

XI. Summary of Screening Matrix Evaluations

Table 51 summarizes the screening matrix evaluation results by alternative. The table shows 11 alternatives for Segments 1 and 2 (although not the same 11 alternatives), and eight alternatives for Segment 3 passed the initial screening matrix. In order to focus the alternatives into implementable projects, an additional screening evaluation was needed. Therefore a secondary matrix was developed to evaluate the alternatives with additional scrutiny.

Table 51 – Initial Screening Matrix Summary By Alternative			
	Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3
No Build	X	X	X
Reduce Number of Lanes	X	X	
General Purpose Lane Addition	X		
Lane Conversion to Bus Lane	X	X	
Reduce Lane Width*	X	X	
Intersection Improvements	X	X	X
Access Control		X	X
Complete Streets*	X	X	X
Trail Connectivity	X	X	X
Enhanced City and Regional Transit	X	X	X
Transportation Systems Management	X	X	X
* - alternative will be considered as part of any roadway improvements)			

These secondary screening matrices, shown in Table 52 through Table 54, seek to assist in the evaluation of the projects by taking a second look at the alternatives, this time compared against each other, instead of against the initial screening criterion.

The secondary screening matrix consists of the following criteria:

Functions As an Acceptable Regional Highway

This criterion seeks to determine if the proposed alternative supports the continued function of St. Francis Drive as a State and US Highway and a major travel route for regional, intrastate and interstate traffic. A ranking of Low indicates that the alternative does not allow the facility to function as an acceptable regional highway and is not expected to accommodate the future travel demand. A ranking of High indicates the highway functionality is available for the demand.

Financial Reasonableness Given Available Resources

This criterion attempts to discriminate amongst the alternatives by cost of the improvement likely to be funded with Federal or State resources. A High or Very High reasonableness evaluation indicates that a project is within a reasonable expectation for the anticipated future funding stream.

Minimizes Local Resource Needs

This item describes the relative contribution to the project for the local or regional government. A High or Very High ranking indicates that the particular alternative has relatively minimal local contribution requirements. A Low ranking indicates that the alternative does not minimize the local resource contribution.

Minimizes Environmental Impacts

This additional screening compares the alternatives amongst each other for potential opportunities to minimize environmental, economic, and social impacts and support environmental stewardship.

Compliance with Local Government Plans

This attempts to summarize the applicability of the alternative to local policy objectives. It is possible that members of the local policy boards or their staffs will disagree with these characterizations.

A. Secondary Screening Matrix for Segment 1

The secondary screening matrix for Segment 1 is shown Table 52.

Table 52 – Secondary Screening Matrix Segment 1					
Segment 1	Functions As An Acceptable Regional Highway	Financial Reasonableness Given Available State Resources	Minimizes Local Resource Needs	Minimizes Environmental Impacts	Compliance With Local Governmental Plans
No Build	Low	Very High	Very High	High	Low
Reduce Number of Lanes	Very Low	Medium	Very Low ¹	Medium	High
General Purpose Lane Addition	High	Low	High	Medium	Very Low
Lane Conversion to Bus Lane	High ²	High	Very Low ¹	Medium	High
Reduced Lane Width*	Low	Very High	Very High	High	Low to Medium
Intersection Improvements	High	Low to High	Medium to High	Low to High	Low to Medium
Complete Streets*	Low	High	High	High	Medium
Trail Connectivity	n/a	High	High	High	High
Enhanced City and Regional Transit	High ²	Medium	Very Low ¹	High	High to Very High
Transportation Systems Management	Medium	High	High	High	Medium
* - alternative will be considered as part of any roadway improvements 1 – for local transit expansion 2 – with large shift to transit					

It can be seen from the table that segment 1 has no alternative that fully serves the future regional needs of the highway, fits within reasonable funding availability at the Federal, State or Local level, will result in limited environmental impacts, and substantially support local government objectives.

Given those constraints the following alternatives for Segment 1 are recommended for further evaluation in Phase B:

- No Build
- Intersection Improvements
- Trail Connectivity
- Transportation Systems Management

The Reduced Lane Width and Complete Streets alternatives should continue to be considered and included in any recommendations that result from the Phase B evaluation but are removed as separate alternatives.

