

## **APPENDIX B**

---

### Level 2 Screening Matrix



Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Kimball Junction and S.R. 224 Area Plan  
Level 2 (Final Screening) Evaluation Matrix

Rating  
3 = High, 2 = Medium, 1 = Low

ALTERNATIVE		Revised Alternative 1		Revised Alternative 3		Alternative 4	
Alternative Characteristics		Split Diamond with One-way Frontage Roads and optional HOV Ramps		Grade-separated Intersections with Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Facilities at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway and Alternate Connections to the I 80 Interchange		Combination of Stand-alone Surface Street Improvements	
Evaluation Criterion	Measure	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail
Prevent off-ramp queues from I-80 to S.R. 224 from affecting operations and safety of the I-80 mainline.	Measure peak-hour queue lengths at the westbound and eastbound off ramps	3	I-80 ramp queues don't back onto mainline	3	I-80 ramp queues don't back onto mainline	3	I-80 ramp queues don't back onto mainline
Accommodate current and projected travel demand on S.R. 224 in the Kimball Junction area while minimizing the roadway footprint.	Quantitatively assess the alternative's ability to reduce travel times for travel time pairs on S.R. 224 south of Kimball Junction to and from eastbound and westbound I-80.	2	Some peak direction through traffic travel time savings from no build (~10 sec AM and 5:10 PM)	3	Considerable peak direction through traffic travel time savings from no build (~2 min AM and 6:20 PM )	3	Considerable peak direction through traffic travel time savings from no build (~1:10 AM and 6:10 PM )
Reduce person-delay of private (single-occupant or high occupancy) vehicles from navigating through the Kimball Junction area.							
Improve the overall capacity of the Kimball Junction area by improving vehicular and transit networks.	Improve vehicle or person throughput at intersections during future (2050) peak hours. Measure overall intersection level of service as well as percent served.	2	Intersection LOS E at I-80 AM peak (no improvement over No Build) and E at Ute Boulevard PM peak (slight improvement over No Build)	2	Intersection LOS E at Olympic Parkway PM peak (slight improvement over No Build)	3	Intersection LOS C or D at all intersections AM peak and PM peak
Maintain existing, and consider additional, grade-separated active transportation connections across I-80 and S.R. 224.	Measure directness of safe and comfortable routes for people bicycling and walking to major destinations in the Kimball Junction area.	3	Proposed pedestrian tunnel on S.R. 224 at Ute Boulevard will increase connectivity and comfort	2	Trails are impacted but could be reconstructed. Depending on trench cover - pedestrian promenade could be included but directness of pedestrian travel not yet determined	3	Proposed pedestrian tunnel on S.R. 224 at Ute Boulevard will increase connectivity and comfort
Enhance regional transit connectivity to the Kimball Junction Transit Center and future BRT facilities.	Measure changes in transit travel times for all routes that serve the Kimball Junction area.	2	Transit elements included, although operation of transit elements require further study. Alternative adds dual left turns, which could aid transit but also could add volume which could negate benefits. In general, the level of detail for transit design isn't enough to make transit "awesome" at this point in design; however, transit elements are not precluded.	3	Transit elements included, makes left turns to WB I-80 and NB S.R. 224 easier. Because this alternative offers a bypass to Kimball Junction, transit vehicles going to points south could use bypass. While transit details require additional study, this alterantive may offer the best transit throughput and reliability.	2	Adds 3rd lane going south, which could be used by transit vehicles. In general, the level of detail for transit design isn't enough to make transit "awesome" at this point in design; however, transit elements are not precluded.
Improve existing access deficiencies and accommodate future access needs.	Qualitatively assess whether the alternative includes or supports future congestion-management strategies such as Transportation Demand Management.	2	HOV ramps but no HOV elements connecting to S.R. 224; also considered active transportation and transit . Ultimately, policy changes should be enacted to further support TDM and other congestion-management strategies.	2	Has one HOV element (HOV right turn lane at SPUI); also considered active transportation and transit. Ultimately, policy changes should be enacted to further support TDM and other congestion-management strategies.	3	Has the highest HOV benefits with left/right HOV at SPUI; also considered active transportation and transit. Ultimately, policy changes should be enacted to further support TDM and other congestion-management strategies.

