Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Traffic Engineering Division

Access Justification Report Checklist

Facility:		Interchange:	
Job Piece:		Project #:	
County:		ODOT Division:	
Reviewed By:		Report Date:	
Document Status:	☐ Draft ☐ Final	☐ Revision	☐ Conceptual

YES	NO	N/A	
1. Executive Summary			
☐	☐	☐	a. The purpose and need for the new or revised access point is provided. Matches NEPA document. Clearly describe and summarize why the new or revised access point is needed.
☐	☐	☐	b. A statement regarding the status of NEPA.
☐	☐	☐	c. Total estimated cost of the proposed project is provided which includes right-of-way, utilities, design, and construction.
☐	☐	☐	d. Communities and facilities directly served, including size(s) are in report.
☐	☐	☐	e. Provide a map to scale showing the area of influence and distances for the proposed change in access to be studied. (See Appendix A)

2. Preliminary Engineering Analysis (Existing Facilities and Transportation System Management)

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.

Reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate and/or local road system will not provide the desired access without the proposed change in access.

			NO-BUILD CONDITION
☐	☐	☐	a. A drawing showing design elements of the existing condition (including committed projects) within the area of the proposed access change (not area of influence) has been provided including but not limited to ramp geometry and control type, number of travel lanes, shoulder widths, acceleration and deceleration lane lengths, auxiliary lane lengths, storage bay lengths, frontage roads, and collector/distributor roads.
☐	☐	☐	b. Develop design traffic for current and future year for area of influence. Future volumes are for a design period 20 years from the anticipated opening date of the project. The tool used for demand forecasting should follow the process defined by NCHRP 765. Ensure there have not been any changes to the analysis area from the time traffic volumes were collected. Perform any necessary updated traffic data collection to verify traffic volumes are still valid.
☐	☐	☐	c. Report includes an operational analysis of the no-build condition for area of influence. No-build condition includes any improvements that will be made with any other committed projects. For complex interchanges where simpler methods of analysis (e.g. Highway Capacity Software, Synchro) are inadequate to represent the no-build configuration, microsimulation software (e.g. PTV Vissim) should be used to create a calibrated model for analysis. Include reasoning for why determined method of analysis was selected.
☐	☐	☐	d. Operational analysis measures of effectiveness (MOE's) should be clearly defined and include network-level measurements (e.g. network delay, travel time, throughput, Level of Service) as well as element-level measurements (e.g. intersection delay, queue lengths, weave-area density). Select MOE's according to the purpose and need.

YES	NO	N/A	
☐	☐	☐	e. Report includes a summary of the project's existing safety-related data within the study area for at least the five most-recent years of available and complete crash data. Identify problematic crash patterns within the study area. Distinguish between injury and non-injury crashes.
			NO-BUILD WITH MINOR MODIFICATIONS CONDITION
☐	☐	☐	f. Report must identify potential minor fixes to the no-build that would improve deficiencies demonstrated in previous section. Minor fixes may include, but are not limited to: access control; signal re-timing; signal re-phasing; signal coordination; removing signals; adding signals; adding turn pockets; restriping to add or reallocate capacity within existing pavement; use of innovative intersections; installation of roundabouts; construction of accessible bus stops; construction of bus lay-bys; construction of bus queue jumps; construction of sidewalks; construction of bike lanes.
☐	☐	☐	g. Report includes an operational analysis of the no-build condition implementing identified minor modifications utilizing the same operational analysis techniques as used in the no-build evaluation.
☐	☐	☐	h. Discuss Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) modifications such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV improvements and their impact on the identified deficiencies.

3. Policy Point 1 (Operational and Safety Analysis)

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, and ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis should, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), paragraphs 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, should 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 should 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 should 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)).

☐	☐	☐	a. Report includes an operational analysis of the proposed change in access. Use the same methodology for analysis as was used with the no-build and no-build with minor modifications. Provide comparison tables showing the no-build vs no-build with minor modifications vs the proposed change in access. (See Preferred Table Formats xlsx)
☐	☐	☐	b. Report includes a safety analysis for the area of the proposed change in access (not influence area), considering all locations where traffic is being rerouted. In situations where simpler methods of analysis (e.g. crash modification factors or Highway Safety Manual methods) are inadequate to predict the change in the substantive crash performance, more in depth analysis methods (e.g. iSATe, IHSDM) should be used to perform the analysis. Include reasoning for why determined method of analysis was selected.
☐	☐	☐	c. Report contains a conceptual signing and striping plan for the proposed change in access. Signing plan is to scale and includes sign types and messages, as well as any existing interchange-related signs in area of influence and all existing freeway signs. Designate any signs to be removed within the study area.
☐	☐	☐	d. A summary statement of impact has been included detailing what effect the added interchange will have on the Interstate's operations and safety.

YES	NO	N/A	
4. Policy Point 2 (Access Connection and Design)			
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, such as managed lanes (e.g., transit or high occupancy vehicle and high occupancy toll 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)). In rare instances where all basic movements are not provided by the proposed design, the report should include a full-interchange option with a comparison of the operational and safety analyses to the partial-interchange option. The report should also include the mitigation proposed to compensate for the missing movements, including wayfinding signage, impacts on local intersections, mitigation of driver expectation leading to wrong-way movements on ramps, etc. The report should describe whether future provision of a full interchange is precluded by the proposed design.			
☐	☐	☐	a. A drawing showing design elements of the proposed condition (including committed projects) within the area of the proposed access change (not area of influence) has been provided including, but not limited to, ramp geometry and control type, number of travel lanes, shoulder widths, acceleration and deceleration lane lengths, auxiliary lane lengths, storage bay lengths, frontage roads, and collector/distributor roads. Include any other design details regarding the proposed change in access.
☐	☐	☐	b. Proposed access connects to a public road.
☐	☐	☐	c. All traffic movements provided which creates a "full interchange." If a partial interchange is proposed, the report discusses a full interchange configuration (including operations and safety analysis) with justification presented for why a full interchange is not proposed. The design should not preclude adding the missing movement(s) in the future.
☐	☐	☐	d. Design adheres to AASHTO A Policy on Design Standards - Interstate System (latest). All design exceptions have been clearly identified and justified.
☐	☐	☐	e. Explanation of proposed access demonstrating lane balance and the basic number of lanes to maintain basic movements.

Appendix A

Area of Influence