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## Introduction

The East Yellowstone Intersection Study was commissioned by the Casper Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to analyze a section of Yellowstone Highway between $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Streets in Casper. This portion of Yellowstone Highway parallels one of the original railroad corridors in Casper and is mere blocks from the first structures built in the present-day City. The road alignment skews the adjacent city streets that were built on a North-South based grid system, causing difficult road geometry.

The project goal is to identify improvements for roadway safety and capacity, as well as improvements to bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility though the East Yellowstone Highway corridor between $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street. The report documents the existing conditions and transportation needs within the study area. The identified needs include addressing safety challenges, improving traffic operations, enhancing multimodal accessibility and safety, managing roadway access, and supporting local land use.

## Public Involvement

Gaining input and feedback from the public and key stakeholders is critical to the success of this study. A kickoff meeting was held with the MPO, City of Casper staff and other stakeholders to review the study scope, objective, schedule and deliverables. Relevant background information was obtained, including GIS mapping, existing roadway plans, existing traffic data, crash data, planned land use changes, programmed transportation improvements on any adjacent City roadways, and parking data. Previous transportation studies and master plans for downtown Casper (including "Connecting Crossroads", "Urban Center Parking Plan", "Generation Casper", "Casper Area Trails, Path and Bikeways Plan"), were reviewed to become familiar with prior recommendations for circulation, parking, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, plus City policies and goals.

One public input session, with both in-person and online components, was held to solicit input on existing conditions and issues, and proposed improvement alternatives.

Stakeholder meetings with both in-person and online components, were held with downtown property owners, residents, property managers, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, WYDOT, City of Casper, and adjacent property owners to solicit project input. Design challenges identified during the study include:

```
> skewed alignment
\(>\) multiple public street and driveway access points
- future traffic growth
bigh speeds
```

    signal timing / phasing and lane assignment
    The project will include a presentation at a City Council Meeting to present project findings and recommendations.

## Existing Conditions

Existing conditions were documented through desktop and field inventories and conversations with City and MPO staff. This included a comprehensive inventory of the existing intersection geometry and traffic controls including lane configuration and width, typical cross-sections, auxiliary lanes, posted speed limits, sight distance, access points, channelization, drainage, lighting, signing, marking, traffic signal displays and phasing, and pavement conditions. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure including sidewalks, crosswalks, median refuges, pedestrian signals, transit routes and stops were also inventoried, to identify gaps and barriers in the active transportation network.

## Study Area

The study area is approximately $1 / 4$ mile east of Downtown Casper, WY. Land use in the study area consists of mixed commercial with retail/office/service usage.

The following intersections are present within the study area, FIGURE 1:

E. ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street / Kimball Street<br>- E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street / Park Street<br>D. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street / Grant Street<br>D E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street / E. Yellowstone Highway **<br>E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street / Lincoln Street<br>E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street / Jefferson Street<br>- E. Yellowstone Highway / Lincoln Street<br>- E. Yellowstone Highway / Kimball Street<br>E. Yellowstone Highway / Park Street<br>E. Collins Drive / Park Street<br>- E. Collins Drive / Lincoln Street<br>E. 2nd Street / Kimball Street **<br>E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street / Park Street<br>E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street / Grant Street<br>E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street / Lincoln Street<br>E. 2nd Street / Jefferson Street

** Primary Signalized Study Intersections


## Existing Traffic Volumes

Daily and peak hour traffic counts were obtained from the City of Casper's 2016 traffic signal timing study and from 2021 signal detector data. Spot field counts were made at a few intersections to verify that the volumes within the study are reasonable random field observations and were made to document traffic conditions such as queue length and residual queuing, motorist behavior such as compliance with traffic control devices and conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists. Average daily traffic volumes (ADTV) are shown on FIGURE 2, AM/PM peak hour traffic volumes are on FIGURE 3, and pedestrian volumes are on FIGURE 4.

ADT's of note:

- 10,076 E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street west of E. Yellowstone Highway

3,615 E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street east of E. Yellowstone Highway
7,812 E. 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street west of E. Yellowstone Highway
11,783 E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street east of E. Yellowstone Highway
2,501 E. Yellowstone Highway between E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street
7,508 E.Yellowstone Highway north of E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street
5,718 S. Kimball Street south of E. 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street

Turning-movement count data indicate that the PM peak hour volume is slightly higher than AM peak hour volume at the study intersections. This is typical for a business district as higher traffic volumes occur during normal business hours. Full traffic count reports are included in Appendix A.

