SECTION 3: PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

To prioritize the proposed improvements, a matrix was developed to score projects and to determine in which order they should be completed. Proposed improvements were evaluated based on how well each improvement met the goals of UDOT. UDOT's *final four* was used as the basis for evaluation criteria. These criteria were prioritized by level of importance, which was based on a scale of zero to five: zero having small importance and five having great importance. The following is a list of the final four and the level of importance score assigned for each category:

- Take Care of What We Have: 4
- Make the System Work Better: 3
- Improve Safety: 5
- Increase Capacity: 4

A value was then assigned to each proposed improvement based on its ability to achieve the evaluation criteria. These values were determined based on time (i.e., when is the improvement needed), the improvement's level of importance, or the improvement's level of effectiveness in meeting the criteria.

The time-based scoring system evaluated capacity and pavement; the values were given based on when the roadway would no longer meet capacity needs and when the pavement would need to be replaced. If the replacement was needed in the next two years, a value of five was assigned. This time-based scoring system analyzed each improvement in relation to the *increase capacity* and *take care of what we have* criteria. These time-based values can be seen in Table 3-1.

The importance-based values prioritized improvements by evaluating which were critical for geometric corrections or for safety. This system helped to evaluate each improvement in relation to the *take care of what we have* criterion. These importance-based values can be seen in Table 3-2.

The effectiveness-based values were determined by evaluating an improvement's effect on accident clusters. If the proposed improvement corrected a geometric deficiency at an accident cluster location, then the improvement was given a value of five. This system helped to evaluate each improvement in relation to the *improve safety* and *make the system work better* criteria. These effectiveness-based values can be seen in Tables 3-3 and 3-4.

Table 3-1: Time-Based Values

Take Care Of What We Have And Increase Capacity		
From	To	Value
2008	2010	5
2011	2013	4.5
2014	2016	4
2017	2020	3.5
2021	2025	3
2026	2030	2.5
2031	2035	2
2036	2040	1.5

Table 3-2: Importance-Based Values

Take Care of What We Have	
Value	Description
5	Maintenance of Project Is Critical
4	Maintenance of Project Is Important
3	Maintenance of Project Is Average
2	Maintenance of Project Is Helpful
1	Maintenance of Project Is Minor
0	Project Does Not Address Any Maintenance Concern

Table 3-3: Effectiveness-Based Values

Make the System Work Better	
Value	Description
5	Critical System Needs (Structural Maintenance)
4	Important System Needs (Vertical Clearance)
3	Average System Needs (Improve Ramp Acceleration and Deceleration Lengths)
2	Helpful System Needs (Climbing Lanes, Chain-up Area)
1	Minor System Needs
0	Project Does Not Address Any System Concerns

Table 3-4: Effectiveness-Based Values

Improve Safety	
Value	Description
5	Documented Geometric Deficiency Associated with an Accident Cluster
4	Roadside Deficiencies with Safety Index Score of Four or Greater
3	Roadside Deficiencies with Safety Index Score of Three or Less
2	Low Level of Safety Concern Such As Deer Traffic Areas
1	Minimal Safety Concerns
0	Project Does Not Address Any Safety Concerns

Once values were assigned to each proposed improvement, the improvement was then given a total score. This score was calculated for each improvement by first multiplying the evaluation criteria's level of importance score with the improvement's time-based, importance-based, and effectiveness-based values; this resulted in a subtotal for each evaluation criteria. The improvement's subtotals for each evaluation criteria were then added together, which resulted in a total score. Figure 3-1 shows the values assigned for each proposed improvement and their total score.

Once total scores had been calculated, all improvements were sorted by their recommended completion years and put into three phases, which correlate with the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). If the recommended completion year occurred between 2010 to 2015, the improvement was placed into Phase I. If the recommended completion year occurred between 2016 to 2025, the improvement was placed into Phase II. If the recommended completion year occurred between 2026 to 2040, the improvement was placed into Phase III. After the improvements had been sorted into the three phases, they were then sorted by their total scores from high to low. Those with the highest scores are considered the highest priority improvements for the corridor.

