**Checklist for Preparing and Submitting Interstate Point of Access (POA) Study to FHWA for Review and Approval**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 1:** “The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by existing interchanges to the Interstate, and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the desired access, nor can they be reasonably improved (such as access control along surface streets, improving traffic control, modifying ramp terminals and intersections, adding turn bays or lengthening storage) to satisfactorily accommodate the design-year traffic demands (23 CFR 625.2(a)).” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Does the access request clearly describe the need and purpose of the proposal and identify project goals and objectives that are specific and measurable? | *Pages 12-14* |
|  |  |  | Is the proposal in the best interest of the public, or does it merely serve a narrow interest? | *Page 14* |
|  |  |  | Is the proposal serving a regional transportation need, or is it merely compensating for deficiencies in the local network of arterials and collectors? | *Page 14* |
|  |  |  | In lieu of granting new access, is there any reasonable alternative consisting of improvements to the existing roadway(s) or adjacent access points that could serve the need and purpose? | *Page 14* |
|  |  |  | Has the evaluation of existing interchanges and the local road network taken into account all proposed improvements currently identified in the State and/or Regional Long Range Plan? | *Page 16* |
|  |  |  | Will the proposed change in access result in needed upgrades or improvements to the cross road for a significant distance away from the interchange? | *Improvements proposed within interchange areas & cross roads as appropriate (see Appendix D graphics)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 2:** “The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate without the proposed change(s) in access (23 CFR 625.2(a)).” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Was FHWA actively involved in preliminary studies and decisions? If not, then more detailed information may be required in support of proposed action. | *FHWA involved throughout project, project scoping, meetings, report reviews* |
|  |  |  | Did the study area cover sufficient area to allow for an evaluation of all reasonable alternatives? | *Page 14* |
|  |  |  | Was a No-Build Alternative evaluated? | *Pages 24, 32-51* |
|  |  |  | Considering the context of the proposal, is this the best location for the proposed new interchange? | *Existing interchange reconstruction proposed* |
|  |  |  | Were different interchange configurations (Tight diamond, SPDI, Parclo) considered? | *Pages 24-51* |
|  |  |  | Were pedestrians and bicyclists considered in the alternative evaluation? | *Pages 25 & 35* |
|  |  |  | Was there an evaluation of different intersection configurations (stop control, signal, roundabout, free right turns, etc.?) | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendix M* |
|  |  |  | Have Transportation Systems Management (i.e. HOV, ITS, Ramp Metering, Transit etc.) options been evaluated as an alternative to a new or modification to an existing interchange? | *Pages 24-26, 33-36* |
|  |  |  | Did the report discuss how TSM alternatives were evaluated and eliminated from consideration? | *Pages 33-36* |
|  |  |  | Does the proposal consider any future planned TSM strategies and is the design consistent with the ability to implement the future TSM strategies? | *Pages 33-36, 55* |

| **Policy Point 3:** “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, ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (23 CFR 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, shall 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 must 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 must 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)).” | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Does the report demonstrate that a proper traffic operational analysis was conducted? The analysis should include the applicable basic freeway segments, freeway weaving segments, freeway ramp segments, ramp junctions and crossroad intersections related to the proposed access point and at least the two adjacent interchanges. | *Pages 17-51 &*  *Appendices* |
|  |  |  | Does the report include a **safety** analysis of the mainline, ramps and intersections of the proposed access point and the nearest adjacent interchange (provided they are near enough that it is reasonable to assume there may be impacts)? | *Pages 21-24, 36-38 &*  *Appendix C & Q* |
|  |  |  | Has the design traffic volume been validated? | *Appendix F* |
|  |  |  | Does the report include verification that the data used in the traffic analysis is consistent with the traffic and air quality models MPOs use to develop their current Transportation Plan (20-year) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)? | *Page 16 & 50*  *Air Quality Report is being prepared.* |
|  |  |  | Does the report include a design period of 20 years commencing at the time of project approval (PS&E approval)? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendices* |
|  |  |  | Does the report include quantitative analyses and results to identify operational differences between alternatives that are heavily congested? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendices* |
|  |  |  | Has a conceptual signing plan been provided? | *Appendix O* |
|  |  |  | Is guidance signing (i.e., way-finding or trail blazing signs) clear and simple? | *Appendix O* |
|  |  |  | Do the results of the operational analysis result in a significant adverse impact to existing or future conditions? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendices* |
|  |  |  | Will the proposed change in access result in needed upgrades or improvements to the cross road for a significant distance away from the interchange? If so, have impacts to the local network been disclosed and fully evaluated?" | *Improvements proposed within interchange areas & cross roads as appropriate (see Appendix D graphics)* |
|  |  |  | Are the cross roads or adjacent surface level roads and intersections affected by the proposed access point analyzed to the extent (length) where impacts caused or affecting the new proposed access point are disclosed to the appropriate managing jurisdiction? | *Pages 32-51* |