FIGURE 4 shows the pedestrians entering and crossing at least one crosswalk at the two primary signalized intersections within the study area. There are more pedestrian crossings along E 2nd St , which is likely due to the presence of the Transit Depot at Beech Street and 2nd Street, park and roadway enhancements, such as landscaped medians. The skewed intersection of Yellowstone Highway and E ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street has longer distances to cross than other nearby crosswalks. East Yellowstone and E $1^{\text {st }}$ Street crosswalks are approximately $120^{\prime}$ compared to $60^{\prime}-80^{\prime}$ at other 5 lane intersections.



FIGURE 4: EXISTING PEDESTRIAN VOLUMES


## Existing Road Geometry

Road geometry varies from block to block. FIGURES 5-11 illustrated the road cross sections on some key blocks. Existing Pedestrian Infrastructure is highlighted on FIGURE 12. Curbside parking regulations in the study area are presented on FIGURE 13.

Within the Study Area, E. Yellowstone Highway is situated in a northeast/southwest direction and consists of a 4-lane section with 2 through lanes each direction with parallel parking permitted between E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. 2nd Street. East Yellowstone Highway has curbs, gutters, and sidewalks in place as well as wide driveways along the south side serving a large parking area for the adjacent development. There is a 10 -foot wide multi-use path parallel to and offset approximately 50' south of E. Yellowstone Highway.

East $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street are east/west, parallel routes approximately 450 apart. Both roadways consist of a five-lane section with two travel lanes in each direction and a middle turn lane area. Both roadways have curb and gutters with sidewalks on both sides. There is no on street parking permitted on these roadways within the study area.

The intersection of E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and East Yellowstone Highway is signalized. The signals are maintained and controlled by WYDOT. East $1^{\text {st }}$ Street is the mainline roadway. As shown in FIGURES 7, 8, 9 and 10, there are two approach lanes, one exclusive through lane and one shared through/right turn lane, and an exclusive left turn lane on both the EB and WB sides of E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street. Both the NB and SB side of East Yellowstone Highway have two approach lanes, one shared through/left turn lane and one shared through/right turn lane.

The intersection of E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street and East Yellowstone Highway/South Kimball Street is signalized. The signals are maintained and controlled by WYDOT. E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street is the mainline roadway. As shown in FIGURES 5, 6 and 11, there are two approach lanes, one exclusive through lane and one shared through/right turn lane, and an exclusive left turn lane on both the EB and WB sides of E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street. The NB side of Kimball Street has one shared through/ right turn lane and an exclusive left turn lane. The SB side of East Yellowstone Highway has one exclusive through lane, one shared through/right turn lane and an exclusive left turn lane.

The posted speed limit on E. Yellowstone Highway in the project area is 30 mph . The speed limit is reduced to 20 mph approaching the curve southwesterly at S. Kimball Street and E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street. The posted speed limit along E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street is 30 mph . On E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street, the speed limit is 20 mph between S . Park Street and Kimball Street and 30 mph between S. Park Street and S. Jefferson Street.

Crosswalk markings at E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway consist of wide longitudinal white markings (Continental), with black borders for contrast, while at E. 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway they consist of red (brick color) placed concrete/asphalt. Stop bars were not present at either signalized intersection.


Figure 5: Existing Cross Section - Yellowstone Highway (South of 2nd Street)


Figure 7: Existing Cross Section - Yellowstone Highway (South of $1^{\text {st }}$ Street)


Figure 6: Existing Cross Section - Yellowstone Highway (North of 2nd Street)


Figure 8: Existing Cross Section - Yellowstone Highway (North of $1^{\text {st }}$ Street)


Figure 9: Existing Cross Section - $1^{\text {st }}$ Street (East of Yellowstone Highway)



Figure 10: Existing Cross Section - $1^{\text {st }}$ Street (West of Yellowstone Highway)

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure

Pedestrian infrastructure in the study area is shown in FIGURE12. Sidewalks are located throughout the study area. Most intersections also have marked crosswalks and ADA curb ramps. The signalized intersections (E. Yellowstone Highway at E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street) have pedestrian treatments including pedestrian signal indications and push buttons. There is a wide concrete pathway within the study area, the Casper Area Rail Trail, but there are no designated bike lanes or signs provided within the study area.

