



# I-90 Corridor Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Public Meeting #2 March 6, 2017 BHSU Rapid City Center





### Introduction

- Welcome
- Housekeeping Items
- Methods of Commenting
  - Comment Card tonight
  - Comment Card later
  - Conversations with project representatives
  - Correspondence after the meeting
- Comments due by March 24







### Project Contacts

SDDOT Project Manager:

Steve Gramm, PE

**Planning Engineer** 

Ph: (605)773-6641

steve.gramm@state.sd.us

FHU Project Contacts: Lyle DeVries Todd Frisbie Ph: (303)721-1440 lyle.devries@fhueng.com

### Study Advisory Team Entities:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- City of Box Elder
- Rapid City Area MPO

- Ellsworth AFB
- Ellsworth Development Authority
- SDDOT Departmental/Local Staff









## Project Background

- Recommended in BESTPlan as a more focused study of important corridor
- Positioned to:
  - Answer key questions in advance of I-90 rehab/reconstruction (8 yrs. out)
  - Address future of Exit 63
- Collaborative effort among several entities





#### **Study Goals:**

Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

#### 1. I-90 Corridor Capacity

The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:

- The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- · The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

#### 2. Interchange Access

The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.











# Project Update

- Public Meeting last July attended by 50 people, input included:
  - Safety concerns, particularly weather-related and Highway 1416 intersections
  - Try to minimize vulnerability to poor winter road conditions, when 27% of crashes occur
  - Some favor for interchange at Radar Hill Road vs other options
- Team meetings to discuss key components
  - Alternatives workshop to brainstorm options at Exit 63
  - ITS Stakeholder meeting to discuss technology solutions
- Work has focused on:
  - Exit 63 drawings
  - Analysis of traffic forecasts











#### 2045 Level of Service-No Action













#### Intelligent Transportation Systems









Intelligent Transportation Systems



#### **Potential I-90 Corridor ITS Solutions and Benefits**

IT	S Solution	Description	Goal/Potential Benefits		
1	Roadway condition warning/anti-icing for existing WB Exit	Uses sensors and signs and/or sprayers	Improve safety		
	63 on- ramp to I-90	to reduce crash risk			
2	Intersection conflict warning for County Highway 1416	Uses detection and flashers to alert	Improve safety		
	intersections	drivers approaching conflicting traffic			
3	Remotely operated "intelligent" gates	Allows current manual closure gates to	Improve safety and staff efficiency		
		be operated remotely			
4	Additional vehicle detection and surveillance on I-90	Allows data collection and monitoring	Improve mobility and efficiency		
		of "trouble" spots, reducing response			
		time and improving awareness			
5	Fiber optic "trunk" along I-90 to connect devices to unify	Enables reliable communications and	Improve mobility and efficiency		
	communications	full-motion video. Places all devices on			
		one high performance network			
6	Control software to unify DMS, CCTV, detection and other	Enables monitoring, data collection and	Improve efficiency		
	operations	control from a single interface.			
		Reduces training time and IT workload			
7	Variable speed limit signs (VSL)	Uses active signs to display speed limits	Improves safety		
		that vary based on conditions			







### Exit 63 Alternatives

- Goal of alternatives is to provide full movements at Exit 63, not necessarily at the current interchange location
- 12 alternatives have been developed, including the no action and removal of Exit 63
- Conceptual designs address basic layout and key design implications of options, including grades, property impacts and control of access
- Locations of alternatives fall into two categories: west (near current Exit 63) and east (vicinity of Radar Hill Road)
- Further analyses to be performed for alternatives carried forward

















for Intersection Ramp Spacing











### Feasibility Screening Matrix



			Best accom ong-Range			]				Alternatives at Westgate are most compatible with EAFB and Box Elder Land Planning				
Has the fewest impacts to property				]						[	Best utilizes existing infrastructure			
EXIST 63 INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES	ADDRESS THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT	APZ CONFLICTS	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	PRIVATE PROPERTY AND ROW	FACILITATES MOVEMENTS TO AND FROM EAFB	ACCOMODATES TRANSPORTATION APPROVED PLANS	CONSTRUCT-ABILITY	CONSTRUCTION COSTS	JLUS	CONNECTIVITY WITH EXISTING ROAD NETWORK	SIMPLICITY OF INTERCHANGE CONFIGURATION	DESIGN CRITERIA	CONTROL OF ACCESS	Carry Forward?
The No Action Alternative	4	Ŷ	3	1	Ŷ	•	Ŷ	Ŷ	, ^	10	\$	12	0 1	٠
Nemative 1 - Intercharge at Wesigate	Ŷ	Ŷ	\$		2	\$	R	R	1	R	Ŷ	⇒	\$	•
Atternative 2 - Interchange at Westgate with Direct Access to EB 1416	Ŷ	Ŷ	\$	\$	R	\$	R	R	•	R	R	⇒	⇒	٠
Alternative 3 - Interchange at Westgate Rd. with Existing West Ramps and New East Ramps	Ŷ	Ŷ	\$	\$	Ŷ		R	R	•		\$	R	2	•
Alternative 4 - Interchange at Highway 1416	Ŷ	Ŷ	2	•	\$	R	\$	8	1	R	Ŷ	合	Ŷ	٠
Atemative 5 - Interchange at Radar Hill Road	1	Ŷ	₽	4	2	•		SI .	2		Ŷ	Ŷ	2	•
Alternative 6 - Interchange at Radar Hill Rd. with Braided Ramps to Commercial Dr.	Ŷ	Ŷ	4	4	Ŷ	⇔	2	4	R	⇒	2	Ŷ	4	0
Alternative 7 - Split Interchange with Radar Hill Rd. and Commercial Dr.	Ŷ	⇔	4	2	Ŷ	⇒	2	4	⇒	2	2	₽	8	0
Alternative 8 - Split Diamond with Radar Hill Rd. and Commercial Dr. with Exclusive EAFB Ramps	Ŷ	⇔	4	4	Ŷ	⇔	S	<b>₽</b>	\$	R	⇒	⇒	\$	•
Alternative 9 - Interchange at Bennett Road	Ŷ	Ŷ	5	2	4	4	2	⇒	Ŷ	2	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	•
Alternative 10 - Split Diamond Interchange at Commercial Dr	Ŷ	⇔	2	8	8	\$	8	2	⇒	⇒	8	⇒	\$	0
Alternative 11 - Remove Exit 63 Interchange	•	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	4	₽	Ŷ	Ŷ	Û	₽	\$	Ŷ	Ŷ	•
LEGEND Point Value = Point Value = Point Value	1	ts criterion			ves have mo ne and mine				and the second se		ar Hill Road uction cost			



Point Value = 3

Point Value = 4 Best meets criterion







# I-90 Corridor Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study **Open House Portion**