Once these improvements were organized into the three phases and sorted by total score, it was evident that each phase addressed a different aspect of the corridor's needs. Phase I projects are mostly in the rural area from MP 19 to 42. These projects consist of fixing geometrics (especially those related to crash clusters), providing pavement rehabilitation, fixing guardrails, improving clear zones, providing structural maintenance, extending ramp acceleration and deceleration lengths, constructing passing lanes, and providing preliminary design for Phase II capacity projects. Phase II projects are capacity improvement projects in the urban area from Bloomington to Hurricane (MP 4 to 16). The Phase II projects also include realigning the NB on-ramp and providing a chain-up area at the Browse interchange (MP 30). Phase III projects are scattered over the corridor with the most notable being capacity improvements from the stateline to Bloomington (MP 0 to 4).

Figure 3-2 shows the prioritized project matrix. This matrix includes the projects in order according to their ranking. The five projects highlighted in yellow at the top of the matrix are projects in the corridor that are already funded. The total score for each of these projects shows that these projects should be completed in the next five years. The figure also lists the recommended construction year and environmental/design year for the proposed improvement. The environmental or design year notes what year the environmental or design process will need to start so that the actual construction of the project is not delayed.

Project costs have been included for a present 2008 cost and for a future construction-year cost. Future construction-year costs were determined by adding seven percent per year to the 2008 cost. Completing Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III projects at one time should be considered to save overall costs due to inflation (the $364,791,000 present 2008 cost versus the $928,908,000 construction-year cost). Also, completing these projects within a few years of construction, as opposed to several years of construction, would minimize impacts to the traveling public.

Figure 3-2 includes information regarding potential impacts to environmental recourses or environmentally sensitive sites.