## Parking

On-street park in the study area is shown in FIGURE 13. There is parallel parking along East Yellowstone Highway between E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street. This parallel parking consists of both time restricted parking, 30-minutes, and time restricted/time of day restricted parking, 30-minutes \& 2 hours/8am-6pm.


FIGURE 12: EXISTING PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE


7


## Crash History

The crash analysis is based on data provided by WYDOT for the period from 2016 to 2019. There was a total of 114 police-reported collisions within or adjacent to the study area. FIGURE 14 summarizes the crash data. The data was analyzed to identify any recurring crash types and trends, as well as probable cause or contributing factors that can be summarized and correlated to documented physical or operational deficiencies. The following are key conclusions from the data:

$86 \%$ of the crashes resulted in property damage only. Fifteen crashes (13\%) resulted in an injury. There was 1 pedestrian collision (1\%). There was one bicycle fatality in 2014 near these intersections.
$>$ The most frequent collision types were angle collisions (42\%) and rear-end collisions (30\%). One crash involving a pedestrian occurred during this period.

18 of the collisions occurred at E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway (16\%).
24 crashes near E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street (11 @ E. 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway -10\% \& 13 @ E. Yellowstone Highway and S. Kimball Street-11\%).

The severe skew angle at E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway is a probable factor for the higher incidence of angle and rear-end collisions. The proximity and intersection configuration of S. Kimball Street adjacent to E. 2nd Street and E. Yellowstone Highway is a probable factor for the crashes at these intersections.


TABLE 1: CRASH TYPES / SEVERITY


## Traffic Operations Analysis

A capacity analysis was performed using "Synchro 11" traffic analysis software, which incorporates the methodology of the 6th edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM2000), for the existing study intersections. New Synchro models with 2021 traffic volumes were developed by Mead \& Hunt, incorporating existing roadway geometry/ lane configurations and signal timing data/stop sign control data. Signal timing data was obtained from the City of Casper and WYDOT.

Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative measure describing operational conditions of an intersection or any other transportation facility. LOS measures the quality of traffic service, and may be determined for intersections, roadway segments, or arterial corridors based on delay, congested speed, volume to capacity (v/c) ratio, or vehicle density by functional class. At intersections, LOS is a letter designation that corresponds to a certain range of roadway operating conditions. The levels of service range from ' $A$ ' to ' $F$ ', with ' $A^{\prime}$ indicating the best operating conditions and ' $F$ ' indicating the worst, or a failing, operating condition.

The volume-to-capacity ratio ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio) is the ratio of current flow rate to the capacity of the intersection. This ratio is used to determine how much of the capacity for a given roadway is being utilized. A ratio of 1.0 indicates that the roadway is operating at capacity. A ratio of greater than 1.0 indicates that the vehicle volume exceeds the roadway capacity. A ration of less than 1.0 indicates vehicle volume is below the roadway capacity.

Delay (Control delay) is the portion of delay attributed to traffic signal operation for signalized intersections. Control delay (overall delay) can be categorized into deceleration delay, stopped delay, and acceleration delay.

Existing traffic operations were analyzed in Synchro. The results of the analysis are summarized in FIGURE 15. Full Synchro reports are included in Appendix B.

The signalized intersection of E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway operates with 2 signal phases. There are no protected left turn signal phases for either street. Pedestrian signal heads and buttons are present to accommodate pedestrian crossings for each of the 4 legs of the intersection. The level of service for left turns and through movements on both the EB and WB approach of E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street for both the AM and PM peak hours is LOS A. The SW approach of E. Yellowstone Highway operates at a level of service B for both AM and PM peak hours. The NE approach of E. Yellowstone Highway operates at a level of service $C$ for both AM and PM peak hours. The overall intersection LOS for this signal is an LOS A for both AM and PM peak hours.

The signalized intersection of E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway operates with 3 signal phases, including opposing left turn phases for both EB and WB approaches of E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street. There are no protected left turn signal phases for SB E. Yellowstone Highway or NB Kimball Street. Pedestrian signal heads and buttons are present to accommodate pedestrian crossings for each of the 4 legs of the intersection. The level of service for the left turn phases for both the EB and WB approach of E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street for both the AM and PM peak hours is LOS A. For E. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street, the EB is a LOS A in the AM and PM and the WB is a LOS B in the AM and PM. The SB approach of E. Yellowstone Highway operates at a LOS C during the AM and a LOS D during the PM peak hours. The NB approach of Kimball Street operates at a LOS D during the AM peak and a LOS C during the PM peak hours. The overall intersection LOS for this signal is an LOS B for both AM and PM peak hours.

