate that outpaces others.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{HartfordMap.png}
\caption{Study Area Future Land Use Data}
\end{figure}

\subsection*{3.2. Existing Land Use}

The study area comprises a mix of residential, commercial, industrial, institutional and agricultural uses. \textbf{Figure 4} illustrates current City of Hartford zoning within the study area.

A number of light industrial businesses are clustered in the southeast quadrant of the Exit 387 interchange. Agricultural land use occupies the remainder of the study area south of I-90.


\textsuperscript{3} 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-year Estimate, US Census Bureau.  \url{https://factfinder.census.gov} (retrieved November 2018)
North of I-90, there is a mix of commercial, industrial, institutional, agricultural, and residential land use. Commercial uses now line Western Avenue north of I-90, providing services to I-90 travelers and Hartford residents.

The City of Hartford Comprehensive Plan identifies continued commercial development around the interchange, with heavy industrial uses replacing many of the existing agricultural uses south of I-90.

3.3. Existing Roadway Network
The major streets within the study area, as illustrated in Figure 5, are as follows:

**Interstate 90**
- West of Western Avenue/463rd Avenue: Rural Interstate:
  - SDDOT access classification: Interstate.
  - 2 lanes eastbound and westbound through study area, separated by a depressed turf median.
- East of Western Avenue/463rd Avenue: Rural Interstate:
  - SDDOT access classification: Interstate.
  - 2 lanes eastbound and westbound through study area, separated by a depressed turf median.
SD 38

- West of I-90: Major Collector
  - SDDOT access classification: Rural, with control of access within interchange area
  - 2-lane rural type cross-section with turn lanes at I-90 ramp termini

- East of I-90: Minor Arterial
  - SDDOT access classification: Rural, with control of access within interchange area
  - 2-lane rural type cross-section with turn lanes at I-90 ramp termini

Western Avenue/463rd Avenue

- FHWA functional class rural major collector
  - 2-lane rural type cross-section throughout study area

Mickelson Road

- FHWA functional class rural local road
  - Three-lane urban cross-section east of Western Avenue
  - Two-lane rural cross-section west of Western Avenue

261st Street

- Unclassified rural roadway
  - Two-lane rural cross-section east of Western Avenue
  - Two-lane rural cross-section west of Western Avenue

Other public streets of note within the study area include analyzed Western Avenue intersections with local streets:

Local Analyzed Streets

- Opal Lane: FHWA functional class rural road
- Diamond Trail: FHWA functional class rural road
- Jeffrey Street: FHWA functional class rural road
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Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
3.4. Alternative Travel Modes

Travel along the existing transportation network within and around the study area is primarily by automobile. However, other forms are present:

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are limited within the study area, particularly along Western Avenue. Sidewalks are provided on some of the recently-constructed intersecting streets and a multiple-use recreational trail exists along the south side of Mickelson Road. There are shoulders on both sides of Western Avenue, except across the interchange structure, where the narrow width of the bridge deck restricts bicycle and pedestrian mobility along the corridor.

**Transit**

Fixed-route transit within the Sioux Falls metropolitan area is served by the Sioux Area Metro. However, routes do not currently extend to the Hartford area. Hartford Area Transit, Inc. provides on-call door-to-door service that covers the study area depending on passenger destinations.

Jefferson Lines provides regional bus transportation along I-90 through the interchange, providing connectivity between prime transfer points of Sioux Falls and Rapid City. Jefferson Lines does not provide a bus stop in Hartford and, therefore, does not routinely use the interchange.

**Airports**

The nearest commercial airport is the Sioux Falls Regional Airport located approximately eleven miles east of the I-90 Exit 387 Interchange. The airport may be accessed via SD 38 or the I-90 Cliff Avenue Exit (Exit 399).

**Railroad**

No passenger or freight rail lines run through the study area.

3.5. Interchanges

Two interchanges are located within the study area, Exits 387, and 390, and are further described in the following subsections.

**I-90 Exit 387**

The existing interchange at Exit 387 is a Standard Diamond configuration with approximately 945-foot separation between ramp terminal intersections as shown in Figure 6. Each ramp terminal is stop-controlled from the off-ramp approach. Diagonal ramps in all four quadrants are single lane. A review of the geometric conditions at the interchange was reported in a project memorandum provided in Appendix D.

Through a review of construction plans and previous studies, the following elements of the existing interchange design support improvement at the interchange:

- The foreslopes adjacent to the ramp shoulders do not meet current standards within the clear zone unless protected by guardrail.
• The interchange ramps do not have deceleration or acceleration tapers.
• The distance from the ramp terminal intersections to the mainline centerline is shorter than the current design guidance.
• The distance from the ramp P.I. to the centerline of the crossroad do not meet the current design guidance.

The existing structure over I-90 has a total bridge roadway width of 30 feet, restricting the ability to accommodate increasing travel demand and multi-modal mobility. This limited bridge width also negates the opportunity to develop left-turn lanes across the bridge for I-90 on-ramps. In addition, the current bridge deck does not provide adequate clear zone space between travel lanes and the bridge railing, and separate pedestrian/bicycle facilities are not provided.

The first public roadway intersection south of the interchange is Jeffrey Street, with a west leg approximately 300’ south and an east left approximately 730’ south (measured center-of-intersection to center-of-intersection) of the eastbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection. A two-lane segment is present between the intersections.

To the north of the interchange, the first access breaks are driveways to a commercial property approximately 530’ and 675’ north of the westbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection. The first local street intersection is Diamond Trail, approximately 775’ north of the westbound I-90 ramp terminal intersection.
I-90 Exit 390

The I-90 Exit 390 Interchange, shown in Figure 7, is a Folded Diamond configuration including a single through lane in each direction on the crossroad (SD 38) through the interchange. An auxiliary right turn lane exists for westbound traffic on SD 38 turning onto the westbound I-90 on-ramp. A left turn lane exists for eastbound traffic on SD 38 turning onto the eastbound I-90 on-ramp. Each interchange ramp has a single lane and ramp terminal intersections are stop-controlled from the off-ramp approach.
3.6. Existing Data
Existing data was collected at the onset of the study and updated as needed to fulfill the study objectives. The source of data was identified in the project Methods and Assumptions document, which was agreed upon through the signing of that document by FHWA and SDDOT. The data obtained for this project is of high quality.

Traffic Data
Existing traffic data was collected during 2018, summarized in the following table. Peak hour volumes and heavy vehicle percentages were extracted from the data to develop a balanced Existing Conditions traffic data set of AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes.

Table 2: Traffic Data Collection Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Corridor</th>
<th>Truck Percentages</th>
<th>Peak Hour Factor (Intersections)</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 13-hour Intersection Turning Movement Counts</td>
<td>• 2018 intersection turning movement counts</td>
<td>• 2018 intersection turning movement counts</td>
<td>• Posted speed limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mickelson Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opal Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diamond Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I-90 Exit 387 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I-90 Exit 387 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jeffrey Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 261st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Western Avenue Corridor Counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North and South of Mickelson Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-90 Freeway and Exits 387 and 390 Interchange Ramps</th>
<th>Truck Percentages</th>
<th>Peak Hour Factor (Intersections)</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 24-hour I-90 Freeway Counts</td>
<td>• Freeway: 2018 24-hour I-90 freeway counts</td>
<td>• Freeway: 2018 24-hour I-90 freeway counts</td>
<td>• Freeway: 2018 24-hour I-90 freeway counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I-90 EB/WB mainline locations west of Exit 387, between Exits 387 and 390, and east of Exit 390</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ramps: 2018 13-hour intersection turning movement counts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 24-hour Ramp Counts</td>
<td>• Freeway: 2018 24-hour I-90 freeway counts</td>
<td>• Ramps: 2018 13-hour intersection turning movement counts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I-90 Exit 387 ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I-90 Exit 390 ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 13-hour Intersection Turning Movement Counts</td>
<td>• Freeway: 2018 24-hour I-90 freeway counts</td>
<td>• Ramps: 2018 13-hour intersection turning movement counts</td>
<td>• Freeway: 2018 24-hour I-90 freeway counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exit 390 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exit 390 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future-Year Traffic Data
The development of future-year traffic volumes was based on the existing traffic counts and traffic forecasts from the Sioux Falls 2040 Travel Demand Model (TDM). The Sioux Falls MPO provided the most current version of the Sioux Falls 2040 TDM for this study.

Crash Data
The SDDOT provided a GIS database of reported crashes within the study over a 5-year period between 2013 and 2017. Crash data, including crash information such as severity, manner of collision, location and contributing circumstances, was reviewable in tabular and spatial format.

Geometric Data
Geometric data review of existing conditions was based on construction plans provided by the SDDOT.

For conceptual design and refinement of Build Alternatives, the SDDOT provided topographic survey files for the interchange area and along the Western Avenue/463rd Avenue corridor.

3.7. Operational Performance

Existing Traffic Operations
Traffic operations for all roadway elements within the study area were evaluated using methodology described in the 6th edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 6). The Highway Capacity Software (HCS 7), release 7.5, was used in the analysis of traffic operations at freeway mainline, merge, and diverge segments, two-way stop-controlled intersections (minor crossroad and ramp-terminal intersection), and signalized intersections. HCS 7 measures average control delay in terms of seconds of delay per vehicle (sec/veh) at two-way stop-control and signalized intersections. It measures density in terms of passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln) on freeway segments. Level of Service (LOS) values were applied to these measures in accordance with methodologies outlined in the HCM 6.