Figure 3-1: Scoring of Proposed Improvements

	Project	From MP	To MP	Design/Environmental Year	Environmental/Design Year	Recommended Completion Year (Based on Maintenance or Capacity)	Rural vs. Urban	Maintain What We Have			Interchanges/Structures (Make the System Work Better)			Improve Safety			Increase Capacity			Total Score
								Importance	Value	Score	Importance	Value	Score	Importance	Value	Score	Importance	Value	Score	
1	**Safety Improvements Project**	**0.0**	**42.2**	**-**	**2009**	**2010**	**-**	**4**	**5**	**20**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**5**	**25**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**45**
2	MP 0 to 4.6 (High Seal)	0.0	4.6	2022	2020	2022	Urban	4	3	12	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	25
3	Capacity Improvements - State Line to Atkinville	0.0	2.1	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23
4	Structure Widening - State Line to Atkinville	0.0	4.6	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23
5	Capacity improvements - Atkinville to Bloomington	2.1	4.6	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23
6	**Atkinville - Interchange Phase I**	**2.1**	**2.4**	**2008**	**2005**	**2008**	**Urban**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**5**	**15**	**5**	**2**	**10**	**4**	**5**	**20**	**45**
7	**Bloomington - Interchange Improvements**	**4.6**	**6.3**	**6.3**	**-**	**-**	**Urban**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**12**	**5**	**3**	**15**	**4**	**3.5**	**14**	**41**
8	**Dixie - Interchange Improvements Phase I**	**4.6**	**6.0**	**2010**	**2008**	**2010**	**Urban**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**5**	**15**	**5**	**3**	**15**	**4**	**5**	**20**	**50**
9	Capacity Improvements - Bloomington to Dixie	4.6	5.7	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27
10	Structure Widening - Bloomington to Dixie	4.6	5.7	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27
11	Pavement Maintenance - High Seal	4.6	6.3	-			Urban	4	3.5	14	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	27
12	Capacity Improvements - Dixie to Bluff	5.7	6.3	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27
13	Structure Widening - Dixie to Bluff	5.7	6.3	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27
14	**Pavement Rehab - MP 6 to 10**	**6.3**	**10.7**	**2008**	**2007**	**2008**	**Urban**	**4**	**5**	**20**	**3**	**3**	**9**	**5**	**3**	**15**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**44**
15	Capacity Improvements - Bluff to BLVD	6.3	8.8	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25
16	Structure Widening - Bluff to BLVD	6.3	8.8	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25
17	Pavement Maintenance - High Seal	6.3	10.9	-			Urban	4	3	12	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	25
18	Coordinate City Drainage Problems with Widening	6.3	10.9	-			Urban	4	3	12	3	0	0	5	0	0	4	0	0	12
19	Capacity Improvements - BLVD to Washington	8.8	10.9	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25
20	Structure Widening - BLVD to Washington	8.8	10.9				Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25
21	**Pavement Rehab - MP 10 to 19**	**10.7**	**19.4**	**2009**	**2008**	**2009**	**Urban**	**4**	**5**	**20**	**3**	**3**	**9**	**5**	**3**	**15**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**44**
22	Capacity Improvements - Washington to Hurricane	10.9	16.1	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25
23	Structure Widening - Washington to Hurricane	10.9	16.1	-			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25
24	Pavement Maintenance - High Seal	10.9	16.1				Urban	4	3	12	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	25
25	MP 19 to 27 (Minor Rahab)	19.4	27.3	2030	2028	2030	Rural	4	2	8	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	21
26	Improve Ramp Accel and Decel Lengths (South Leeds Exit 22 and North Leeds Exit 23)	19.4	27.3		0	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	40
27	Pavement Rehab - Functional Overlay	19.4	27.3	2015	0	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	1	3	5	3	15	4	0	0	34
28	Structural Maintenance (Harrisburg Creek MP 20.2, South Leeds Exit 22, and North Leeds Exit 23)	19.4	27.3	-	0	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	5	15	5	0	0	4	0	0	31
29	Flatten Sideslopes and Remove Clearzone Hazards	19.4	27.3	-	0	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	31
30	Improve runout length of guardrail and update end sections	19.4	27.3	-	0	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	31
31	Add NB Climbing Lane	20.0	21.5	-	2031	2033	Rural	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	2	10	4	0	0	16
32	Improve South Leeds NB Off-Ramp Terminal Intersection	21.7	22.8	-	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	4	12	5	5	25	4	0	0	53
33	Correct Horizontal Curve at MP 23	23.0	23.9	-	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	5	25	4	0	0	41
34	Improve Vertical Clearance for I-15 NB and SB structures at MP 23.7	23.6	23.8	-	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	4	12	5	2	10	4	0	0	38
35	MP 27 to 34 (High Seal)	27.3	34.3	2028	2026	2028	Rural	4	2.5	10	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	23
36	Improve Ramp Accel and Decel Lengths (Toquerville Exit 27, Browse Exit 30,Pintura Exit 31, and Snowfield Exit 33)	27.3	34.3	-	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	42
37	Pavement Rehab	27.3	34.3	2012	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	1	3	5	4	20	4	0	0	41
38	Structural Maintenance (Toquerville Exit 27, Browse Exit 30, Ash Creek MP 31.1, Pintura Exit 31, Leap Creek MP 33.2, and Snowfield Exit 33)	27.3	34.3	-	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	5	15	5	0	0	4	0	0	33
39	Flatten Sideslopes and Remove Clearzone Hazards	27.3	34.3	-	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	4	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	33
40	Improve runout length of guardrail any update end sections	27.3	34.3	-	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	4	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	33
41	Deer Fence	27.3	34.3	-	2029	2031	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	2	10	4	0	0	18
42	Add NB climbing lane	28.2	30.6	-	2027	2029	Rural	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	3	15	4	0	0	21
43	Relocate NB on ramp Browse Interchange MP 30	30.0	31.2	-	2011	2013	Rural	4	1	4	3	3	9	5	2	10	4	0	0	23
44	Provide chain-up area with advance signing at MP 30 or 33 Interchange	30.0	34.0	-	2022	2024	Rural	4	2	8	3	2	6	5	2	10	4	0	0	24
45	Fix Vertical Clearance Browse Interchange MP 30	30.4	30.9	-	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	4	12	5	2	10	4	0	0	40
46	MP 34 to 42 (High Seal)	34.3	42.2	2026	2024	2026	Rural	4	2.5	10	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	23
47	Add NB Climbing Lane	34.1	37.1	-	2019	2021	Rural	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	4	20	4	1.5	6	32
48	Improve Ramp Accel and Decel Lengths (Ranch Exit 36, Kolob Exut 40, and New Harmoney Exit 42)	34.3	42.2	-	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	42
49	Pavement Rehab	34.3	42.2	2010	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	1	3	5	4	20	4	0	0	41
50	Flatten Sideslopes and Remove Clearzone Hazards	34.3	42.2	-	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	0	0	5	4	20	4	0	0	38
51	Improve runout length of guardrail and update end sections	34.3	42.2	-	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	0	0	5	4	20	4	0	0	38
52	Structural Maintenance (Ranch Exit 36, Ash Creek Spillway MP 37.2, Kolob Exit 40, Dry Creek Culvert MP 40.8, New Harmoney Exit 42)	34.3	42.2	-	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	5	15	5	0	0	4	0	0	33
53	Deer Fence	34.3	42.2	-	2029	2031	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	2	10	4	0	0	18
54	Snow Fence	34.3	42.2	-	2033	2035	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	1	5	4	0	0	13
55	Black Ridge Curve - Safety Improvements	37.2	38.4	-	2009	2011	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	5	25	4	0	0	41
56	Improve Drainage in area to prevent ponding	38.2	42.2	-	2024	2026	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	1	5	4	0	0	13