As discussed above and shown in the tables and figures, each intersection performs at an overall acceptable level of service; no intersection has, or are forecast to have, an overall level of service that is below a LOS C.

## TABLE 2: LOS/DELAY/QUEUES

| E Yellowstone Highway @ | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay | Max <br> Queue, <br> Direction | LOS | Delay | Max Queue, Direction |
| $E 1^{\text {st }}$ St | A | 7.9 s | 57' SB | A | 8.6 s | 78'SB |
| $E 2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{St}$ | B | 18 s | 187' NB | B | 17.6 s | 154 ' NB |



FIGURE 15: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) - Existing Conditions


## - Transportation Needs

Based on the analysis, the transportation needs in the project area include improving traffic safety for both motorists and pedestrians. Providing alternatives to address the skewed intersection at E. ${ }^{1 \text { st }}$ Street and E. Yellowstone Highway will improve the safety at this signal. Providing alternatives to address the proximity of S. Kimball Street with the intersection of E. 2nd Street and E. Yellowstone Highway will also enhance the safety of this area.

## Existing Conditions Summary

E. Yellowstone Highway is a 4-lane roadway between E. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and E. 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street in Casper, WY. Traffic safety concerns indicate revisions to the two signalized intersections may improve traffic safety for both motorists and pedestrians. Key findings include:

- The study area is currently operating as commercial with retail/office/service usage. Traffic volumes do not exceed existing roadway capacity on any of the roadways in the study area. PM peak hour volumes are higher than the AM peak, and pedestrian volumes are higher around $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street, near the park.
- The existing level of service is acceptable at all intersections in the study area, performing at an LOS C or higher, using current count volumes.

Crashes in the study area are primarily angle and rear end crashes, with most crashes resulting in only property damage.

- Overall, the pedestrian infrastructure is mostly complete, while the bicycle infrastructure is incomplete.

This information presents a technical foundation for discussing the City's goals for E. Yellowstone Highway including increased transportation options for all modes and improved health and safety of all roadway users.

## Alternatives Development

The existing alignments, proximity of alleyways and other streets to the study intersections as well as overall topography of the study area presented unique challenges when developing viable alternatives. The study team took a holistic approach when analyzing and developing alternatives, looking at impacts beyond just the study area. In order to identify the best alternatives many different options were developed and screened by the team, the City of Casper, WYDOT and the Casper Area MPO staff. The goals of the alternatives are:

- To meet the needs identified in the study;
- To be cost-effective;
- To be feasible and implementable; and
- To improve intersection operation for all user types.

The alternatives include:

- Islands - the inclusion of islands could serve to provide delineation between directions of travel, access management, pedestrian refuge and streetscape improvements.
- Road Diets - eliminating four-lane roadways where they are not warranted could create opportunities for dedicated bike lanes, and center turn lanes that could enhance safety.

Traffic Control - evaluation of traffic control changes (multiway stop, flashing beacon, and traffic signals) were also considered to ensure safe and efficient intersection operations.

- Intersection Alignment - Intersecting roads should be aligned at right angles where possible. This reduces multi-modal crossing distances, improves visibility and decrease vehicle exposure times..



## No Build Alternative

The option to keep each intersection as-is is viable. Each intersection performs relatively satisfactorily as currently design.

## Kimball \& 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street Alternative

This alternative would make Kimball Street from $1^{\text {st }}$ to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street the primary route. The current alignment has a large curb extension that directs traffic to eastbound Yellowstone Highway. Islands would serve to channelize traffic, prevent unwanted turning movements and provide pedestrian refuge mid-crossing. The additional landscaped area at Veteran's Park would allow the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street crosswalk to be moved closer to the intersection, increasing multi-modal safety in the crosswalk.

The Kimball \& 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street alternative is shown in FIGURE 16.

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway: Option \#1

The $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway intersection option \#1 makes Yellowstone Highway south of the intersection a right turn in and out only, the thru-traffic option on westbound Yellowstone would be eliminated. Traffic heading south would be directed to the intersection of Kimball and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street in order to continue in that direction. A HAWK signal would be installed on the east side of the intersection of E. 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street and Lincoln Street, in addition to curb extensions to increase multi-modal visibility and safety. An island would be installed where the existing turn lane from westbound $1^{\text {st }}$ Street to southbound Yellowstone Highway was previously.
$1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Option \#1 is shown in FIGURE 17.