A weighted average approach was also used to present an alternative average delay measure at minor two-way stop-controlled intersections with Western Avenue/463rd Avenue and SD 38. This methodology uses average control delay values for the stop-controlled approach calculated in the HCM 6 two-way stop-control analysis and assumes zero delay for the major street through and right-turn vehicles to calculate an average delay for all vehicles entering the intersection. A LOS measure was applied to the weighted average delay using HCM 6 all-way stop-control thresholds for intersection delay and LOS.

Table 3 and Table 4 present the LOS thresholds used to evaluate operations along freeway elements and at intersections within the study area.
Table 3: Freeway Level of Service Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Segment Density (pc/mi/ln)</th>
<th>Merge and Diverge Segment</th>
<th>Freeway Weaving Segment</th>
<th>Basic Freeway Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0 – 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 20</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 20</td>
<td>&gt; 11 – 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 20 – 28</td>
<td>&gt; 20 – 28</td>
<td>&gt; 18 – 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 28 – 35</td>
<td>&gt; 28 – 35</td>
<td>&gt; 26 – 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 35</td>
<td>&gt; 35</td>
<td>&gt; 35 – 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Demand exceeds capacity; &gt; 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4: Intersection Level of Service Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Intersection Delay (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Signalized Intersections</th>
<th>Two-Way Stop-Control*, All-Way Stop-Control, Roundabouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 20</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 15</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 20 – 35</td>
<td>&gt; 15 – 25</td>
<td>&gt; 15 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 55 – 80</td>
<td>&gt; 35 – 50</td>
<td>&gt; 35 – 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Demand exceeds capacity; &gt; 80</td>
<td>Demand exceeds capacity; &gt; 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following LOS thresholds represent the minimum allowable LOS measures for future-year Build concepts to be carried forward and considered for a preferred Build alternative. For the analysis contained within this memorandum, these LOS thresholds will also be applied to identify areas with current and future-year concerns in the No-Build Conditions.

- Ramp Terminal Intersections:
  - Intersection: LOS C.
  - Individual Movements: LOS D with overall intersection at LOS C or better.

- Signalized Non-Ramp Terminal Intersections (modified by project):
  - Intersection: LOS D.
  - Individual Movements: LOS E with overall intersection at LOS D or better.
  - Individual Movements: Cannot operate with a v/c ratio greater than 1.0.

- Other Non-Ramp Terminal Intersections (modified by project):
  - Intersection: LOS D.
  - Individual Movements: LOS E or F with overall intersection at LOS D or better.

- Intersections Not Modified by Project:
  - Intersection: LOS D.
  - Individual Movements: LOS E or F with overall intersection at LOS D or better.
The LOS results are summarized in Figure 8 and shown in Tables 5 - 9. HCS 7 reports are provided in Appendix C.

### Table 5: Western Avenue/463rd Avenue Intersection Traffic Operations – Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road (260th Street)</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Lane</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 387 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 387 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261st Street</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two-way stop-control LOS reflects worst-case stop-controlled approach.

### Table 6: Western Avenue/463rd Avenue Local Network Intersection Traffic Operations (Weighted Average) – Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road (260th Street)</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Lane</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261st Street</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: I-90 Exit 390 Ramp Terminal Intersections – Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD38 Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 390 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 390 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two-way stop-control LOS reflects worst-case stop-controlled approach.

### Table 8: Western Avenue Corridor Two-Lane Highway Segments – Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Segment</th>
<th>Direction of Travel</th>
<th>Segment Length (mi)</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
<th>Bicycle Score LOS (AM/PM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTSF (%)</td>
<td>PTSF* (%)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road – Diamond Trail</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>D E/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>B E/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail – WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>D C/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>B C/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Ramp Terminal – EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>B E/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>C F/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Ramp Terminal – 261st Street</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>B F/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>A F/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>C -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>B -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PTSF = Percent Time Spent Following
The Existing Conditions analysis shows generally good levels of service throughout the study area, although some congestion (LOS D) shows up in the peak hour two-way highway segment analysis on Western Avenue. All analyses of I-90 operations show LOS A or B.
Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian (Nonautomobile Mode) Facility Evaluation

The Streets Module in HCS 7 was used to analyze pedestrian and bicycle facilities, when applicable. HCM 7 Chapters 16, 17, and 18 provides a nonautomobile mode LOS criteria for pedestrian and bicycle modes at and through signalized intersections. The quality of service-based LOS score measures a combination of factors that describe performance measures and intersection character. The LOS score criteria are provided in Table 10.

Table 10: Pedestrian and Bicycle Modes Level of Service Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Level of Service Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤ 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 2.00-2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 2.75-3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 3.50-4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 4.25-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Western Avenue corridor segments through the study area were analyzed as two-way highway segments as part of the Existing Conditions analysis, providing an evaluation of bicycle level of service. That analysis showed low levels of service (LOS E, F) due to lack of facilities (lack of shoulders and/or sidewalk and bridge width restrictions across I-90). Analysis of pedestrian level of service was not possible due to the existing roadway configuration, but the lack of specific pedestrian facilities would likely result in low levels of service. It should be noted; however, that the Build Alternatives were developed to provide improvements to both pedestrian and bicycle mobility throughout the corridor when compared to the Existing Conditions.

3.8. Existing Safety Conditions

A review of crash data was completed for the I-90 Exit 387 study area to identify potential trends or safety concerns within the study area. Crash data from the South Dakota Department of Transportation was collected and analyzed for nine study area intersections, as well as the I-90, Western Avenue and SD Highway 38 segments in the study area. The study period is the five-year period between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2017. The study area crash distribution in shown in Figure 10.

In addition to the three study segments, the study intersections analyzed are:

1. Western Avenue and 261st Street
2. Western Avenue and Jeffrey Street
3. Western Avenue and I-90 EB ramps (south ramps)
4. Western Avenue and I-90 WB ramps (north ramps)
5. Western Avenue and Diamond Trail
6. Western Avenue and Opal Lane
7. Western Avenue and Mickelson Road
8. SD 38 and I-90 EB ramps (south ramps)
9. SD 38 and I-90 WB ramps (north ramps)
Crash frequencies, rates and severities were evaluated for study intersections and roadway segments. To determine if potential safety issues are present, intersection and segment crash rates were compared to typical crash rates on similar facilities. The data used for this comparison was published by the Minnesota Department of Transportation for similar roadway types as similar data from SDDOT is not readily available.

To determine whether crash rates are above typical crash rates simply due to the random nature of crashes or if elevated crash rates are attributable to roadway design or traffic control, the critical crash rate analysis methodology was used. The critical crash rate method uses statistical analysis to determine if differences between observed crash rates and crash rates for a larger population of locations are statistically significant. Improvements to reduce crashes will be considered in the alternatives analysis at any locations that may exhibit crash rates outside the critical crash rate. Crash data and statistics are shown in Table 13.

**I-90 Crash History**
Crash history was evaluated for the eight mile I-90 segment between 459th Avenue and 467th Avenue. There were 165 segment crashes in the 5-year analysis period, of which 25 crashes resulted in injuries or possible injuries (six incapacitating injuries). No fatalities were reported in the study period.

Single vehicle crashes were the most reported crash type, with 131 such crashes reported (83 percent). There were 69 single vehicle/animal crashes on I-90.

In the past five years, two trucks collided with the overhead bridge structure at Exit 387. One collision occurred in 2014 and the other in 2016. Both involved flatbed trucks carrying equipment that had not been fully retracted for highway travel.
**Western Avenue Corridor Crash History**

Crash history was evaluated on the one-mile long segment of Western Avenue between 261st Street and Mickelson Road. There are seven intersections on this segment, including the I-90 interchange ramps.

The Western Avenue corridor experienced 22 total crashes in the five-year analysis period, with 18 of these being intersection or intersection-related crashes. There were no fatal crashes. A summary of the types of crashes occurring on Western Avenue can be seen in Figure 11.

All intersections analyzed on Western Avenue have crash rates below the critical crash rate, however the intersections with 261st Street, the I-90 eastbound and westbound ramps, and Mickelson Road have crash rates above the typical rate at many similar intersections. While crash rates are above the typical rate at many Western Avenue intersections due to low traffic volumes, no more than four crashes were reported at any of these intersections, resulting in fewer than one crash per year on average. Angle crashes were the most common intersection crash type at Western Avenue intersections (9 crashes), followed by rear-end crashes (5 crashes).

Of the 18 intersection crashes, six resulted in injuries or possible injuries. There was one incapacitating injury crash at 261st Street (sideswipe collision) and one incapacitating injury crash at the I-90 eastbound ramps (run-off-road crash).

*Figure 11: Western Avenue Crash Types (2013-2017)*
**SD Highway 38 Crash History**

Crash history was also evaluated on the 2.9-mile long segment of SD Highway 38 between 465th Avenue and 467th Avenue.

There were 32 crashes in the SD Highway 38 study area in the five-year analysis period, with only four crashes occurring at the two ramp intersections. No fatal crashes occurred in the study period. A summary of the types of crashes occurring on SD Highway 38 can be seen in Figure 12.

Three intersection crashes were reported at the westbound I-90 ramp intersection and one crash was reported at the eastbound I-90 ramp intersection. One incapacitating run-off-road crash involving a motorcycle was reported at the I-90 westbound ramp intersection. The three intersection crashes at the westbound ramps result in a crash rate above the typical crash rate, however this is an average of fewer than one crash per year.