Project Legend

- Safety Improvements Project
- MP 0 to 4.6 (High Seal)
- Capacity Improvements (State Line to Bloomington)
- Under Construction or in Design
- Capacity Improvements (Dixie Phase II, Bloomington to Bluff)
- Capacity Improvements (Bluff to Washington)
- Capacity Improvements (Washington to Hurricane)
- MP 19 to 27 (High Seal)
- MP 19 to 27 (Pavement Rehab)
- MP 27 to 34 (Pavement Rehab)
- MP 27 to 34 (High Seal)
- MP 34 to 42 (Pavement Rehab)
- MP 34 to 42 (High Seal)

Note

\# Matches the numbering of Figures 2-X to 2-X

Evaluation Criteria

Maintain What We Have - Importance Based

Value	Note
5	Maintenance of project is Critical
4	Maintenance of project is Important
3	Maintenance of project is Average
2	Maintenance of project is Helpful
1	Maintenance of project is Minor
0	Project Does Not Address Any Maintenance Concern

Improve Safety

Value	Note
5	Documented Geometric Deficiency Associated with an Accident Cluster
4	Roadside Deficiencies with safety index score of 4 or greater
3	Roadside Deficiencies with safety index score of 3 or less
2	Low Level of Safety Concern, Deer Traffic Areas
1	Minimal Safety Concerns
0	Project Does Not Address Any Safety Concerns

Make the System Work Better

Value	Note
5	Critical System Needs (Structural Maintenance)
4	Important System Needs (Vertical Clearance)
3	Average System Needs (Improve Ramp Accel/Decel Lengths)
2	Helpful System Needs (Climbing Lanes, Chain-up Area)
1	Minor System Needs
0	Project Does Not Address Any System Concerns

Maintain What We Have - Time Based

Value	Note
5	2008 to 2010
4.5	2011 to 2013
4	2014 to 2016
3.5	2017 to 2020
3	2021 to 2025
2.5	2026 to 2030
2	2031 to 2035
1.5	2036 to 2040
0	none

Increase Capacity

Value	Note
5	2008 to 2010
4.5	2011 to 2013
4	2014 to 2016
3.5	2017 to 2020
3	2021 to 2025
2.5	2026 to 2030
2	2031 to 2035
1.5	2036 to 2040
0	none