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Kimball Junction and S.R. 224 Area Plan  
Level 2 (Final Screening) Evaluation Matrix

Rating  
3 = High, 2 = Medium, 1 = Low

ALTERNATIVE		Revised Alternative 1		Revised Alternative 3		Alternative 4	
	Alternative Characteristics	Split Diamond with One-way Frontage Roads and optional HOV Ramps		Grade-separated Intersections with Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Facilities at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway and Alternate Connections to the I 80 Interchange		Combination of Stand-alone Surface Street Improvements	
Evaluation Criterion	Measure	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail
Improve vehicle mobility to and from the Kimball Junction area.	Quantitatively assess vehicle delay for movements into and out of Kimball Junction land uses via S.R. 224 and I-80.	3	In the AM peak period, marginal improvement in delay compared to No Build conditions. Reduces delay by over half in the PM peak period when No Build conditions are the worst.	3	In the AM peak period, a five second improvement in delay compared to No Build conditions. In the PM peak period when No Build conditions see the highest travel delay of 145 sec/vehicle, reduced that delay by over half the time seen under No Build conditions	3	In the AM peak period, delay was the same as with No Build conditions. In the PM peak period when No Build conditions see the highest travel delay of 145 sec/vehicle, reduced that delay by over half the time seen under No Build conditions
Promote comfortable active transportation opportunities that connect existing and emerging land uses.	Qualitatively assess the alternative's ability to accommodate safe travel by pedestrians and cyclists.	2	Proposed pedestrian tunnel on S.R. 224 at Ute Boulevard will increase connectivity and comfort	2	Trails are impacted but would be reconstructed. Depending on trench cover - pedestrian promenade could be included but directness of pedestrian travel not yet determined	2	Proposed pedestrian tunnel on S.R. 224 at Ute Boulevard will increase connectivity and comfort
Create a place where there are viable travel alternatives to using a car in order to improve mobility and contribute to improved local and regional air quality, environmental sustainability, and community health.	Qualitatively assess the ability of local residents and visitors to access community facilities both across and along S.R. 224.	2	Provides new direct access to Kimball Junction from I-80	3	Segregates through traffic from local traffic, simplifying local access.	2	Improves traffic flow at existing facilities; dual lefts at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway
	Alternative avoids impacts to existing neighborhoods, has minimal effect on community cohesion, and enhances the character of the area. Assess high-level measures of expected impacts to environmental resources including: (1) acres of floodplains, (2) acres of conservation easements and open space, (3) acres of wetlands, (4) TES habitat by occurrence, (5) acres of right-of-way impacts, (6) number of historic properties, (7) feet of electrical line impacts, (8) feet of stream impacts, (9) acres of FPPA-regulated farmland, and (10) feet and number of trails.	2	Per the environmental screening tab, medium impacts. Impacts the most trails and most wetlands.	2	Per the environmental screening tab, medium impacts. Impacts the most right-of-way.	2	Per the environmental screening tab, medium impacts. Impacts the most open space.

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Kimball Junction and S.R. 224 Area Plan  
Level 2 (Final Screening) Evaluation Matrix