The other 28 crashes on SD Highway 38 were segment-type crashes which is just under the typical rate for similar rural minor arterials. Sixteen of these segment-type crashes were single-vehicle collisions, with 12 involving collisions with animals. The next most prevalent segment crash type was run-off-road crashes, with 10 such crashes being reported. Seven of the 28 segment crashes resulted in injuries or possible injuries, with one incapacitating injury crash being reported (opposite direction sideswipe crash).

![Figure 12: Crash Types on SD Highway 38 (2013-2017)](image)
## INTERSECTION CRASHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Incap.</th>
<th>Non-Incap.</th>
<th>Poss.</th>
<th>PDO</th>
<th>Typical Crash Rate</th>
<th>Observed Crash Rate</th>
<th>Critical Crash Rate</th>
<th>Rear End</th>
<th>Sideswipe</th>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>Head On</th>
<th>Non-Collision w/MV</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261st St/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey St/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EB/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 WB/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trl/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Ln/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickelson Rd/Western Ave</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EB/SD 38</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 WB/SD 38</td>
<td>Rural Thru/Stop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2015 MnDOT Typical Intersection Crash Rates

## SEGMENT CRASHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Roadway Section</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Incap.</th>
<th>Non-Incap.</th>
<th>Poss.</th>
<th>PDO</th>
<th>Typical Crash Rate</th>
<th>Observed Crash Rate</th>
<th>Critical Crash Rate</th>
<th>Rear End</th>
<th>Sideswipe</th>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>Head On</th>
<th>Non-Collision w/MV</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Ave (South of I-90 WB ramps)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90</td>
<td>Rural Interstate</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Highway 38</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ave (North of I-90 WB ramps)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2015 MnDOT Typical Intersection Crash Rates
3.9. Existing Environmental Conditions

The environmental conditions and subsequent impacts of proposed alternatives are being identified in the Environmental Scan. The Study Area is in southwestern Minnehaha County and is approximately 14 square miles in size and includes the City of Hartford. The Study Area encompasses the range of all reasonable concepts that meet the Project’s purpose and need. The Study Area extends along I-90 from three miles west of Exit 387 and slightly east of Exit 390 to capture any effects to traffic on I-90. The Study Area also includes a segment of SD 38 from the 460th Avenue intersection to the 466th Avenue intersection. Within the Study Area, the following resources have been identified and described in more detail within the Environmental Scan.

- Social Environmental
- Wetlands/Waters of the U.S.
- Cultural Resources
- Bicyclists, pedestrians, recreational resources
- Economic resources
- Noise
- Floodplain
- Soils, vegetation, Fish and Wildlife
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Water quality

Figure 14, 15, 16 and 17 illustrate the location of some of these features.
Figure 14: Environmental Study Area
Figure 15: Threatened and Endangered Species, Wetlands and Waterways
Figure 16: Floodplain
Figure 17: Recreational Resources
4. Need

4.1. Condition of the Structure
The structure at this I-90 Exit has been hit multiple times, requiring costly repairs and creating traffic delays from the time damage occurs until repairs are completed. Although the clearance of this bridge meets standards, this clearance is the lowest on the I-90 westbound side from the Minnesota state line to Exit 374 (Montrose). The following information provided by the SDDOT details the known bridge hits:

- First strike was on July 1, 2014. The repair cost approximately $270,324 in contractor costs. This cost did not include state employee or mileage costs. The repairs required emergency closures for approximately 51 days.
- Second strike was on August 1, 2016. The repair cost was approximately $584,997, including state employee and mileage costs. This repair required two separate closures for a total duration of approximately 117 days.

Each strike causes traffic delays since traffic is reduced to one lane across the bridge. In addition, safety is reduced due to the lane reduction and presence of a work zone. Adjacent businesses have reported economic impacts due to repair closures.

Each time the bridge is hit, the SDDOT has been able to use heat strengthening to repair the bridge to SDDOT safety standards. Heat strengthening can only be used a limited number of times until it is no longer effective. If the bridge is hit again, the repair method would likely be a partial girder replacement. Incurring greater cost and requiring an emergency partial or full bridge closure. Emergency closures affect the public by not allowing for planned detours. The unexpected closures can also affect businesses economically and operationally.

4.2. Transportation Demand
Analysis was conducted of Interstate and crossroad operations under 2018 conditions. That analysis indicated that all Interstate facilities operated at Level of Service (LOS) A or B. Intersections on the crossroad corridors, including Western Avenue and SD 38 operate at LOS A, B or C. Some crossroad segments on Western Avenue, however, operate at LOS D during the peak weekday hours.

Planned growth within the City of Hartford and the Sioux Falls Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) area indicate that travel demand will increase in the future and put increased pressure on transportation facilities within the study area. Future transportation demand will be analyzed in detail in Chapter 6 of this IMJR.

The current bridge at Exit 387 does not provide specific facilities for pedestrian and bicycle users, although a multi-use path exists along the south side of Mickelson Road and future multi-use path development is planned. The existing commercial and industrial area and planned residential expansion south of I-90 will create increased demand and need for sidewalks and multi-use paths.
4.3. Planned Land Use

The Hartford Comprehensive Plan 2017-2037 indicates a steady growth trend within the Hartford Community and plans for expansion of residential, commercial and industrial uses within the study area, particularly south of I-90. I-90 presents a barrier between much of this planned development and interactions with the rest of the community. Careful planning of the Exit 387 interchange area is necessary to implement existing land use plans.

5. Alternatives

This chapter presents and evaluates concepts developed for the I-90 Exit 387 (Hartford) Interchange and Western Avenue corridor. At this stage of concept development, interchange and corridor concepts were prepared independently. As the project progresses, these concepts may be combined for specific Build Alternatives. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce each concept and narrow the number of concepts down to those that will be developed into Build Alternatives. The Build Alternatives will be analyzed to determine the preferred alternative that will be fully considered later in the Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) and the Environmental Document.

5.1. Relation to the Environmental Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other environmental requirements rely on a project decision-making process guided by the Purpose and Need for the project. The purpose is a brief statement of the primary intended transportation objective and related goals to be achieved by the proposed transportation improvement. The need is a condition(s) sought to be relieved or a statement of the problem in need of a solution. The alternatives are developed, evaluated, and compared based on how well they address the purpose and need statement. The purpose and need statement is developed with the consideration of stakeholders, public and agency input.

The purpose of this Project is to accommodate existing and future traffic needs for the I-90 Exit 387 (Hartford) Interchange with a facility that:

- Replaces the existing bridge structure accommodating higher clearances,
- Accommodates the future traffic capacity needs projected along S. Western Avenue, and
- Accommodates multi-modal transportation such as pedestrians and bicyclists as the City expands to south of I-90.

5.2. Preliminary Improvement Concepts

No-Build Alternative

A No-Build Alternative is carried through the entire environmental process. It assumes no substantial modifications to the study area except for routine maintenance and preservation type projects. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative would not include replacement of the existing bridge and other interchange-related capacity or multi-modal improvements.

Build Alternatives

The Project will consider the I-90 Exit 387 interchange and the extents of Western Avenue where traffic movements would be affected by the work at the interchange. Currently, the development
of Build Alternatives is in the concept design process, which provides the high-level, conceptual view of potential improvements. *Each concept presented in this chapter has been developed to meet the Purpose and Need of the project.* Concepts are evaluated and screened as part of this report. Those concepts that are not screened out will be pulled forward to a more detailed refinement and evaluation as Build Alternatives.

**Western Avenue Bridge Staging Options**

In addition to a Full-Closure with Detour option, the following three Bridge Staging Options were developed based on a 3-lane roadway plus sidewalk and shared-use path (Figures 18 and 19):

1. **Maintain One Lane of Two-Way Traffic**
   a. One 12-foot wide lane of two-way traffic during each of two stages
   b. Maintains existing horizontal alignment of Western Avenue
   c. Temporary barrier placed at edge of deck during Stage 2, requiring bracing to prevent deflection

2. **Maintain Two Lanes of Traffic**
   a. Two 10-foot wide lanes of head-to-head traffic during each of two stages
   b. Requires horizontal alignment of Western Avenue to be shifted approximately 11 feet to west
   c. Temporary barrier placed at edge of deck during Stage 2, requiring bracing to prevent deflection

3. **Maintain Two Lanes of Traffic and Construct Bridge in 3 Stages**
   a. Two 10-foot wide lanes of head-to-head traffic during first two stages
   b. Maintains traffic during Stage 2 on portion of bridge that will be sidewalk when bridge is fully constructed
      i. Eliminates possibility of cantilevering sidewalk from back of barrier
      ii. Permanent separation barrier between traffic and sidewalk cannot be built in Stage 2
   c. Temporary barrier placed at edge of deck during Stages 1 and 2, requiring bracing to prevent deflection
   d. Requires a third stage to construct permanent separation barrier between traffic and sidewalk
   e. Requires horizontal alignment of Western Avenue to be shifted 5.5 feet to west

**I-90 Exit 387 Interchange Concepts**

In addition to the No-Build alternative, the following interchange concepts were developed. Interchange concept layouts and profiles are shown in Figures 20-28.