Figure 3-1: Scoring of Proposed Improvements

Figure 3-2: Prioritized Projects Matrix

		Project	From MP	To MP	Environmental Design Year	Recommended Completion Year	Rural vs. Urban	Maintain What We Have			Interchanges/Structures (Make the System Work Better)			Improve Safety			Increase Capacity			Total Score	Preliminary 2008 Cost	Preliminary Construction Year Cost	Environmental Resources Project Area	Archeological Sites in Project Area
								Importance	Value	Score	Importance	Value	Score	Importance	Value	Score	Importance	Value	Score					
Phase I Present to 2015	8	**Dixie - Interchange Improvements Phase I**	4.6	6.0	-	2010	Urban	4	0	0	3	5	15	5	3	15	4	5	20	50	-	-	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	Yes
	6	**Atkinville - Interchange Phase I**	1.6	2.4	-	2008	Urban	4	0	0	3	5	15	5	2	10	4	5	20	45	-	-	T&E Plants (Holmgren Milkvetch), Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	7	**Bloomington - Interchange Improvements**	4.6	6.3	-	-	Urban	4	0	0	3	4	12	5	3	15	4	3.5	14	41	-	-	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	No
	14	**Pavement Rehab - MP 10 to 19**	10.7	19.4	-	2009	Urban	4	5	20	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	44	-	-	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat, T&E Plants	Yes
	21	**Pavement Rehab - MP 6 to 10**	0.0	10.7	-	2008	Urban	4	5	20	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	44	-	-	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	No
	32*	Improve South Leads NB Off-Ramp Terminal Intersection	19.4	27.3	2009	2010	Rural	4	4	16	3	4	12	5	5	25	4	0	0	53	$ 1,035,100	$ 1,183,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	1	**Safety Improvements Project**	0.0	42.2	2009	2010	-	4	5	20	3	0	0	5	5	25	4	0	0	45	$ 46,000	$ 53,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat	No
	48	Improve Ramp Accel and Decel Lengths	34.3	42.2	2009	2010	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	42	$ 2,083,400	$ 2,380,000		No
	36	Improve Ramp Accel and Decel Lengths	27.3	34.3	2011	2012	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	42	$ 3,275,800	$ 4,271,000		No
	55*	Black Ridge Curve - Safety Improvements	34.3	42.2	2009	2010	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	5	25	4	0	0	41	$ 9,227,900	$ 10,538,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	No
	49	Pavement Rehab	34.3	42.2	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	1	3	5	4	20	4	0	0	41	$14,312,100	$ 17,466,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	Yes
	37	Pavement Rehab	27.3	34.3	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	1	3	5	4	20	4	0	0	41	$ 12,951,400	$ 18,049,000	None	Yes
	33*	Correct Horizontal Curve at MP 23	19.4	27.3	2013	2014	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	5	25	4	0	0	41	$ 2,951,300	$ 4,396,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	45	Fix Vertical Clearance Browse Interchange MP 30	27.3	34.3	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	4	12	5	2	10	4	0	0	40	$ 94,600	$ 131,000	None	No
	26	Improve Ramp Accel and Decel Lengths	19.4	27.3	2013	2014	Rural	4	4	16	3	3	9	5	3	15	4	0	0	40	$ 614,900	$ 916,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	50	Flatten Sideslopes and Remove Clear Zone Hazards	34.3	42.2	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	0	0	5	4	20	4	0	0	38	$ 858,000	$ 1,048,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	Yes
	51	Improve runout length of guardrail and update end sections	34.3	42.2	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	0	0	5	4	20	4	0	0	38	$ 1,243,000	$ 1,516,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	Yes
	34	Improve Vertical Clearance for I-15 NB and SB structures at MP 23.7	19.4	27.3	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	4	12	5	2	10	4	0	0	38	$ 293,700	$ 468,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	27	Pavement Rehab - Functional Overlay	19.4	27.3	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	1	3	5	3	15	4	0	0	34	$ 5,875,100	$ 9,350,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	52	Structural Maintenance	34.3	42.2	2009	2011	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	5	15	5	0	0	4	0	0	33	$ 1,299,100	$ 1,585,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	No
	38	Structural Maintenance	27.3	34.3	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	3	5	15	5	0	0	4	0	0	33	$ 1,111,000	$ 1,549,000	None	No
	39	Flatten Sideslopes and Remove Clear Zone Hazards	27.3	34.3	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	4	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	33	$ 806,300	$ 1,124,000	None	Yes
	40	Improve runout length of guardrail and update end sections	27.3	34.3	2011	2013	Rural	4	4.5	18	4	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	33	$ 816,200	$ 1,137,000	None	Yes
	47	Add Climbing Lane MP 34 to 36.7	34.3	42.2	2011	2012	Rural	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	4	20	4	1.5	6	32	$ 4,581,500	$ 5,976,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	No
	28	Structural Maintenance	19.4	27.3	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	5	15	5	0	0	4	0	0	31	$ 574,200	$ 914,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	No
	29	Flatten Sideslopes and Remove Clear Zone Hazards	19.4	27.3	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	31	$ 1,567,500	$ 2,495,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	30	Improve runout length of guardrail and update end sections	19.4	27.3	2013	2015	Rural	4	4	16	3	0	0	5	3	15	4	0	0	31	$ 257,400	$ 410,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	-	Preliminary Engineering Bloomington to Bluff	4.6	6.3	2015	2015	Urban														-	5,000,000		No