|  |  |  | Are pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities included (as appropriate) and do these facilities provide for reasonable accommodation? | *Pages 25 & 35* |
|  |  |  | Does the proposed access secure sufficient Limits of Access adjacent to the Interchange ramps? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | Does the proximity of the nearest crossroad intersections to the ramps contribute to safety or operational problems? Can they be mitigated?? | *Pages 21-23, 36-38 &*  *Appendix C & Q* |
|  |  |  | In addition to HCS, what analysis tools were employed and were they appropriate? | *Appendix G, J, M*  *Synchro used for signals with HCS results reported* |
|  |  |  | Has the proposal distinguished between nominal safety (i.e. adherence to design policies and standards) and substantive safety (actual and expected safety performance)? | *HSM utilized*  *Pages 36-38 &*  *Appendix Q* |
|  |  |  | Will any individual elements within the recommended alternative be degraded operationally as a result of this action? If yes, are reasons provided to accept them? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendices* |
|  |  |  | In evaluating whether the proposal has a "significant adverse impact" on safety, has the State Strategic Highway Safety Plan been used as a benchmark? | *HSM utilized*  *Pages 36-38 &*  *Appendix Q* |
|  |  |  | Are the proposed interchange design configurations able to satisfactorily accommodate the design year traffic volumes? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendices G,J, M* |
|  |  |  | If the project is to be built in stages, has the traffic operational and safety analyses considered the interim stages of the proposal? | Report/analyses assume all improvements will be constructed. A TMP will be prepared in the future for traffic operation and safety analyses during each construction stages. |

| **Policy Point 4:** “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 for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT 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)).” | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Does the proposed access connect to a public road? | *Page 1, Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | Are all traffic movements for full interchange access provided? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | If not, is the proposed access for special purposes such as transit vehicles, HOVs, and/or a park and ride lot? | *N/A – no special purpose access proposed* |
|  |  |  | If a partial interchange is proposed, is there sufficient justification for providing only a partial interchange? | *N/A – Pages 32-51 & Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | If a partial interchange is proposed; was a full interchange evaluated as an alternative and is there sufficient justification to eliminate or discard it? | *N/A – Pages 32-51 & Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | Is sufficient ROW available (or being acquired) to provide a full interchange at a future date (staged construction)? | *N/A – full interchanges provided* |
|  |  |  | Are you comfortable with how the missing movements will be accommodated on the surface streets and adjacent interchanges? | *N/A – all movements accommodated* |
|  |  |  | Does FHWA support the selection of design controls/criteria and desired operational goals? | *Page 12-14 Purpose and Need* |
|  |  |  | Does the proposed access meet or exceed current design standards for the Interstate System? | *Pages 3 & 51* |
|  |  |  | If not, have anticipated design exceptions been identified and reviewed (at least conceptually)? | *N/A - Pages 3 & 51* |
|  |  |  | If expected design exceptions could have significant operational impacts on the Interstate and/or Crossroad system, are mitigation measures described? | *N/A - Pages 3 & 51* |
|  |  |  | Will the length of access control along the crossroad provide for acceptable operations and safety? (100-300' is a minimum. Additional access control is strongly encouraged when needed for safety and operational enhancement) | *Pages 32-51&*  *Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | Does FHWA support selection of opening and design years? | *Page 31 &*  *Appendix F* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 4:** “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 for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT 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)).” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Have all design criteria (including but not limited to the following) been adequately addressed? | *Page 51 & Appendix E for items a. to j.* |
|  |  |  | a. Sight distance at ramp terminals (Don't overlook signal heads obscured by structures.) | *Page 51 & Appendix E* |
|  |  |  | b. Sufficient storage on ramp to prevent queues from spilling on to the Interstate (based on current and/or future projected traffic demand) | *Appendix J & M* |
|  |  |  | c. Vertical clearance | *Page 51 & Appendix E* |
|  |  |  | d. Pedestrian access through the interchange | *Page 35, 51 & Appendix E* |
|  |  |  | e. Length of acceleration/deceleration lanes | *Page 53 & Appendix E* |
|  |  |  | f. Length of tapers | *Page 51 & Appendix E* |
|  |  |  | g. Spacing between ramps | *Page 51 & Appendix E, Appendix P* |
|  |  |  | h. Lane continuity | *Appendix D & E - 3 I-80 through lanes per direction* |
|  |  |  | i. Lane balance | *Appendix D & E - 3 I-80 through lanes per direction* |
|  |  |  | j. Uniformity in interchange design and operational patterns (i.e. right-side ramps, exit design consistent w/adjacent interchanges) | *Appendix D* |
|  |  |  | Has each movement of the proposal been "tested" for ease of operation? | *Appendix J & M* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 5:** “The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. Prior to receiving final approval, all requests for new or revised access must be included in an adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan, in the adopted Statewide or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (STIP or TIP), and the Congestion Management Process within transportation management areas, as appropriate, and as specified in 23 CFR part 450, and the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR parts 51 and 93.” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Does the IJR discuss or include (as appropriate) other project(s), studies or planned actions that may have an effect on the report analysis results? | *Page 15 (adjacent Interchange 308 project)* |