1. **Standard Diamond**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange
   b. Stop control from the off-ramp approaches
   c. Bridge staging options:
2. **Standard Diamond with Roundabouts**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange
   b. Roundabout ramp terminal intersections
   c. Bridge staging options:
      i. Full Closure with Detour
      ii. Maintain one lane of traffic (Bridge Staging Option 1)

3. **Standard Diamond, Western Avenue Shifted West**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange
   b. Stop control from the off-ramp approaches
   c. Bridge staging options:
      i. Maintain two lanes of traffic with approximately 11-foot shift in alignment (Bridge Staging Option 2)
      ii. Maintain two lanes of traffic with 5.5-foot shift in alignment (Bridge Staging Option 3)

4. **Standard Diamond with Roundabouts, Western Avenue Shifted West**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange
   b. Roundabout ramp terminal intersections
   c. Bridge staging options:
      i. Maintain two lanes of traffic with approximately 11-foot shift in alignment (Bridge Staging Option 2)
      ii. Maintain two lanes of traffic with 5.5-foot shift in alignment (Bridge Staging Option 3)

5. **Standard Diamond with Lowered I-90**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange with similar features as Standard Diamond Concept 1
   b. I-90 profile lowered approximately 1-foot below the Western Avenue corridor to allow for a lower Western Avenue profile
      i. Required limits of I-90 reconstruction included in concept

6. **Standard Diamond with Roundabouts and Lowered I-90**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange with similar features as Standard Diamond, Western Avenue Shifted West, Concept 3
   b. I-90 profile lowered approximately 1-foot below the Western Avenue corridor to allow for a lower Western Avenue profile
      i. Required limits of I-90 reconstruction included in concept

7. **Standard Diamond with Lowered I-90 and Western Avenue Shifted West**
a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange with similar features as Standard Diamond with Roundabouts Concept 2
b. I-90 profile lowered approximately 1-foot below the Western Avenue corridor to allow for a lower Western Avenue profile
   i. Required limits of I-90 reconstruction included in concept

8. **Standard Diamond with Roundabouts and Lowered I-90, Western Avenue Shifted West**
   a. Reconstructs the existing standard diamond interchange with similar features as Standard Diamond with Roundabouts, Western Avenue Shifted West, Concept 4
   b. I-90 profile lowered approximately 1-foot below the Western Avenue corridor to allow for a lower Western Avenue profile
      i. Required limits of I-90 reconstruction included in concept

9. **Standard Diamond with I-90 over Western Avenue**
   a. Reconstruction of existing standard diamond interchange with I-90 over Western Avenue
      i. Required limits of I-90 mainline reconstruction included in concept, including structures
   b. Stop control from the off-ramp approaches
   c. Structure options:
      i. Phased construction requiring closures on Western Avenue

Interchange concept notes:
- At this stage, all interchange concepts are assumed constructible based on a high-level constructability and maintenance of traffic review. Concepts carried forward from this process will be evaluated in more detail during the refinement of build options.
- A typical 3-lane bridge, plus sidewalk and shared-use path, over I-90 was used for Concepts 1-8. Bridge widths will be further refined for build options being carried forward.
- Detour route impacts have not yet been identified and may increase costs of concepts requiring full closures.
- Property impacts based on standard offsets from proposed improvements. The build option refinement phase will model proposed modifications to better understand fill impacts.
- Ramp junction design incorporated tapered exit and parallel entrance.
- Control of Access (COA) distances are subject to change. Distances are currently noted to next access break.
- Interchange layout limits are shown to end of potential COA.

**Western Avenue Concepts**
In addition to the No-Build alternative, the following corridor concepts were developed *(Figures 29-33)*:
A. 2-Lane Rural Section (North of Interchange only)
   a. Upgrades the current rural road facility to include 8-foot shoulders, turn lanes where warranted, sidewalk, and shared-use path
   b. Shown with connections to Interchange Concept 1

B. 3-Lane Urban Section (North of Interchange only)
   a. Provides an urban road section with a continuous left-turn lane, warranted right-turn lanes, sidewalk, and shared-use path
   b. Shown with connections to Interchange Concept 1

C. 2-Lane Rural Section With Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)
   a. Upgrades the current rural road facility to include 4-foot shoulders, left-turn lanes where warranted, and 100-foot right-of-way (ROW)
   b. Shared-use path extension southward from the interchange to Jeffrey Street
   c. Shown with connections to Interchange Concept 1

D. 2-Lane Rural Section Without Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)
   a. Upgrades the current rural road facility to include 4-foot shoulders and left-turn lanes where warranted, and 100-foot ROW
   b. Shown with connections to Interchange Concept 1

E. Southwest Quadrant Frontage Road Realignment
   a. Realigns frontage road for connection with Western Avenue at Jeffrey Street
   b. Shown with connections to Interchange Concept 1

Corridor concept notes:
- At this stage, all corridor concepts are assumed constructible. Concepts carried forward from this process will be evaluated in more detail during the refinement of build options.
- Each corridor concept may be applied to any of the interchange concepts. A reverse curve transition between concepts will be needed for offset interchange alignments.
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See Western Avenue Corridor Concepts for potential corridor modifications. Measured distances along Western Avenue corridor reflect the distance between the interchange ramp terminals and adjacent roadway or public street intersection.
LEGEND

Existing ROW/Property Line
Potential ROW Impact
Proposed Driveway Closure
Edge of Sidewalk/Bike Path

SCALE 1:200

8/20/2018

NORTH

TYPICAL SECTION

2-LANE RURAL SECTION (NORTH OF INTERCHANGE ONLY)

EXISTING 80' ROW
LANE
SHOULDER
SIDWALK

PROPOSED 160' ROW
2' SHARED USE PATH

Mickelson Rd
Polo Ln
Diamond T

See I-90 Exit 387 Interchange Concepts for potential tie-in options for Western Avenue Corridor Concepts

I-90 EXIT 387 INTERCHANGE MODIFICATION STUDY
Hartford, South Dakota

Figure No. 29
8/20/2018
LEGEND

Existing ROW/Property Line
Potential ROW Impact

Proposed Driveway Closure

Edge of Sidewalk/Bike Path

NORTH SCALE: 1:200

EXISTING ROW

5'

3-LANE URBAN SECTION (NORTH OF INTERCHANGE ONLY)

TYPICAL SECTION

SIDEWALK

SHARED USE PATH

EXISTING ROW

3-LANE URBAN SECTION (NORTH OF INTERCHANGE ONLY)

See I-90 Exit 387 Interchange Concepts for potential tie-in options for Western Avenue Corridor Concepts

I-90 EXIT 387 INTERCHANGE MODIFICATION STUDY

Hartford, South Dakota

Figure No. 30

9/5/2018

ROW INSET

SEE ROW INSET

(30' NORTH OF INTERCHANGE ONLY)
See I-90 Exit 387 Interchange Concepts for potential tie in options for Western Avenue Corridor Concepts and frontage/road options.
LEGEND
- Existing ROW/Property Line
- Potential ROW Impact
- Proposed Driveway Closure
- Edge of Sidewalk/Bike Path

NORTH SCALE 1:200

Figure No.

SCALE 1:200

9/5/2018

NORTH

MODIFICATION STUDY
I-90 EXIT 387 INTERCHANGE
Hartford, South Dakota

TYPICAL SECTION
2-LANE RURAL SECTION WITHOUT SHARED USE PATH (SOUTH OF INTERCHANGE ONLY)

EXISTING ROW
PROPOSED 100' ROW

See I-90 Exit 387 Interchange Concepts for potential tie-in options for Western Avenue Corridor Concepts and frontage road options.
See I-90 Exit 387 Interchange Concepts for potential tie in options for Western Avenue Corridor Concepts
5.3. Improvements to Alternate Interchanges
No improvements are planned or programmed for the I-90 interchanges adjacent to Exit 387 (Exit 379 – Humboldt and Exit 390 – SD 38). A slightly-elevated crash rate was noted at Exit 390 in the 2010 Decennial Interstate Corridor Study. No crash trend was identified and no improvement was recommended in that study. Improvements to the adjacent interchanges will not fulfill the primary need at Exit 387; the need to improve the interchange to avoid vehicles striking the structure.

5.4. Transportation System Management Alternatives
Transportation System Management (TSM) actions are not designed to solve the primary need at Exit 387; the need to improve the interchange to avoid vehicles striking the structure.

5.5. Alternative Transportation Modes
Alternative transportation modes available within the study area include on-call transit service and pedestrian and bicycle travel. While improvements within the interchange area should be designed to complement these alternative travel modes, the alternative modes will not solve the primary need at Exit 387; the need to improve the interchange to avoid vehicles striking the structure.

5.6. Alternatives Carried Forward in IMJR
A screening of the alternatives was conducted based on technical analysis and input from the Study Advisory Team. That screening, documented in the September 12, 2018, Concept Evaluation memo (Appendix J), made the following recommendations:

Interchange Concepts Carried Forward
- 10. Standard Diamond
- 11. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts
- 12. Standard Diamond – Western Avenue Shifted West
- 13. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts – Western Avenue Shifted West

Interchange Concepts Held for Further Consideration, only if needed due to property impacts or other findings in respective companion Concept 1-4
- 14. Standard Diamond with Lowered I-90
- 16. Standard Diamond with Lowered I-90 – Western Avenue Shifted West
- 17. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts and Lowered I-90 – Western Avenue Shifter West

Interchange Concepts Eliminated from Further Consideration
- 18. Standard Diamond with I-90 over Western Avenue

Corridor Concepts Carried Forward
- B. 3-Lane Urban Section (North of Interchange only)
- C. 2-Lane Rural Section with Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)
- E. Southwest Quadrant Frontage Road Realignment
  - a. Merge this concept with interchange concepts in build option refinement phase
Corridor Concepts Eliminated from Further Consideration

A. 2-Lane Rural Section (North of Interchange only)
D. 2-Lane Rural Section without Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)

6. Future Year Traffic

6.1. Development of Future-Year Traffic Volumes

Traffic projections were developed for 2025 and 2050 using results from the 2040 Sioux Falls travel demand model. A travel demand model estimates area-wide traffic volume as a function of area-wide demographics (population and employment) and the roadway network.