It is also apparent that due to the large shift in trips to transit that would be needed to result in improvements to the corridor (see Sections X.D and X.G), that transit in isolation on St. Francis Drive alone will not satisfy the purpose and need for the corridor. A comprehensive city and regional solution and commitment is required for transit to contribute to improvements in mobility along the corridor in order to provide the type of transit system that would allow an alternative to the automobile throughout the City and region.

Transit solutions are based on network operations and performance, therefore a singular transit element on St. Francis Drive alone cannot independently solve the congestion problems on the corridor. A more comprehensive study of the local and regional network is required. The corridor primarily has three functions or roles: State Highway, regional connection and a local street. A more extensive multi-modal study at the local and regional level evaluating system-wide multi-modal plans and the impact on corridor capacity would be most beneficial since it would have the greatest impact in reducing vehicular trips on the corridor. Since a majority of the State Highway traffic cannot be mitigated through new transit alternatives, the transit studies should be focused on reducing local and regional vehicular traffic. A comprehensive multi-modal transportation study conducted jointly by the City of Santa Fe and the MPO (including the NMDOT) would help address this issue at the local and regional level.

To be successful at reducing the vehicular traffic along St. Francis Drive, the multi-modal plan would need to result in a reduction in local vehicular use on the corridor by residents and commuters traveling through the corridor. The study should focus on alternate modes of transportation such as:

- Evaluation of existing local and regional bus service routes and ridership
- Pedestrian connectivity and walkability including proximity to commercial areas, employment centers, neighborhoods and cultural amenities
- Bicycle connectivity
- Evaluation of potential bus rapid transit corridors and bus transfer stations (express routes and remote parking)
- Signal timing and progression preemption

As with any larger transit component, the Enhanced City and Regional Transit and Lane Conversion to Bus Lane require significant local resources and commitment to achieve. As stated above, this should be further developed at the local and regional level through the MPO process to determine regional priorities and the potential impacts on St. Francis Drive. The MPO and NMDOT is committed to moving forward on a comprehensive study of the local and regional transit and rail system and how it can be improved to not only impact St. Francis Drive, but to provide a viable alternative to driving in the Santa Fe area in general. For this reason this concept will be included for all segments during Phase B.

The following alternatives are eliminated from further consideration for segment 1 based on the secondary screening matrix:

- Reduce Number of Lanes
- General Purpose Lane Addition

These alternatives were removed from further consideration because reducing the number of lanes will not satisfy the purpose and need as it will not result in a roadway that serves as an acceptable regional highway.

The General Purpose Lane Addition was removed due to the costs of the project (right-of-way, construction, community) and because they do not support local government plans and objectives.

B. Secondary Screening Matrix for Segment 2

The secondary screening matrix for Segment 2 is shown Table 53.

Table 53 – Secondary Screening Matrix Segment 2					
Segment 2	Functions As An Acceptable Regional Highway	Financial Reasonableness Given Available State Resources	Minimizes Local Resource Needs	Minimizes Environmental Impacts	Compliance With Local Governmental Plans
No Build	Low	Very High	Very High	High	Low
Reduce Number of Lanes	Very Low	Medium	Very Low ¹	Medium	High
Lane Conversion to Bus Lane	High ²	High	Very Low ¹	Medium	High
Reduce Lane Width*	Low	Very High	Very High	High	Low to Medium
Intersection Improvements	High	Low to High	Medium to High	Low to High	Low to Medium
Access Control	Low	High	High	Medium	Low
Complete Streets*	Low	High	High	High	Medium
Trail Connectivity	n/a	High	Medium	High	Medium to High
Enhanced City and Regional Transit	High ²	Medium	Very Low ¹	High	High to Very High
Transportation Systems Management	Medium	High	High	High	Medium
* - alternative will be considered as part of any roadway improvements 1 – for local transit expansion 2 – with large shift to transit					

It can be seen from the table that Segment 2 has no alternatives that fully serve the future regional needs of the highway, fit within reasonable funding availability at the Federal, State or Local level, will result in limited environmental impacts, and substantially support local government objectives.

Given those constraints the following alternatives for Segment 2 are recommended for further evaluation in Phase B:

- No Build
- Intersection Improvements
- Access Control
- Trail Connectivity
- Transportation Systems Management

The Reduced Lane Width and Complete Streets alternatives should be continued to be considered and included in any recommendations that result from the Phase B evaluation but removed as separate alternatives.