|  |  |  | Does the project conform to the local planning, MPO or other related plans? | *Page 16, 51-52* |
|  |  |  | Does the report include an endorsement of land use plans by the appropriate government entity before it is utilized for traffic generation purposes? | *N/A – POA is not for a new development* |
|  |  |  | Is the access request located within a Transportation Management Areas? (TMAs are metropolitan areas of 200,000 or more in population) | *Page 7* |
|  |  |  | Is the access request located within a non-attainment area for air quality? (requests for access in a non-attainment or maintenance areas for air quality must be a part of a conforming transportation plan) | *Air Quality Study is being prepared* |
|  |  |  | Is the project included in the TIP/STIP and LRTP? | *Pages 17 & 50* |
|  |  |  | Is the access point covered as a part of an Interstate corridor study or plan? *(especially important for areas where the potential exists for construction of future adjacent interchanges)* | *Page 16 - Corridor Conceptual Study completed in 2009. Reconstruction of existing interchanges proposed, no new interchanges proposed* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 6:** “In corridors where the potential exists for future multiple interchange additions, a comprehensive corridor or network study must accompany all requests for new or revised access with recommendations that address all of the proposed and desired access changes within the context of a longer-range system or network plan (23 U.S.C. 109(d), 23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d), and 771.111).” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Is it possible that new interchange(s) not addressed in the IJR could be added within an area of influence to the proposed access point? (If so, could the proposal preclude or otherwise be affected by any future access points?) | *Page 16* |
|  |  |  | Does the IJR report include the traffic volumes generated by any future additional interchanges within a vicinity of influence that are proposed? | *Page 16*  *(report considers existing adjacent interchanges)* |
|  |  |  | Does the IJR report fail to include any other proposed interstate access points within a vicinity of influence that are being proposed or are in the current long range construction program? | *Page 16*  *(report considers existing adjacent interchanges)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 7:** “When a new or revised access point is due to a new, expanded, or substantial change in current or planned future development or land use, requests must demonstrate appropriate coordination has occurred between the development and any proposed transportation system improvements (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). The request must describe the commitments agreed upon to assure adequate collection and dispersion of the traffic resulting from the development with the adjoining local street network and Interstate access point (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Does the access request adequately demonstrate that an appropriate effort of coordination has been made with appropriate proposed developments? | *Pages 51-52, 59* |
|  |  |  | Are the proposed improvements compatible with the existing street network or are other improvements needed? | *Pages 32-51 &*  *Appendix D and M* |
|  |  |  | Are there any pre-condition contingencies required in regards to the timing of other improvements? | *Page 59* |
|  |  |  | Have all commitments to improve the local transportation network been included in a TIP/STIP/LRTP prior to the Interstate access approval (final approval of NEPA document)? | *Page 59* |
|  |  |  | If pre-condition contingencies are required, are pertinent parties in agreement with these contingencies and is this documented? | *Page 59* |
|  |  |  | If the proposed improvements are founded on the need for providing access to new development, are appropriate commitments in place to ensure that the development will likely occur as planned? | *Page 59* |
|  |  |  | If project is privately funded, are appropriate measures in place to ensure improvements will be completed if the developer is unable to meet financial obligations? | *Page 59* |
|  |  |  | If the purpose and need to accommodate new development/traffic demands aren't fully known, is a worst case scenario used for future traffic? | *Page 59* |
|  |  |  | Does the project require financial or infrastructure commitments from other agencies, organizations, or private entities? | *Page 59* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Point 8:** “The proposal can be expected to be included as an alternative in the required environmental evaluation, review and processing. The proposal should include supporting information and current status of the environmental processing (23 CFR 771.111).” | | | | |
| **Addressed Adequately?**  **Y**(POA Page #)  **N**(State why) **N/A**(State why)  **Y N N/A** | | | **Question** | **POA Study Page # and**  **Reference Section** |
|  |  |  | Are there any known social or environmental issues that could affect the proposal? | *Pages 49, 53-54 &*  *Appendix N* |
|  |  |  | Is the project consistent with the current TIP/STIP and LRTP and/or proposed amendments to the plan? | *Page 50* |
|  |  |  | Although NEPA is a separate action, is an environmental overview for the proposed improvements included? | *Pages 53-54 &*  *Appendix N* |
|  |  |  | Is it appropriate to emphasize to the project stakeholders that the access approval will be handled as a two-step process? (i.e. Step 1: Engineering and Operational Acceptability and Step 2: Environmental Approvals) | *Page 52* |
|  |  |  | Are all funding commitments included in a TIP/STIP/LRTP prior to the Interstate access approval (prior to final approval of the NEPA document)? | *Pages 16 & 50-51* |
|  |  |  | Are all commitments included in a TIP/STIP/LRTP prior to the Interstate access approval (prior to final approval of the NEPA document)? | *Pages 16 & 50-51* |