The following travel modeling results were evaluated:

- **2013 Base Year Model**: Estimates 2013 regional traffic volumes based on 2013 population and employment locations. The base year model is used to best replicate actual conditions to improve the predicting capability of future year models.
- **2040 Model**: Estimates 2040 regional traffic volumes after inputting expected demographic changes and the expected roadway network based on funding availability.

To estimate 2025 and 2050 daily traffic volumes, the estimated annual traffic growth between 2013 and 2040 was evaluated for all model links in the project area (in terms of number of daily vehicles). This was done by dividing the total difference in modelled volume by 27 (2040-2013 = 27). To estimate 2025 volumes, this annual growth in traffic was multiplied by 7 (2025-2018 = 7) and this total was added to 2018 link volumes. To estimate 2050 volumes, the annual growth in traffic was multiplied by 32 (2050-2018 = 32), then added to 2018 link volumes. The 2025 and 2050 daily traffic projections can be seen in Figures 34 and 35.

AM and PM peak hour turning movement projections were estimated using the NCHRP 765 method, which estimates future intersection turning movements based on existing turning movement data and estimated growth factors on each intersection approach. The assumed growth factors were established based on projected daily volume growth. This method is commonly used since it is responsive to volume changes on each approach, meaning that if high growth is expected on only two approaches, turning movement projections will reflect this.

Turning movement projections assume that existing peaking characteristics (K-factors) from field-collected data will also occur in the future since field-collected data indicates much higher peaks in the morning and evening compared to modelled peaks. Based on Hartford’s proximity to Sioux Falls, the team believes this to be a reasonable assumption due to commuter traffic in the mornings and evenings.

The 2018 peak hour turning movements and 2025/2050 peak hour turning movement projections can be seen in Figures 36 and 37. Turning movement projections were rounded to the nearest five. To be conservative, future peak hour turning movements are expected to have a minimum of five vehicles, except for eastbound/westbound through movements at interchange ramp terminals, since such movements are uncommon.
All turning movements (2018 and future conditions) were balanced between intersections other than the segment of Western Avenue between the I-90 westbound ramps and Diamond Trail, given the presence of the truck stop access on this segment.
Figure 34: I-90 Exit 387 Daily Traffic Projections
Figure 35: I-90 Exit 390 Daily Traffic Projections
Figure 36: 2025 AM/PM Peak Hour Turning Movements
Figure 37: 2050 AM/PM Peak Hour Turning Movements
6.2. 2025 No-Build Condition Traffic Operations

The 2025 No-Build Conditions LOS results are summarized in Figure 38 and Tables 11-15. All intersections operate at LOS C or better through 2025 with the existing traffic controls, while all Interstate segments operate at LOS B or better. Two-lane highway segment analysis showed that many segments of Western Avenue operate at LOS D during the peak hours and bicycle levels of service are between C and F during the peak hours due to the lack of specific bicycle facilities.

Table 11: Western Avenue Intersection Traffic Operations – 2025 No-Build Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road (260th St)</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Lane</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 387 WB</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 387 EB</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261st Street</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two-way stop control LOS reflects worst-case stop-controlled approach

Table 12: Western Avenue Corridor Local Network Intersections (Weighted Average) – 2025 No-Build Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road (260th St)</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Lane</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261st Street</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: I-90 Exit 390 Ramp Terminal Intersections – 2025 No-Build Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD38 Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 390 WB</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 390 EB</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two-way stop-control LOS reflects worst-case stop-controlled approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Segment</th>
<th>Direction of Travel</th>
<th>Segment Length (mi)</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
<th>Bicycle Score LOS (AM/PM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTSF (%)</td>
<td>PTSF (%)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road - Diamond Trail</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>51.4 B</td>
<td>71.2 D</td>
<td>E/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.3 D</td>
<td>51.0 B</td>
<td>E/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail - WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>48.3 B</td>
<td>72.2 D</td>
<td>C/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9 D</td>
<td>52.3 B</td>
<td>C/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Ramp Terminal - EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>41.2 B</td>
<td>56.3 C</td>
<td>E/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.6 D</td>
<td>65.5 C</td>
<td>F/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Ramp Terminal - 261st Street</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>49.7 B</td>
<td>48.3 B</td>
<td>F/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9 A</td>
<td>35.5 A</td>
<td>F/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>48.3 B</td>
<td>65.5 C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.0 C</td>
<td>52.4 B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: I-90 Freeway Segment Traffic Operations – 2025 No-Build Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-90 Freeway Segment</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density (pc/mi/ln)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastbound I-90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline to Exit 387</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline within Exit 387</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline between Exits 387 and 390</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane within Exit 390</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline from Exit 390</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westbound I-90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline to Exit 390</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline within Exit 390</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline between Exits 390 and 387</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline within Exit 387</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline from Exit 387</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>B (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>A (rural)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3. 2050 No-Build Condition Traffic Operations

The 2050 Planning Year No-Build Conditions LOS results are summarized in Figure 39 and shown with respective density and average control delay values in Tables 16-19. Measured LOS values reflective of the worst-case stop-controlled approach delay and weighted average intersection delay are reported for each stop-controlled local road intersection.

The analysis shows that the Western Avenue worst-case stop-controlled approaches operate between LOS B and LOS D in the 2050 peak hours, while the weighted average delay operations at stop-controlled intersections on Western Avenue are LOS A and the ramp terminal intersections operate between LOS B and LOS F. The Western Avenue 2-lane highway segment operations range between LOS B and LOS D, while the segment bicycle operations range from LOS B to LOS F. All Interstate segments operate at LOS A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road (260th St)</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>34.9 D</td>
<td>24.3 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Lane</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>23.6 C</td>
<td>21.2 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>22.3 C</td>
<td>29.3 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 387 WB</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>11.4 B</td>
<td>32.8 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 Exit 387 EB</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>30.1 D</td>
<td>18.4 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>11.2 B</td>
<td>12.3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261st Street</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>12.4 B</td>
<td>12.5 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two-way stop-control LOS reflects worst-case stop-controlled approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Avenue Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mickelson Road (260th St)</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>7.9 A</td>
<td>4.0 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Lane</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>2.8 A</td>
<td>1.9 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Trail</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>3.3 A</td>
<td>4.8 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>0.9 A</td>
<td>1.8 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261st Street</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>1.9 A</td>
<td>1.1 A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18: I-90 Exit 390 Ramp Terminal Traffic Operations – 2050 No-Build Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD 38 Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Control Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>TWSC*</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two-way stop-control LOS reflects worst-case stop-controlled approach.

#Denotes volume/capacity ratio greater than 1.

### Table 19: I-90 Freeway Segment Traffic Operations – 2050 No-Build Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-90 Freeway Segment</th>
<th>AM Peak Period</th>
<th>PM Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density (pc/mi/ln)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastbound I-90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline to Exit 387</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline within Exit 387</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline between Exits 387 and 390</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane within Exit 390</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline from Exit 390</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westbound I-90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline to Exit 390</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline within Exit 390</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from SD 38 (Exit 390)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline between Exits 390 and 387</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverge, to Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline within Exit 387</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge, from Western Avenue (Exit 387)</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, 2-lane mainline from Exit 387</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>B (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B (urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>A (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A (urban)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4. Future Year No-Build Traffic Operations Conclusions
Analysis of the existing roadway network under 2050 traffic conditions shows that all segments will operate within the limits set in the Methods and Assumptions document without roadway improvements, except for the ramp terminal intersections at Exit 390. While the intersections along Western Avenue, including the ramp terminal intersections at Exit 387, don’t require improvements for capacity reasons, the interchange needs to be revised to prevent future collisions with the interchange structure. Interchange improvements will provide the opportunity to provide potential enhancements to roadway safety and multi-modal service, as described in Chapter 5.

While capacity improvements at Exit 390 are not the subject of this study, it appears likely that low peak hour levels of service in 2050 at that location may be remedied by Transportation System Management (TSM) actions.
7. Alternatives Analysis

Chapter 5, Alternatives, summarized the development and screening process for potential interchange and corridor concepts and Build Alternatives. The following interchange and corridor Build Alternatives were carried forward (from Chapter 5) for further analysis in this chapter:

- No-Build

Interchange Concepts Carried Forward
1. Standard Diamond
2. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts
3. Standard Diamond – Western Avenue Shifted West
4. Standard Diamond with Roundabouts – Western Avenue Shifted West

Corridor Concepts Carried Forward
B. 3-Lane Urban Section (North of Interchange only)
C. 2-Lane Rural Section with Shared-Use Path (South of Interchange only)
E. Southwest Quadrant Frontage Road Realignment
   a. Merge this concept with interchange concepts in build option refinement phase

This chapter investigates the relative feasibility of each alternative and seeks to further determine which alternatives best meet the study purpose and need.