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway: Option \#2

Option \#2 for the intersection of $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and Yellowstone realigns Yellowstone Highway at the north leg of the intersection to create a signalized T-intersection. Southbound traffic from Yellowstone will have a free right turn onto westbound $1^{\text {st }}$ Street thanks to a large island that will channelize traffic and create the new intersection alignment. Traffic at the south leg of the intersection will be right turn in and right turn out only, no thru traffic will be allowed from westbound $1^{\text {st }}$ Street or southbound Yellowstone Highway. Traffic heading south would be directed to the intersection of Kimball and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street in order to continue in that direction. Islands will be installed in $1^{\text {st }}$ Street to channelize traffic, reduce crossing distances and provide pedestrian refuge.

FIGURE 18 shows ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway Option \#2.

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway: Option \#3

The third option evaluated for the intersection of $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway provides reduced crossing distances for pedestrians, a free right turn for traffic going from southbound Yellowstone to westbound $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and a free right turn for westbound ${ }^{1 \text { ts }}$ Street to northbound Yellowstone Highway traffic. The south leg of the intersection is a right turn in and right turn out on Yellowstone. Traffic heading south would be directed to the intersection of Kimball Street and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street in order to continue in that direction. The eastbound turning movement from southbound Yellowstone has been eliminated. Traffic would be redirected to Jackson Street to continue in this direction.

Option \#3 is shown in FIGURE 19.
FIGURE 20 shows the road cross sections for the prosed road diet.

Table 3: Alternatives LOS/DELAY/QUEUES

| \# | Intersection | Approach | Existing - AM (PM) |  |  | Option 2 - AM (PM) |  |  | Option 3-AM (PM) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS | Delay [s] | V/C | LOS | Delay [s] | V/C | LOS | Delay [s] | V/C |
| 1 | 1st St \& Yellowstone Hwy | Overall | B (B) | 11.1 (11.1) | 0.28 (0.39) | A (A) | 5.1 (7.0) | 0.34 (0.48) | A (A) | 4.5 (7.6) | 0.38 (0.53) |
|  |  | EB | A (A) | 3.6 (4.1) | 0.28 (0.37) | A (A) | 3.8 (6.5) | 0.34 (0.50) | A (B) | 7.7 (11.8) | 0.38 (0.60) |
|  |  | WB | A (A) | 3.2 (3.2) | 0.16 (0.13) | A (A) | 6.3 (6.9) | 0.35 (0.30) | A (A) | 3.4 (3.6) | 0.31 (0.26) |
|  |  | NB | C (C) | 27.6 (27.1) | 0.20 (0.20) | - | - | - | C (C) | 26.8 (26.9) | 0.02 (0.05) |
|  |  | SB | C (C) | 28.1 (28.6) | 0.32 (0.48) | D (D) | 37.3 (43.3) | 0.16 (0.44) | A (A) | 0.2 (0.3) | 0.18 (0.24) |
| 2 | 2nd St \& Kimball St | Overall | C (B) | 22.2 (19.8) | 0.31 (0.36) | B (B) | 19.4 (19.1) | 0.22 (0.37) | B (B) | 19.4 (19.1) | 0.22 (0.37) |
|  |  | EB | A (B) | 8.8 (10.9) | 0.08 (0.25) | A (B) | 6.5 (10.9) | 0.08 (0.25) | A (B) | 6.5 (10.9) | 0.08 (0.25) |
|  |  | WB | A (A) | 8.3 (7.9) | 0.20 (0.29) | A (A) | 6.0 (7.9) | 0.19 (0.29) | A (A) | 6.0 (7.9) | 0.19 (0.29) |
|  |  | NB | D (D) | 49.0 (44.5) | 0.72 (0.62) | D (D) | 41.9 (37.5) | 0.40 (0.24) | D (D) | 41.9 (37.5) | 0.40 (0.24) |
|  |  | SB | D (D) | 36.7 (40.9) | 0.24 (0.52) | D (D) | 43.5 (44.1) | 0.43 (0.65) | D (D) | 43.5 (44.1) | 0.43 (0.65) |
| 3 | Kimball \& E Yellowstone Hwy* | Overall | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | EB | A (A) | 9.0 (9.3) | 0.02 (0.03) | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | WB | - | - | - | A (A) | 9.0 (9.0) | 0.01 (0.02) | A (A) | 9.0 (9.0) | 0.01 (0.02) |
|  |  | NB | A (A) | 1.5 (1.5) | 0.03 (0.04) | A (A) | 0.0 (0.0) | 0.06 (0.07) | A (A) | 0.0 (0.0) | 0.06 (0.07) |
|  |  | SB | A (A) | 0.0 (0.0) | 0.04 (0.08) | A (A) | 0.0 (0.0) | 0.04 (0.07) | A (A) | 0.0 (0.0) | 0.04 (0.07) |