Rating  
3 = High, 2 = Medium, 1 = Low

ALTERNATIVE		Revised Alternative 1		Revised Alternative 3		Alternative 4	
Alternative Characteristics		Split Diamond with One-way Frontage Roads and optional HOV Ramps		Grade-separated Intersections with Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Facilities at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway and Alternate Connections to the I 80 Interchange		Combination of Stand-alone Surface Street Improvements	
Evaluation Criterion	Measure	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail
Minimize environmental, right-of-way, and utility impacts.	Qualitatively assess vehicle-miles traveled reduction for improvement in air quality.	2	Less delay and less idling from LOS improvement leads to improved air quality. No likely significant reduction in vehicle-miles traveled.	3	Less delay and less idling from LOS improvement leads to improved air quality; vehicles on mainline S.R. 224 don't stop at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway. No likely significant reduction in vehicle-miles traveled.	2	Less delay and less idling from LOS improvement leads to improved air quality. No likely significant reduction in vehicle-miles traveled.
	Qualitatively assess increased physical activity achieved during everyday trips.	3	Improved access across S.R. 224 due to proposed pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard	3	Trails are impacted but would be reconstructed. Depending on trench cover - pedestrian promenade could be included which could offer green space for physical activity.	3	Improved access across S.R. 224 due to proposed tunnel at Ute Boulevard
Minimize impacts to public health while improving health-related activities and access and equity to public health facilities.	Qualitatively assess improved access to health-related resources along S.R. 224.	3	New pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard offers another access point to Redstone area; provides direct access to Kimball Junction	3	Offers better east-west connectivity	3	Dual lefts may make access to Redstone area easier. New pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard offers another access point to Redstone area.
	Qualitatively assess improved multimodal connectivity to Kimball Junction—area destinations.	2	Adds active transportation, transit and HOV amenities but not detailed enough at this level to assess big improvements	2	Adds active transportation, transit and HOV amenities but not detailed enough at this level to assess big improvements	2	Adds active transportation, transit and HOV amenities but not detailed enough at this level to assess big improvements
	Measure distance traveled for accessibility to transit and active transportation facilities—what is available within ¼ mile—and assess physical barriers.						
	Qualitatively assess transportation equity.	2	Adds active transportation, transit and HOV amenities; policy changes can also improve this	2	Adds active transportation, transit and HOV amenities; policy changes can also improve this	2	Adds active transportation, transit and HOV amenities; policy changes can also improve this
Improve safety on S.R. 224 in the Kimball Junction area for all users.	Quantitatively assess the alternative's ability to reduce conflict points (vehicle-to-vehicle) and crash rates (where <i>Highway Safety Manual</i> methodologies apply).	1	Adds new conflict points via new split diamond interchange configurations	2	S.R. 224 tunnel removes some conflict points but adds new conflict points at the split intersections making for no reduction	2	No reduction due to no change to the existing number of conflict points
	Quantitatively assess the alternative's ability to reduce conflict points (vehicle-to-cyclist/pedestrian) and crash rates (where <i>Highway Safety Manual</i> methodologies apply).	2	New pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard reduces conflict point	1	No reduction	2	New pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard reduces conflict point

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Kimball Junction and S.R. 224 Area Plan  
Level 2 (Final Screening) Evaluation Matrix

Rating  
3 = High, 2 = Medium, 1 = Low

ALTERNATIVE		Revised Alternative 1		Revised Alternative 3		Alternative 4	
Alternative Characteristics		Split Diamond with One-way Frontage Roads and optional HOV Ramps		Grade-separated Intersections with Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Facilities at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway and Alternate Connections to the I 80 Interchange		Combination of Stand-alone Surface Street Improvements	
Evaluation Criterion	Measure	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail
Ensure that the alternative is consistent with planned land uses.	Alternative is consistent with adopted local and regional land use and transportation plans.	2	No transformative change; new pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard adheres to Summit County active transportation plans	3	Offers better east-west connectivity, which aligns to Kimball Junction Neighborhood Plan. The trench covering offers potential for promenade. Better east-west connectivity offers benefits to proposed new tech center ingress/egress.	2	No transformative change; offers benefits to proposed new tech center ingress/egress and new pedestrian tunnel at Ute Boulevard adheres to Summit County active transportation plans
	Alternative is compatible with other planned projects on S.R. 224 in the Kimball Junction area as identified in adopted planning studies for the area						
Ensure that the alternative fits the character and scale of the community and is complementary to the landscape.	Assess community support for the alternative based on a public survey and meetings.	2	Mixed reaction to Alternative 1, survey respondents thought the traffic configuration was complicated, respondents felt that this alternative would improve ingress/egress at Kimball Junction and I-80 but may not reduce congestion, positive reception for pedestrian tunnel	3	Received highest overall rating from respondents, general sentiment is that this alternative is least impactful with greatest benefits, positive reception for pedestrian tunnel, some concern that this alternative would affect character of the community, less visual impacts through Kimball Junction by depressing roadway	2	Second lowest rating (after Alternative 2, which didn't get through Level 2A screening), respondents didn't like phased approach of short term improvements, respondents didn't think this alternative would solve the congestion and mobility problems
	Qualitatively assess the suitability of the alternative within the scale of the community and the alternative's ability to enhance the corridor's natural setting and character.						
Ensure that the alternative is practical and implementable.	Measure the alternative's practicality and implementability with conceptual-level costs.	2	Moderate cost	1	Very high cost	3	Low cost compared to other alternatives, especially given possible incremental approach
	Consider the alternative's constructability given available technology.	3	Constructible, can be phased to reduce construction impacts	2	Constructible though details for depressing roadway and potentially covering roadway need to be considered	3	Should be easy to construct and can be phased, which will reduce construction impacts
Accommodate snow storage after plowing and other maintenance activities.	Qualitatively assess the alternative's ability to accommodate snow storage and other maintenance activities to ensure travelers' safety and mobility.	3	Snow storage can be accommodated	2	Snow plowing and storage may be challenging due to depressed roadway	3	Snow storage can be accommodated