All interchange construction alternatives currently under consideration involve some form of standard diamond interchange, with associated construction on the adjacent segments of Western Avenue. Interchange Alternatives 1 and 2 keep Western Avenue on its current alignment through the interchange area while Alternatives 3 and 4 shift the Western Avenue alignment to the west to allow staged bridge construction and maintain traffic through the interchange area instead of requiring long construction detours. The corridor concepts under consideration complement the interchange alternatives by providing a 3-lane urban street north of the interchange, a 2-lane rural roadway south of the interchange and a realignment of the southwest quadrant frontage road to provide greater intersections spacing from the interchange.

7.1. Traffic Operations

Analysis of the traffic operations of the construction alternatives was documented in the Build Alternatives Traffic Operations project memorandum (Appendix K). The results of the analysis are summarized in the following discussion.

Analysis for 2025 Conditions
Level of Service results shown in Figures 40 and 41 show that all segments and intersections and all construction alternatives satisfy the relevant operational criteria under 2025 traffic conditions. Tables 20 and 21 provide additional information on corridor operations.
Table 20: 2025 Build Conditions – I-90 Exit 387 Ramp Terminal Intersection 95th Percentile Queues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-90 EXIT 387 RAMP TERMINAL INTERSECTION</th>
<th>MOVEMENT</th>
<th>NO-BUILD CONDITIONS</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND (ALT. 1 &amp; 3)</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND WITH ROUNDABOUTS (ALT. 2 &amp; 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95TH % QUEUE (FT.)</td>
<td>95TH % QUEUE (FT.)</td>
<td>95TH % QUEUE (FT.)</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EXIT 387 WB RAMP TERMINAL</td>
<td>WB OFF-RAMP</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTION</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EXIT 387 EB RAMP TERMINAL</td>
<td>EB OFF-RAMP</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB LEFT TURN</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTION</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: 2025 Build Conditions – Interchange O-D Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGIN-DESTINATION PATH</th>
<th>CONTROL DELAY</th>
<th>NO-BUILD CONDITIONS</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND (ALTS 1 &amp; 3)</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND WITH ROUNDABOUTS (ALTS 2 &amp; 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE THROUGH MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>O₁ - D₂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₄ - D₃</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE TO I-90 ON-RAMP MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>O₃ - D₁</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₃ - D₂</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₄ - D₂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₄ - D₁</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 OFF-RAMP TO WESTERN AVENUE MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>O₁ - D₃</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₁ - D₄</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₂ - D₃</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₂ - D₄</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis for 2050 Conditions

Level of Service results shown in Figures 42 and 43 show that all segments and intersections and all construction alternatives satisfy the relevant operational criteria under 2050 traffic conditions, except the ramp terminal intersections at Exit 390 (SD 38). It appears that operations at Exit 390 may be improved through TSM measures such as the addition of turn lanes and/or intersection signalization. Tables 22 and 23 provide additional information on corridor operations.

The analysis indicates that traffic signal control may be required by 2050 at the WB ramp terminal intersection and that roundabout control at the WB ramp terminal intersection provides better level of service than signal control (LOS A/A for roundabout, LOS A/B for signal control). Roundabout control also provides shorter 95% queues at the off-ramps. Delays for crossroad movements are expected to be slightly higher with roundabout control than with signals, although overall ramp terminal intersection delays are lower with roundabouts than with signals. At the time that signalization becomes needed, the SDDOT will reevaluate the ramp terminal intersections to determine whether or not to signalize or install a roundabout.

Interstate mainline and merge/diverge operations are unaffected by the choice of control at the ramp terminals. All Interstate operations are expected to be within the required level of service parameters through 2050.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDORS</th>
<th>CONTROL TYPE</th>
<th>HCMT 6TH EDITION LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
<th>LOCAL STREET WEIGHTED AVERAGE LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Western Avenue &amp; Michelle Road</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Western Avenue &amp; Opal Lane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Western Avenue &amp; Diamond Trail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Western Avenue &amp; I-90 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Western Avenue &amp; I-90 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Western Avenue &amp; Jeffrey Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Western Avenue &amp; 261st Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SD 38 &amp; 190 WB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SD 38 &amp; 190 EB Ramp Terminal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 22: 2050 Build Conditions – I-90 Exit 387 Ramp Terminal Intersection 95th Percentile Queues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-90 EXIT 387 RAMP TERMINAL INTERSECTION</th>
<th>MOVEMENT</th>
<th>NO-BUILD CONDITIONS</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND (ALT. 1 &amp; 3)</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND WITH ROUNDABOUTS (ALT. 2 &amp; 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95TH % QUEUE (FT.)</td>
<td>95TH % QUEUE (FT.)</td>
<td>95TH % QUEUE (FT.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EXIT 387 WB RAMP TERMINAL</td>
<td>WB OFF-RAMP</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB LEFT TURN INTERSECTION TURN</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTION CONTROL</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EXIT 387 EB RAMP TERMINAL</td>
<td>EB OFF-RAMP</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB LEFT TURN INTERSECTION TURN</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTION CONTROL</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23: 2050 Build Conditions – Interchange O-D Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGIN-DESTINATION PATH CONTROL DELAY</th>
<th>NO-BUILD CONDITIONS</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND (ALTS 1 &amp; 3)</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND WITH ROUNDABOUTS (ALTS 2 &amp; 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELAY (SEC/VEH)</td>
<td>DELAY (SEC/VEH)</td>
<td>DELAY (SEC/VEH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE THROUGH MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>O₁ - D₂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₄ - D₃</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE TO I-90 ON-RAMP MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>O₃ - D₁</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₃ - D₂</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₄ - D₂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₄ - D₄</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 OFF-RAMP TO WESTERN AVENUE MOVEMENTS</td>
<td>O₁ - D₃</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₁ - D₄</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₂ - D₃</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₂ - D₄</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-modal Operations

Limitations to HCS7 Streets Module do not allow for the analysis of corridors not bounded by signalized intersections. Therefore, a formal, HCS7-based multi-modal (pedestrian and bicycle) analysis was not conducted for this study. However, proposed multi-modal accommodations as part of the Build Alternatives are an improvement to multi-modal mobility and accessibility throughout the study area.

The Western Avenue corridor currently lacks any multi-modal facilities along the corridor. Western Avenue is currently a rural section through the entire study area, with limited shoulders, no sidewalk or curb and gutter, and ditches to convey storm water. The existing bridge over I-90 does not have any additional room for pedestrians or bicycles outside of the vehicular travel lanes. This limits multi-modal mobility and accessibility throughout the corridor.

Recent development and side-street improvements has begun to extend sidewalks and pedestrian crossing opportunities up to Western Avenue, (Diamond Trail, Opal Lane, and Mickelson Road). However, these routes are currently fragmented and the lack of facilities along Western Avenue and over I-90 limits north/south connectivity.

Each proposed Build Alternative provides improved pedestrian and bicycle route accessibility and connectivity along Western Avenue and across I-90 through the following improvements:

- **Interchange Build Alternatives**
  - 10-foot shared use path on east side
  - 6-foot sidewalk on the west side (5-foot sidewalk where boulevard section is present)
  - Key features compared to No-Build Conditions:
    - Extends Western Avenue bicycle and pedestrian accommodations across I-90

- **Western Avenue Build Alternative (North of I-90 Exit 387 interchange)**
  - 10-foot shared use path on east side
  - 5-foot sidewalk where boulevard section is present (6-foot if located back of curb)
  - Key features compared to No-Build Conditions:
    - Extends bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along Western Avenue, connecting to proposed improvements at I-90 Exit 387 interchange
    - Connects to existing side-street sidewalks
    - Provides multi-modal connectivity to the Western Avenue corridor and the rest of Hartford for development extending outward from Western Avenue (eliminates the multi-modal island situation for some development)

- **Western Avenue Build Alternative (South of I-90 Exit 387 interchange)**
  - 10-foot shared use path on east side
  - Key features compared to No-Build Conditions:
    - Extends bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along Western Avenue south of the I-90 Exit 387 interchange to Jeffrey Street
Neither a sidewalk nor shared-use path are extended south of Jeffrey Street. At this time, Minnehaha County does not plan to extend these facilities southward beyond the interchange area. Jeffrey Street is considered the logical terminus for multi-modal facilities for this study. It is anticipated that 463rd Avenue (Western Avenue) will see some bicycle use, but demand is expected to be low and riders are typically experienced road bicyclists. If or when future development does occur south of I-90, multi-modal improvements associated with that development will be able to tie into the proposed shared-use path and sidewalk extending southward through the I-90 Exit 387 interchange as part of this study’s Build Alternatives.

It can be concluded that while an HCS7-based analysis was not conducted on multi-modal operations, the proposed Build Alternatives provide a significant improvement to multi-modal accessibility and connectivity.

**Corridor Analysis**

Limitations to the HCS7 Streets Module does not allow for the analysis of corridors not bounded by signalized intersections. Therefore, a formal HCS7 Streets Module-based corridor analysis was not conducted for this study.

In the No-Build Conditions operations memorandum, the corridor was analyzed with HCM6 Two-Lane Highways methodology. This methodology assigns a LOS based on percent-time spent following (PTSF) of a vehicle following another vehicle.