*Kimball Street is EB in existing and NB-SB in Alternatives


Figure 16: Kimball \& 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street


Figure 17: $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone - Option \#1
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Figure 18: $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone - Option \#2


Figure 19: ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone - Option \#3
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## Construction Costs

Public Stakeholders met to discuss the alternatives presented above. Each option was retained with the exception of $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and Yellowstone Highway Option \#1. This option did not effectively accomplish the goals of the study in a cost effective and implementable manner. Cost estimates for each of the retained alternatives were developed to a planning and preliminary engineering stage level. Quantities used in each cost estimate were based on the conceptual engineering plans. Total cost and unit prices are calculated in present value dollars (February 2022). Adjustments should be made for inflation costs to future years if improvements are delayed. Costs include engineering and design fees as well as engineering services during construction. No right-of-way acquisition was identified as being necessary to complete these alternatives and therefore no associated costs were included in these estimates. Lastly, these estimates assume full resurfacing of the roadway (e.g. mill and overlay) for any partial roadway work.

Detailed cost estimates for Kimball \& $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street, $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway Option \#2, and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway Option \#3 are included in the following tables.

Table 4: Kimball \& $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street

| KIMBALL \& 2ND STRE다 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preparation of Final Design and Specifications |  |  |  |  | \$30,800.00 |
| Permitting and Mitigation |  |  |  |  | \$5,000.00 |
| Legal Fees |  |  |  |  | \$0.00 |
| Acquisition of Access and Right-of-way |  |  |  |  | \$0.00 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOBILIZATION \& BONDS | LS | 1 | \$28,000.00 | \$28,000.00 |  |
| DEMOLITION \& REMOVAL | LS | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000.00 |  |
| WATER LINE RELOCATION | LS | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000.00 |  |
| CONCRETE WALK WITH ADA RAMPS | LS | 1 | \$20,000.00 | \$20,000.00 |  |
| RAISED MEDIAN/ISLANDS | LS | 1 | \$100,000.00 | \$100,000.00 |  |
| ASPHALT REPLACEMENTS | LS | 1 | \$70,000.00 | \$70,000.00 |  |
| STRIPING \& SIGNAGE | LS | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000.00 |  |
| LANDSCAPING | LS | 1 | \$25,000.00 | \$25,000.00 |  |
| IRRIGATION | LS | 1 | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |  |
| ROADWAY LIGHTING | LS | 1 | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |  |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL | LS | 1 | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |  |
| Construction Cost Subtotal No. 1 |  |  |  | \$308,000.00 |  |
| Engineering Services During Construction (10\%) |  |  |  | \$30,800.00 |  |
| Construction Cost Subtotal No. 2 |  |  |  | \$338,800.00 |  |
| Contingency ( $25 \%$ of CCS No. 2) |  |  |  | \$84,700.00 |  |
| Construction Cost Total |  |  |  |  | \$423,500.00 |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST |  |  |  |  | 460,000.00 |

Table 5: $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway - Option \#2

## 1ST STREET \& YELLOWSTONE: OPTION \#2



Table 6: $1^{\text {st }}$ Street \& Yellowstone Highway - Option \#3

## 1ST STREET \& YELLOWSTONE: OPTION \#3



## Findings and Recommendations

This report evaluated existing conditions for the intersection of E. Yellowstone Highway with $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Streets including traffic volumes, traffic operations, traffic safety, signal operations, and multi-modal accessibility. These intersections were identified in previous transportation plans as being problem intersections.

Based on stakeholder feedback, public input and technical analysis, it is recommended that the intersection of Kimball and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street be redesigned to make Kimball Street the primary north-south route between $1^{\text {st }}$ Street and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street as shown in Figure 16. This redesign increases multimodal safety during crossing movements, reduces driver confusion and allows for increased beautification at the entrance to downtown Casper. It is further recommended that the intersection of East Yellowstone Highway and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street be realigned to create a T-intersection (Option \#2). A T-intersection reduces crossing distances for both vehicles and multimodal users. The channelized free right turn reduces travel times and reduces the potential for angle crashes. These intersection improvements would improve overall user safety and increase accessibility to multi-modal transportation options.