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Kimball Junction and S.R. 224 Area Plan  
Level 2 (Final Screening) Evaluation Matrix

Rating  
3 = High, 2 = Medium, 1 = Low

ALTERNATIVE		Revised Alternative 1		Revised Alternative 3		Alternative 4	
	Alternative Characteristics	Split Diamond with One-way Frontage Roads and optional HOV Ramps		Grade-separated Intersections with Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Facilities at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway and Alternate Connections to the I 80 Interchange		Combination of Stand-alone Surface Street Improvements	
Evaluation Criterion	Measure	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail
	Include innovative operational technologies. Qualitatively assess whether the alternative includes or supports future congestion-management strategies such as Transportation Systems Management, Intelligent Transportation Systems, or Transportation Network Companies.	2	Can support future congestion management strategies from a policy level	2	Can support future congestion management strategies from a policy level	2	Can support future congestion management strategies from a policy level
		52		54		57	

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Kimball Junction and S.R. 224 Area Plan  
Level 2 (Final Screening) Evaluation Matrix

Rating  
3 = High, 2 = Medium, 1 = Low

ALTERNATIVE		Revised Alternative 1		Revised Alternative 3		Alternative 4			
Alternative Characteristics		Split Diamond with One-way Frontage Roads and optional HOV Ramps		Grade-separated Intersections with Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Facilities at Ute Boulevard and Olympic Parkway and Alternate Connections to the I 80 Interchange		Combination of Stand-alone Surface Street Improvements			
Evaluation Criterion	Measure	Ratings thresholds	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	Rating	Detail	
Environmental Issues	Acres of floodplains	less than 1 acre = 3, 1 acre -10 acres = 2, more than 10 acres = 1	2	1.33	3	0.5	3	0	
	Acres of open space	less than 0.5 acre = 3, 0.5 acre - 2 acre = 2, over 2 acres = 1	2	0.54	2	0.55	1	2.15 (Florence Gilmore open space)	
	Acres of wetlands (NWI mapping)	less than 1/2 acre = 3, 1/2 acre - 1 acre = 2, over 1 acre = 1	1	0.74 (over 1/2 acre requires individual permit)	1	0.55 (over 1/2 acre requires individual permit)	2	0.32 (less than 1/2 acre)	
	TES habitat by occurrence	less than 5 occurrences = 3, 5-15 occurrences = 2, Over 15 occurrences = 1	2	14	2	14	2	14	
	Acres of right-of-way impacts	15 acres or less = 3, 16 acres to 20 acres = 2, over 20 acres = 1	3	11 (use 15 acres as cut off for 3)	2	18 (use 15 acres as cut off for 3)	3	15 (use 15 acres as cut off for 3)	
	Feet of electrical line impacts		3	0	3	0	3	0	
	Feet of stream impacts	less than 200 feet = 3, 200 feet - 399 feet = 2, over 400 feet = 1	3	0	3	0	1	405	
	Acres of FPPA-regulated farmland	less than 25 acres = 3, 26 acres - 50 acres = 2, over 50 acres = 1	1	84	2	33	2	29	
	Number of historic properties		3	0	3	0	3	0	
Feet and number of trails	less than 2500 ft = 3, 2500 ft - 4999 ft = 2, over 5,000 ft = 1	1	6400 ft (7 trails)	2	2,743 ft (3 trails)	3	2,050 ft (4 trails)		
<b>No fatal flaws that would eliminate alternative</b>				<b>No fatal flaws that would eliminate alternative</b>				<b>No fatal flaws that would eliminate altern</b>	