Improvements proposed as part of this study will convert much of the Western Avenue corridor from a rural cross-section to an urban cross-section. Growth surrounding the interchange and throughout Hartford is expected to transform this area into more of an urbanized area as well. It is anticipated that this corridor would transition out of a HCM6-defined Class II two-lane highway to a Class III two-lane highway with 100 percent not passing. Therefore, the operational goals of this corridor begin to change and focus more on intersection operations as compared to the time one vehicle spends following another vehicle.

The HCM6 methodology does not formally evaluate two-way left-turn lanes in the Two-Lane Highways methodology. However, discussion in Chapter 15 highlights the delay reduction benefits of a two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL). The primary operational benefit is that left-turning traffic is removed from the through lane and allowed to start the left-turn movement from the two-way left-turn lane. Safety benefits are also realized with the reduced risk of rear-end collisions from stopped, left-turning vehicles in the through lane.

**Control of Access**

Control of access (COA) along the Western Avenue corridor is an important consideration in the long-term operational and safety performance of the interchange. FHWA established COA requirements along the crossroad corridor upstream and downstream of the interchange. Distances are measured in accordance with Figure 13-12 in the *SDDOT Road Design Manual*. The minimum COA, as noted in the *SDDOT Road Design Manual*, is shown in the following table.

---

Table 24: Minimum Control of Access along Crossroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Urban (ft.)</th>
<th>Rural (ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Existing Interchange</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of New Interchange</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SDDOT Road Design Manual notes that these are minimum distances as established by AASHTO’s *A Policy on Design Standards Interstate System*. The manual also recommends additional control for existing interchanges with established safety and operational concerns or if it is feasible to meet South Dakota Access Location Criteria.

The following summarizes existing and proposed access locations and their relation to COA requirements.

Existing COA on the north side of the interchange extends approximately 720’ to Diamond Trail. A break in the COA has been granted for the Coffee Cup truck stop on the west side of Western Avenue. COA on the south side of the interchange currently extends approximately 730’ with a frontage road connection on the west side of Western Avenue within the COA area.

The proposed corridor improvement alternatives would maintain the existing COA north of the interchange and would relocate the frontage road intersection south to align with the existing Jeffrey Street intersection, creating an effective COA distance of 730’ on the south side of the interchange.

7.2. Conformance with Transportation Plans
The proposed interchange improvements conform to both state and local plans. While a project at Exit 387 was not identified in the 2010 Decennial Interstate Corridor Study, the need for interchange improvements has been driven by subsequent damage to the interchange structure. Preliminary engineering tasks have been programmed for Exit 387 in the 2022 fiscal year in the current STIP, with tentative construction in 2025.

7.3. Compliance with Policies and Engineering Studies
The interchange No-Build alternative does not meet the project need of providing greater clearance over the Interstate mainline and preventing further damage to the structure. Alternatives 1-4 all will provide proper clearance, as specified in the SDDOT Road Design Manual and other guidance. All other design and administrative aspects of Alternatives 1-4 will comply with the latest version of the SDDOT Road Design Manual.

7.4. Environmental Impacts
The Environmental Document provides details of the environmental evaluation of the No-Build alternative and build Alternatives 3 and 4. See the Environmental Document for additional

---

information on this evaluation. Potential impacts of the construction alternatives include wetlands, floodplain, right-of-way, and economic impact to adjacent businesses during construction. These impacts were determined to be minor and may either be avoided or mitigated.

7.5. Safety

A safety analysis of the alternatives was documented in a Crash Prediction Memorandum, contained in the Appendix F. That analysis, summarized in Table 25, shows that addition of turn lanes is expected to provide significant safety benefits when compared to the No-Build corridor. The Crash Prediction Memorandum also showed that use of roundabout intersection control at the Exit 387 ramp termini would provide significant safety and speed control benefits.
### Table 25: Study Area Crash Prediction Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FACILITY TYPE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>PREDICTED NO. OF CRASHES (2018-2050)</th>
<th>PERCENT REDUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90 INTERCHANGE SOUTH RAMPS</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD NB LEFT TURN LANE (TWSC)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 INTERCHANGE NORTH RAMPS</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD NB LEFT TURN LANE (TWSC)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE - SOUTH OF I-90</td>
<td>ROADWAY SEGMENT</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD 4-FOOT SHOULDER</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE - NORTH OF I-90</td>
<td>ROADWAY SEGMENT</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD 8-FOOT SHOULDER</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD TWO-WAY LEFT TURN LANE</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFREY STREET</td>
<td>INTERSECTION</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD SB LEFT TURN LANE</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAMOND TRAIL</td>
<td>INTERSECTION</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD NB AND SB LEFT TURN LANES</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPAL LANE</td>
<td>INTERSECTION</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD NB LEFT TURN LANE</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICKELSON ROAD</td>
<td>INTERSECTION</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADD NB AND SB LEFT TURN LANES AND NB RIGHT TURN LANE</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6. Evaluation Matrix

Table 26 provides a comparison of the No-Build and Build Alternatives. Evaluation criteria were established from the project Purpose and Need and feeds into the Environmental Document screening process. Ratings for each of the criterion are based on Poor/Good/Best or Yes/No. The evaluation shows that Alternatives 1 and 2, which require full closure of the cross-road during construction, pose major impacts related to traffic delay and economic effects on businesses.

Input at the second public and stakeholder meetings on November 26, 2018, indicated that there was strong public support for alternatives that would maintain traffic through the interchange during construction. Consideration was given to removing Alternatives 1 and 2 from the list of feasible alternatives and SDDOT requested a thorough life cycle analysis of Alternatives 3 and 4, Table 27 and Appendix O. That analysis showed a present value of crash cost savings and travel time savings benefits of $2,514,593 and a present value of additional costs of $898,257 for construction of Alternative 4 when compared with Alternative 3, resulting in a Benefit/Cost ratio of 2.80.

In July 2019, SDDOT provided a determination that due to public concern statewide with installation and functionality of roundabouts, SDDOT will consider alternative options for intersection configuration in the near future. The preferred alternative at this location will not preclude alternative intersection types in the future. Therefore, Alternative 3 stands as the concept that best meets the technical needs and community desires for replacement of the Exit 387 interchange. At the time that signalization becomes needed, the SDDOT will reevaluate the ramp terminal intersections to determine whether or not to signalize or install a roundabout.
### TABLE 26 - I-90 EXIT 387 INTERCHANGE CONCEPT PRELIMINARY EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 VERTICAL CLEARANCE ON I-90 - BOTTOM OF GIRDERS TO I-90 SURFACE</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETS MULTI-MODAL NEEDS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC IMPACT TO BUSINESSES DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MODERATE IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELOCATIONS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
<td>MEETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMP TERMINAL LOS (YEAR 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVE ALIGNMENT SAFETY</td>
<td>NO ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>NO ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>NO ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>NO ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION SAFETY (RAMP TERMINI)</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC DELAY OR TRAVEL TIME IMPACTS</td>
<td>FULL CLOSURE: MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>FULL CLOSURE: MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAINTAIN 2 LANES: MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAINTAIN 2 LANES: MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>FULL CLOSURE: MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>FULL CLOSURE: MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAINTAIN 2 LANES: MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAINTAIN 2 LANES: MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>FULL CLOSURE: MAJOR IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT-OF-WAY (ACRES)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION COST ($ MILLION)</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
<td>$12.4</td>
<td>$11.4</td>
<td>$12.4</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
<td>$20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>CARRY FORWARD</td>
<td>CARRY FORWARD</td>
<td>CARRY FORWARD</td>
<td>CARRY FORWARD</td>
<td>HOLD, PENDING CONCEPT 1 REFINEMENT</td>
<td>HOLD, PENDING CONCEPT 2 REFINEMENT</td>
<td>HOLD, PENDING CONCEPT 3 REFINEMENT</td>
<td>HOLD, PENDING CONCEPT 4 REFINEMENT</td>
<td>ELIMINATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27: Alternative 3, 4 Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>STANDARD DIAMOND INTERCHANGES</th>
<th>3. STANDARD DIAMOND - WESTERN AVENUE SHIFTED WEST</th>
<th>4. STANDARD DIAMOND WITH ROUNDABOUTS - WESTERN AVENUE SHIFTED WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS¹</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC IMPACT TO BUSINESSES DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED RIGHT-OF-WAY (SF)</td>
<td>222,468</td>
<td>232,913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMP TERMINAL LOS (2050)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORST CASE APPROACH (WB/EB)</td>
<td>APPROACH: C/D</td>
<td>APPROACH: B/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORST CAST INTERSECTION (WB/EB)</td>
<td>INTERSECTION: A/A</td>
<td>INTERSECTION: A/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN AVENUE ALIGNMENT SAFETY</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT SHIFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION SAFETY (RAMP TERMINALS)</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>BEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION CONFLICT POINTS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR SPEED CONTROL²</td>
<td>REGULATORY ONLY</td>
<td>REGULATORY AND GEOMETRIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CALMING/SPEED REDUCTION</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE CONSTRUCTABILITY</td>
<td>MINIMAL CHALLENGES</td>
<td>MINIMAL CHALLENGES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTHWORK IMPACTS</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERCHANGE CONSTRUCTABILITY</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC DELAY OR TRAVEL TIME IMPACTS: MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ACROSS I-90 DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>MAINTAIN 2 LANES: MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td>MAINTAIN 2 LANES: MINOR IMPACTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTICIPATED MAINTENANCE COST</td>
<td>$5,516/yr</td>
<td>$5,297/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE CYCLE COST - FUTURE SIGNALIZATION ($ MILLION)</td>
<td>$12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE CYCLE COST - ROUNDABOUT GRADING IN 2025 ($ MILLION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE CYCLE COST - ROUNDABOUT GRADING IN 2050 ($ MILLION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION COST ($ MILLION), 2019 DOLLARS</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Both options have the same potential environmental impacts with one difference. Option 3 would permanently impact 1.11 acres of wetland and Option 4 would impact 1.02 acres.