In addition to the intersection improvements identified above it is recommended that a road diet be implemented on $1^{\text {st }}$ Street between Lincoln Street and Conwell Street to create one travel lane in each direction, a center turn lane and dedicated bike lanes on each side of the road. Minor striping improvements can achieve this recommendation in the short term. Future improvements could create a protected bike lane to increase safety for multi-modal user.

Detailed engineering design plans for each intersection should be developed and additional community outreach should be conducted during design. Driver education and community acceptance will be key to the success of the redesign of these areas.

Appendix A
Traffic Count Reports



| Start | 29-Apr-21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Thu | NB | SB |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| 12:00 AM |  | 9 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 01:00 |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 02:00 |  | 5 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| 03:00 |  | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 04:00 |  | 9 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| 05:00 |  | 19 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |
| 06:00 |  | 80 | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124 |
| 07:00 |  | 190 | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 306 |
| 08:00 |  | 212 | 164 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 376 |
| 09:00 |  | 205 | 156 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 361 |
| 10:00 |  | 197 | 146 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 343 |
| 11:00 |  | 243 | 218 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 461 |
| 12:00 PM |  | 232 | 215 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 447 |
| 01:00 |  | 245 | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 461 |
| 02:00 |  | 200 | 214 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 414 |
| 03:00 |  | 293 | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 509 |
| 04:00 |  | 252 | 251 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 503 |
| 05:00 |  | 216 | 241 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 457 |
| 06:00 |  | 165 | 167 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 332 |
| 07:00 |  | 93 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 193 |
| 08:00 |  | 73 | 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 161 |
| 09:00 |  | 49 | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 105 |
| 10:00 |  | 28 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54 |
| 11:00 |  | 12 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |
| Total |  | 3035 | 2683 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5718 |
| Percent |  | 53.1\% | 46.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  | 11:00 | 11:00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11:00 |
| Vol. |  | 243 | 218 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 461 |
| PM Peak |  | 15:00 | 16:00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15:00 |
| Vol. | - | 293 | 251 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 509 |
| Grand Total |  | 3035 | 2683 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5718 |
| Percent |  | 53.1\% | 46.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADT |  | ADT 5,718 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





| Start <br> Time | $\begin{gathered} \text { 29-Apr-21 } \\ \text { Thu } \end{gathered}$ | NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 AM |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00 |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 |  | 133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00 |  | 124 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09:00 |  | 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:00 |  | 126 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00 |  | 161 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00 PM |  | 198 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00 |  | 152 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00 |  | 162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00 |  | 149 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00 |  | 138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00 |  | 114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00 |  | 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00 |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09:00 |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:00 |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 1835 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | - | 11:00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vol. | - | 161 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PM Peak | - | 12:00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vol. | - | 198 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Grand Total |  | 1835 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADT |  | ADT 1,835 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




Appendix B
Traffic Capacity Analysis
(Synchro) Worksheets

|  | $\rangle$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | 中t |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 10 | 20 | 80 | 85 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 5 | 10 | 20 | 80 | 85 | 5 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 5 | 11 | 22 | 87 | 92 | 5 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  | 104 | 950 |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 192 | 48 | 97 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 192 | 48 | 97 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.8 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 99 | 99 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 760 | 1010 | 1494 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 16 | 51 | 58 | 61 | 36 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 5 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |  |
| CSH | 916 | 1494 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.02 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 17.8\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个个 |  | \％ | 性 |  |  | ＊$\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢1 |  |
| Trafic Volume（vph） | 175 | 215 | 0 | 5 | 355 | 30 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 95 | 170 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 175 | 215 | 0 | 5 | 355 | 30 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 95 | 170 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 5.4 | 5.4 |  | 5.4 | 5.4 |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 4.2 |  |
| Lane Utill．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Fit | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.91 |  |
| FIt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 3539 |  | 1770 | 3497 |  |  | 3503 |  |  | 3201 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.51 | 1.00 |  | 0.61 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.93 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 944 | 3539 |  | 1129 | 3497 |  |  | 3273 |  |  | 3045 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 190 | 234 | 0 | 5 | 386 | 33 | 5 | 87 | 5 | 5 | 103 | 185 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 190 | 234 | 0 | 5 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 52.4 | 52.4 |  | 52.4 | 52.4 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |
| Effective Green， $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{s})$ | 52.4 | 52.4 |  | 52.4 | 52.4 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.73 | 0.73 |  |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| Clearance Time（s） | 5.4 | 5.4 |  | 5.4 | 5.4 |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 4.2 |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  | 1.0 |  |  | 1.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 687 | 2575 |  | 821 | 2545 |  |  | 454 |  |  | 422 |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm | c0．20 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | c0．04 |  |
| v／c Ratio | 0.28 | 0.09 |  | 0.01 | 0.16 |  |  | 0.20 |  |  | 0.32 |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 3.3 | 2.9 |  | 2.7 | 3.0 |  |  | 27.5 |  |  | 27.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 1.0 | 0.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Delay（s） | 4.3 | 2.9 |  | 2.7 | 3.2 |  |  | 27.6 |  |  | 28.1 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | A | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.2 |  |  | 27.6 |  |  | 28.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 11.1 |  | HCM 2000 | Level of S | ervice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 72.0 |  | Sum of lost | time（s） |  |  | 9.6 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 49．1\％ |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Appendix C
Public Comment