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

Level 2A Screening				Travel Demand Model Results										
Criteria	Measure	2050 No Build Metric	2050 No Build Results	2050 No Build		Alternative 1			Alternative 2*			Alternative 3		
				Surrogate Measurement	Surrogate Value	Surrogate Value	Change	Expected Effect on Measure	Surrogate Value	Change	Expected Effect on Measure	Surrogate Value	Change	Expected Effect on Measure
Prevent off-ramp queues from I-80 to SR-224 from affecting operations and safety of the I-80 mainline	Measure peak-hour queue lengths at the westbound and eastbound off ramps	EB AM Off-Ramp Queue (95th)	2970 ft (Backing onto mainline)	EB I-80 Off-Ramp Daily Vol (vpd)	20600	13,100	Significant decrease	Backing likely eliminated	19000	Slight decrease	Backing likely persists	21200	Slight increase	Backing could be eliminated b/c of volume drop on SR-224
		WB AM Off-Ramp Queue (95th)	455 ft (No backing on mainline)	WB I-80 Off-Ramp Daily Vol (vpd)	8400	8500	Slight increase	Likely still no backing	8400	No change	Likely still no backing	8600	Slight increase	Likely still no backing
Reduce person delay of private vehicles navigating through Kimball Junction	Qualitatively assess the alternative's ability to reduce travel time pairs on SR-224 south Kimball Junction to and from eastbound and westbound I-80	SR-224 Northbound PM Travel Time	10:05 (Very slow travel)	PM NB V/C btwn Ute & SPU I	1.25	0.9	Marginal decrease	Likely somewhat slow TTs	1.14	Slight decrease	Likely slow TTs	0.59	Significant decrease	TTs much improved
		SR-224 Southbound AM Travel Time	6:00 (Slow travel)	PM SB V/C btwn Ute & SPU I	1.24	0.87	Marginal decrease	Likely somewhat slow TTs	1.15	Slight decrease	Likely slow TTs	0.45	Significant decrease	TTs much improved
Improve vehicle mobility to/from I-80 and to/from S.R. 224 through Kimball Junction	Improve vehicle or person throughput at intersections during future (2050) peak hours measuring overall intersection LOS	Ute Blvd PM LOS	LOS F	Entering Daily Vol (vpd)	62000	53,600	Marginal decrease	Likely LOS E or F	56400	Marginal decrease	Likely LOS E or F	37900	Significant decrease	Likely improves LOS
		Olympic Pkwy PM LOS	LOS F	Entering Daily Vol (vpd)	61700	61,100	Slight decrease	Still LOS F	58000	Slight decrease	Still LOS F	29400	Significant decrease	Likely improves LOS
Improve vehicle mobility to and from the Kimball Junction area.	Qualitatively assess vehicle delay for movement into and out of Kimball Junction land uses via S.R. 224 and I-80	Ute Blvd EB/WB PM LOS	LOS F / LOS F	Ute Blvd EB/WB PM V/C	0.49/0.25	0.46 /0.21	Slight decrease	Still LOS F	0.36 /0.24	Marginal decrease	Still LOS F	0.64 /0.27	Increase	May have improved LOS b/c of volume drop on SR-224
		Olympic Pkwy EB/WB PM LOS	LOS F / LOS F	Olympic Pkwy EB/WB PM V/C	0.49/0.66	0.49/0.61	Slight decrease	Still LOS F	0.33 /0.62	Slight decrease	Still LOS F	0.34 /0.59	Marginal decrease	May have improved LOS b/c of volume drop on SR-224
<b>Recommendation</b>				Move forward to detailed VISSIM analysis with D-series improvements to Ute & Olympic				Most surrogates indicate measures will not improve. Do not move forward to detailed VISSIM analysis				Move forward to detailed VISSIM analysis		

Rating: 2

\*Assumes GP use of bypass road, so alternative benefits likely overstated  
Rating: 1

Rating: 3

**Rating**  
3 = High (Good), 2 = Medium (Acceptable), 1 = Low (Poor)

\* Note: Alternative 4 was not screened using the travel demand model since the elements that make up Alternative 4 are almost entirely composed of intersection lane improvements which are too small for a travel demand model to measure and are more suited to VISSIM analysis. Therefore, Alternative 4 was automatically advanced to Level 2B screening.