It is also apparent that due to the large shift in trips to transit that would be needed to result in improvements to the corridor (see Sections X.D and X.G), transit in isolation on St. Francis Drive alone will not satisfy the purpose and need for the corridor, although in this area the trip reductions are more manageable (3-5-minute headways). A comprehensive, city and regional solution and commitment is required for transit to contribute to improvements in mobility along the corridor in order to provide the type of transit system that would allow an alternative to the automobile throughout the City and region. Transit on St. Francis Drive alone cannot solve the congestion problems on St. Francis Drive.

As the Enhanced City and Regional Transit and Lane Conversion to Bus Lane require significant local resources and commitment to achieve, as discussed previously, they should be further developed at the local and regional level through the MPO process to determine regional priorities. The MPO and NMDOT is committed to moving forward on a comprehensive study of the local and regional transit and rail system and how it can be improved to not only impact St. Francis Drive, but to provide a viable alternative to driving in the Santa Fe area in general. For this reason this concept will be included for all segments during Phase B.

The following alternative is eliminated from further consideration for Segment 2 based on the secondary screening matrix:

- Reduce Number of Lanes

This alternative was removed from further consideration because reducing the number of lanes will not satisfy the purpose and need as it will not result in a roadway that serves as an acceptable regional highway.

C. Secondary Screening Matrix for Segment 3

The secondary screening matrix for Segment 3 is shown in Table 54 below.

Table 54 – Secondary Screening Matrix Segment 3					
Segment 3	Functions As An Acceptable Regional Highway	Financial Reasonableness Given Available State Resources	Minimizes Local Resource Needs	Minimizes Environmental Impacts	Compliance With Local Governmental Plans
No Build	Medium	Very High	Very High	High	Medium
Intersection Improvements	High	Low to Medium	High	Low to Medium	Medium
Access Control	Medium	High	High	Medium	Low to Medium
Complete Streets*	Medium	High	High	High	Medium
Trail Connectivity	n/a	High	Medium	High	Medium to High
Enhanced City and Regional Transit	High ²	Medium	Very Low ¹	High	High to Very High
Transportation Systems Management	Medium	High	High	High	Medium
* - alternative will be considered as part of any roadway improvements 1 – for local transit expansion 2 – with large shift to transit					

It can be seen from the table that Segment 3, due to its adequate performance under existing geometry, has alternatives that may meet all criteria.

The following alternatives are recommended for further evaluation in Phase B:

- No Build
- Intersection Improvements
- Access Control
- Trail Connectivity
- Transportation Systems Management

The Reduced Lane Width and Complete Streets alternatives should be continued to be considered and included in any recommendations that result from the Phase B evaluation, although due to the nature of this segment, these alternatives may not be appropriate for implementation.

It is also apparent that due to the large shift in trips to transit that would be needed to result in improvements to the corridor (see Sections X.D and X.G); transit in isolation on St. Francis Drive alone will not satisfy the purpose and need for the corridor. A comprehensive city and regional solution and commitment is required for transit to contribute to improvements in mobility along the corridor in order to provide the type of transit system that would allow an alternative to the automobile throughout the City and region.

As with any larger transit component, the Enhanced City and Regional Transit and Lane Conversion to Bus Lane require significant local resources and commitment to achieve. As stated

above, this should be further developed at the local and regional level through the MPO process to determine regional priorities and the potential impacts on St. Francis Drive. The MPO and NMDOT is committed to moving forward on a comprehensive study of the local and regional transit and rail system and how it can be improved to not only impact St. Francis Drive, but to provide a viable alternative to driving in the Santa Fe area in general. For this reason this concept will be included for all segments during Phase B.

D. Summary of Secondary Screening Matrix

The results of the secondary screening evaluation by segment are summarized in Table 55 below.

Table 55 – Secondary Screening Matrix Summary By Segment		
Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3
No Build	No Build	No Build
Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements
Trail Connectivity	Trail Connectivity	Trail Connectivity
Transportation Systems Management	Transportation Systems Management	Transportation Systems Management
	Access Control	Access Control
Enhanced Transit To Be Studied By NMDOT, Santa Fe Trails, NCRTD, SF RPA, MRCOG and SF MPO		
All of the Alternatives Will Accommodate Implementation of Enhanced Transit		
Complete Streets and Reduced Lane Widths are options that will be considered with all roadway improvement alternatives		