## Public Comments

Option one in the packet (pg. 30 of 65) does not address the complicated intersection. You will still have cars making an odd turn from east bound 1st to north bound yellowstone, which is one of the primary reasons we have accidents. . It is how I ended up in my accident, and end up almost getting hit other times.

Option two addresses the odd turn angle, but it restricts traffic on Yellowstone.

It seems to me that the added median on the second st. and kimball/yellowstone intersection drawing (the one on yellowstone) would be unnecessary. I know y'all want it to discourage certain traffic patterns, but I don't think it would be overall helpful. We have a lot of large pick-ups in this town, and while this option would probably fit with most metro planning tools, I don't think it's a good fit for Casper/Wyoming.

In your option 2 drawing for yellowstone \& first, no one - in any vehicle, will be able to make the right hand turn off of east bound first onto southbound yellowstone. That angle is too tight and the medians are definitely not demonstrated as being feasible.

Could I suggest that the city - before investing a lot of money into restructuring the entire area - instead install turn signals on first street, and change the lights to reflect those turns? Maybe pattern it a little after the first and poplar intersection? Where Yellowstone can travel both directions at the same time, but first street lights alternate? Maybe allow the straight through to travel and then work in the turn signals (they CANNOT turn at the same time from both east bound and west bound first street!). It would seem to me that installing turn signals and adjusting the timing would be less costly than remodeling the entire area. I know it doesn't address pedestrian cross traffic, but if the lights work for turns, then the pedestrian crossing could be addressed.

Thank you again for trying to tackle this project. I just don't think the two options for first and yellowstone are great options.


#### Abstract

If they do use option 3 - I would recommend adding the pedestrian crosswalk thing back by Lincoln street like it is shown in option 1.


NO, it stops west travel down Yellowstone to Collins, creates a snow plowing and street sweeping debacle with all the islands.

Essentially then y'all are planning on making it so no one travels through on E Yellowstone Hwy. That's a horrible idea.
And option 2 is the only one that reasonable addresses the awkward turns onto yellowstone off of first street.
What do our plow drivers (not their mangers) think about all these medians? How will they impact snow removal - not just plowing, but where the snow is put when it's removed from the street.
Can't you just add turn signals and design the traffic flow a little like first \& poplar? I like the pedestrian crossing options on 1 better than 2 or 3 for yellowstone \& first.

This looks like a mess. No continuous west travel on Yellowstone which is going to route people to busier downtown streets to get back to where they need to be on Yellowstone. For East travel on Yellowstone you've set up a double turn to achieve continuous travel on Yellowstone. Stop at a sign, turn right on First, immediately having to switch lanes at a stop light to make a left turn back on to Yellowstone. This setup looks like a great setup for traffic jams and wrecks around the 8am and 5pm increased traffic times.

Those responsible for maintaing the roads, whether it be proper striping, building streets that last longer than a year or two, keeping them clean and free of debris, etc lack the ability to do so. And you want to change what can not be maintained? No. Do better than you are now before making changes like these with our tax dollars. Stop paying lower bidder and begin with quality workmanship. Build a budget to be able to do extras. Always complaining about no funds and want to tax more. Wrong approach. Enough said for now. Great place to begin.

Who was the brain child that designed this. No sense of traffic flow...at all.
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