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

		<i>Measure peak-hour queue lengths at the westbound and eastbound off ramps.</i>	<i>Quantitatively assess the alternative's ability to reduce travel times for travel time pairs on S.R. 224 south of Kimball Junction to and from eastbound and westbound I-80.</i>	<i>Improve vehicle or person throughput at intersections during future (2050) peak hours. Measure overall intersection level of service as well as percent served.</i>	<i>Quantitatively assess vehicle delay for movements into and out of Kimball Junction land uses via S.R. 224 and I-80.</i>		
		<b>I-80 Ramp Queues Backing to Mainline (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Traffic Travel Time Savings from No Build (mm:ss)</b>	<b>Intersection LOS</b>			<b>Average Vehicle Delay In/Out of Kimball Junction (sec/veh)</b>
		<b>Screening Result</b>	<b>Screening Result</b>	<b>Ute Blvd</b>	<b>Olympic Pkwy</b>	<b>I-80</b>	<b>Screening Result</b>
<b>AM</b>	<b>No Build</b>	Yes - EB I-80	--	C	C	E	40
	<b>Alt 1</b>	No	0:10	C	C	E	35
	<b>Alt 3</b>	No	2:00	C	C	C	35
	<b>Alt 4</b>	No	1:10	D	C	D	40
<b>PM</b>	<b>No Build</b>	No	--	F	F	D	145
	<b>Alt 1</b>	No	5:10	E	D	C	65
	<b>Alt 3</b>	No	6:20	D	E	C	60
	<b>Alt 4</b>	No	6:10	D	D	D	65

Rating  
 3 = High (Good), 2 = Medium (Acceptable), 1 = Low (Poor)

Appendix B: Level 2 Screening Matrix

	Construction Cost (Roadway, structures, earthwork, drainage, utilities) with contingencies	Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Construction Engineering (CE)	Right-of-way Costs	Project Total
Alternative 1	\$ 35,006,275	\$ 7,001,255	\$ 12,218,580	\$ 54,226,110
Alt 1 + D-10	\$ 38,436,970	\$ 8,030,464	\$ 13,794,610	\$ 60,262,044
Alt 1 + D-10, D-7	\$ 41,563,542	\$ 14,051,886	\$ 16,563,262	\$ 72,178,690
Alt 1 + D-10, D-7, D-11, D-12	\$ 42,269,110	\$ 14,889,871	\$ 17,189,577	\$ 74,348,558
Alternative 3 + D-10	\$ 78,896,044	\$ 16,122,279	\$ 21,450,280	\$ 116,468,603
Alternative 4 (All D-alts built)	\$ 18,506,730	\$ 3,701,346	\$ 7,638,165	\$ 29,846,241
D-1	\$ 3,652,560	\$ 1,095,768	\$ 75,417	\$ 4,823,745
D-7	\$ 3,126,572	\$ 937,972	\$ 3,507,420	\$ 7,571,964
D-9	\$ 1,465,622	\$ 732,811	\$ 1,488,718	\$ 3,687,151
D-10	\$ 3,430,695	\$ 1,029,209	\$ 1,576,030	\$ 6,035,934
D-11	\$ 1,596,614	\$ 798,307	\$ 495,638	\$ 2,890,559
D-12	\$ 1,653,154	\$ 826,577	\$ 753,761	\$ 3,233,492
D-14	\$ 4,027,161	\$ 1,208,149	\$ -	\$ 5,235,310
D-16	\$ 66,633	\$ 33,317	\$ 258,096	\$ 358,046
D-16A	\$ 107,294	\$ 53,647	\$ 377,233	\$ 538,174
D-1 and D-15 (Constructed together)	\$ 4,211,450	\$ 1,263,435	\$ 658,357	\$ 6,133,242
D-7 and D-11 and D-12 (Constructed together)	\$ 3,832,140	\$ 1,149,642	\$ 4,133,735	\$ 9,115,517
D-11 and D-12 (Constructed together)	\$ 2,031,900	\$ 1,015,950	\$ 1,249,399	\$ 4,297,249