²City of Hartford has set up traffic counts and noted traffic with speeds up to 90 mph in corridor.
8. Coordination

Stakeholder and public involvement are centered on three major milestones within the IMJR and Environmental study components:

- Stakeholder and Public Meeting #1: Gather feedback on study area issues and needs.
- Stakeholder and Public Meeting #2: Gather feedback on proposed Build Alternatives for further refinement and analysis.
- Public Meeting #3: As part of the publication of Environmental Document, requesting public comment on the preferred alternative and environmental impacts.

Project stakeholders were invited to take part in smaller, group discussion meetings prior to each public meeting. This allowed for small-group discussions with the Study Advisory Team. Stakeholders consisted of property and business owners and managers along the Western Avenue corridor, emergency responders, government representatives, and others identified to have a strong transportation interest along the corridor.

At the initial set of public and stakeholder meetings held June 28, 2018, the study team gathered feedback from the public regarding the issues and needs they see within and around the I-90 Exit 387 Interchange. Many of the comments focused on the need to maintain traffic through the interchange during construction and the need to add turn lanes on Western Avenue.

The second set of stakeholder and public meetings held November 26, 2018, presented the proposed interchange and corridor Build Alternatives developed for the study area for comment and feedback. Overall, there was notable support for both the Standard Diamond (shifted west) and Standard Diamond with Roundabouts (shifted west) alternatives, with slightly more favoring roundabouts. Comments also favored adding turn lanes on Western Avenue and providing pedestrian and bicycling features along the Western Avenue corridor.

The third public meeting will be held in conjunction with the publication of the Environmental Document, requesting feedback from the public on the proposed preferred alternative and the identified impacts.

Project information has been disseminated to the public through the project website at http://www.i90exit387study.com. The website provides links to study materials such as concept and Build Alternative figures, evaluation summaries, and public information meeting material. The website also provides study contact information for SDDOT and consultant project managers. Viewers of the website have the opportunity to submit comments and questions directly from the website.
I-90 Exit 387 (Hartford)
Interchange Modification Study and Environmental Review

The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT), City of Hartford, Sioux Falls Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Minnehaha County, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), have identified a need to study the I-90 Exit 387 interchange. The study includes an Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) and associated environmental investigation.

Overview
Learn about the study area, process, and study expectations that will guide the development of the project alternatives.

Study Documents
Documents developed during preliminary research, analysis, visioning, and community input will be provided for review and input.

Get Involved
You can get involved by reviewing the project overview and study documents, attending the public meeting, then submitting comments to the study contacts.

Figure 44: I-90 Exit 387 Study Website
(www.i90exit387study.com)
9. Funding Plan

The following table provides the planned project that will include the proposed improvements identified as part of this IMJR.

Table 28: Anticipated Funding Allocation (2019 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>State Funding Category</th>
<th>Federal Funding Category</th>
<th>Federal Funds ($ million)</th>
<th>State Funds ($ million)</th>
<th>Other Funds ($ million)</th>
<th>Total Funds ($ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM 0909(92)387. PCN 06G8</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>National Highway Performance</td>
<td>$16.614</td>
<td>$1.830</td>
<td>$4.081*</td>
<td>$22.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.614</td>
<td>$1.830</td>
<td>$4.081*</td>
<td>$22.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As funding is fluid, category breakdown may be different at time of project authorization.

*City of Hartford currently shows this project as a future project in their Capital Improvements Program (CIP) with no estimated cost – these figures have been estimated based on the proposed improvements in this study, but have not been committed.

Inflated costs to year of implementation are calculated at $25.367 million
10. **Recommendations**

Based on the analysis contained herein, the IMJR-recommended alternative that best meets the established transportation needs within the study area is as follows:

- Interchange Build Alternative 3: Standard Diamond, Western Avenue moved west to allow phased construction and maintain traffic through the interchange area during construction.
- Corridor Build Alternative B: Western Avenue – 3-lane urban section (North of interchange only).
- Corridor Build Alternative C: Western Avenue – 2-lane rural section with shared-use path (South of interchange only).
- Southwest quadrant front road realignment.

The technical analysis contained herein demonstrates that the two policy requirements for new or revised access points to the existing Interstate system, published in the May 22, 2017 policy guidance, have been met.

1. **An operational and safety analysis** has concluded that the proposed change in access does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility (which includes mainline lanes, existing, new, or modified ramps, and ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and planned future traffic projections. The analysis should, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) paragraphs 625.2(a), 655.603(d) and 771.111(f). The crossroads and the local street network, to at least the first major intersection on either side of the proposed change in access, should be included in this analysis to the extent necessary to fully evaluate the safety and operational impacts that the proposed change in access and other transportation improvements may have on the local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). Requests for a proposed change in access should include a description and assessment of the impacts and ability of the proposed changes to safely and efficiently collect, distribute, and accommodate traffic on the Interstate facility, ramps, intersection of ramps with crossroad, and local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). Each request should also include a conceptual plan of the type and location of the signs proposed to support each design alternative (23 U.S.C. 109(d) and 23 CFR 655.603(d)).

The study area was defined as specified by the regulations and included approximately 7 miles of Interstate mainline, including interchange ramps and terminal intersections. Slightly more than 1 mile of the local crossroad was included in the study area.

The existing conditions operational analysis found that all intersections operate at LOS C or higher during the peak hours. All Interstate highway segments operate at LOS B or higher while the crossroad 2-way highway segments operate as low as LOS D during the peak hours. Bicycle and pedestrian levels of service are consistently from LOS C to LOS F because of the lack of specific pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
The existing conditions safety analysis found that five intersections exhibited crash rates higher than typical crash rates for similar intersections (Minnesota DOT rates, 2015). The crash rates for these intersections, however, were lower than the critical rate. The intersections include:

- 261st Street/Western Avenue
- I-90 EB/Western Avenue
- I-90 WB/Western Avenue
- Mickelson Road/Western Avenue
- I-90 WB/SD 38

All segment crash rates were below typical and critical crash rates.

The existing interchange, however, has experienced several crashes with over-height vehicles, damaging the bridge superstructure. Any more events of this type will likely force the closure of the interchange until the bridge can be rebuilt.

The future conditions analysis considered nine interchange alternatives and five crossroad alternatives. These alternatives were screened based on preliminary technical analysis and input from the Study Advisory team and four interchange alternatives and three crossroad alternatives were carried forward for further consideration.

Future year conditions were analyzed for 2025 and 2050 threshold years. That analysis determined that the Interstate mainline will continue to operate at LOS C or higher through 2050 without changes to the mainline configuration. The level of service at several of the crossroad intersections, including the I-90 Exit 387 ramp termini, however, will fall to LOS D by 2050 under no-build conditions.

Future year safety conditions were considered through a crash prediction analysis. That analysis concluded that addition of crossroad turn lanes, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities at the Exit 387 ramp termini will provide safety benefits compared with the other alternatives.

The interchange and crossroad alternatives were further screened based on the future year operational and safety analysis and it was determined that the interchange alternative with a standard diamond configuration moved west to allow phased construction and a combination of the three crossroad improvement alternatives provided for the best solution to transportation system needs, while providing the opportunity to rebuild the interchange bridge to avoid future collisions from over-height vehicles. At the time that signalization becomes needed, the SDDOT will reevaluate the ramp terminal intersections to determine whether to signalize or install a roundabout. Signalized ramp terminal intersections will provide LOS A/B (WB) and LOS A/A (EB) in 2050.

The operations and safety of the proposed alternative were summarized in Chapter 7 and detailed in the Appendix materials. Conceptual plans for signing the proposed alternative are provided in Figures 46 and 47.
2. The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Less than “full interchanges” may be considered on a case-by-case basis for applications requiring special access, such as managed lanes (e.g., transit or high occupancy vehicle and high occupancy toll lanes) or park and ride lots. The proposed access will be designed to meet or exceed current standards (23 CFR 625.2(a), 625.4(a)(2), and 655.603(d)). In rare instances where all basic movements are not provided by the proposed design, the report should include a full-interchange option with a comparison of the operational and safety analyses to the partial-interchange option. The report should also include the mitigation proposed to compensate for the missing movements, including wayfinding signage, impacts on local intersections, mitigation of driver expectation leading to wrong-way movement on ramps, etc. The report should describe whether future provision of a full interchange is precluded by the proposed design.

The proposed access action involves improvement of an existing full-movement interchange to avoid impacts with the interchange structure by over-height vehicles and to bring the interchange up to current standards. The improved interchange will continue to serve all movements. The crossroad, Western Avenue/463rd Avenue, is a public road and will be improved to continue to provide good service as part of the local roadway network.

Based on this recommendation, the proposed control of access is provided in Figure 45. A tentative signing plan for the revised interchange is shown in Figures 46 and 47.
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