																				Phase I Total	**$ 65,876,000**	**$ 91,955,000**		
Phase II 2016 to 2025		**Capacity Improvements (Dixie Phase II, Bloomington to Bluff)**	4.6	6.3	2015	2020	Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27	$ 64,200,000	$ 142,600,000	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	Yes
	9	Capacity Improvements - Bloomington to Dixie	4.6	6.3			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27			Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	Yes
	12	Capacity Improvements - Dixie to Bluff	4.6	6.3			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27			Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	Yes
	10	Structure Widening - Bloomington to Dixie	4.6	6.3			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27			Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	Yes
	13	Structure Widening - Dixie to Bluff	4.6	6.3			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3.5	14	27			Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	No
	11	Pavement Maintenance - High Seal	4.6	6.3			Urban	4	3.5	14	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	27			Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Critical Habitat, Virgin River Chub Critical Habitat, Woundfin Critical Habitat	Yes
		Capacity Improvements (Bluff to Washington)	6.3	10.9	2018	2022	Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25	$ 50,900,000	$ 129,000,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	15	Capacity Improvements - Bluff to BLVD	6.3	10.9			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	No
	19	Capacity Improvements - BLVD to Washington	6.3	10.9			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	16	Structure Widening - Bluff to BLVD	6.3	10.9			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	No
	20	Structure Widening - BLVD to Washington	6.3	10.9			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	No
	17	Pavement Maintenance - High Seal	6.3	10.9			Urban	4	3	12	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	2	**MP 0 to 4.6 (High Seal)**	0.0	4.6	2020	2022	Urban	4	3	12	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	25	$ 4,400,000	$ 11,345,550	T&E Plants (Holmgren Milkvetch), Tortoise, Pincushion Cactus	Yes
		Capacity Improvements (Washington to Hurricane)	10.9	16.1	2021	2023	Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25	$ 59,600,000	$ 161,300,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	22	Capacity Improvements - Washington to Hurricane	10.9	16.1			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25	-		Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	23	Structure Widening - Washington to Hurricane	10.9	16.1			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	3	12	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	24	Pavement Maintenance - High Seal	10.9	16.1			Urban	4	3	12	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	25			Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	44	Provide chain-up area with advance signing at MP 30 or 33 Interchange	27.3	34.3	2022	2024	Rural	4	2	8	3	2	6	5	2	10	4	0	0	24	1,000,000	3,000,000		No
	43*	Relocate NB on ramp Browse Interchange MP 30	27.3	34.3	2022	2024	Rural	4	1	4	3	3	9	5	2	10	4	0	0	23	909,700	2,637,000	None	Yes
																				Phase II Total	**$ 180,100,000**	**$ 447,246,000**		
Phase III 2026 to 2040	46	**MP 34 to 42 (High Seal)**	34.3	42.2	2024	2026	Rural	4	2.5	10	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	23	$ 8,200,000	$ 27,715,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	Yes
		Capacity Improvements (State Line to Bloomington)	0.0	4.6	2025	2027	Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23	$ 50,800,000	$ 179,400,000	T&E Plants (Holmgren Milkvetch), Tortoise, Pincushion Cactus	Yes
	3	Capacity Improvements - State Line to Atkinville	0.0	4.6			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23			T&E Plants (Holmgren Milkvetch), Tortoise, Pincushion Cactus	Yes
	4	Capacity Improvements - Atkinville to Bloomington	0.0	4.6			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23			T&E Plants (Holmgren Milkvetch), Tortoise, Pincushion Cactus	Yes
	5	Structure Widening - State Line to Atkinville	0.0	4.6			Urban	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	2.5	10	23			T&E Plants (Holmgren Milkvetch), Tortoise, Pincushion Cactus	No
	35	**MP 27 to 34 (High Seal)**	27.3	34.3	2026	2028	Rural	4	2.5	10	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	23	$ 7,400,000	$ 28,636,000	None	Yes
	42	Add climbing lane for NB I-15 MP 28-30	27.3	34.3	2027	2029	Rural	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	3	15	4	0	0	21	$ 3,640,000	$ 14,700,000	None	Yes
	25	**MP 19 to 27 (Minor Rehab)**	19.4	27.3	2028	2030	Rural	4	2	8	3	1	3	5	2	10	4	0	0	21	$ 8,000,000	$ 35,443,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	53	Deer Fence	34.3	42.2	2029	2031	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	2	10	4	0	0	18	$ 945,000	$ 4,400,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	Yes
	41	Deer Fence	27.3	34.3	2029	2031	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	2	10	4	0	0	18	$ 688,000	$ 3,200,000	None	Yes
	31	Add Climbing Lane MP 20-21	19.4	27.3	2031	2033	Rural	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	2	10	4	0	0	16	$ 2,300,000	$ 11,900,000	Desert Tortoise Preserve and Critical Habitat	Yes
	56	Improve Drainage in area to prevent ponding	34.3	42.2	2024	2026	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	1	5	4	0	0	13	$ -	$ -		No
	54	Snow Fence	34.3	42.2	2033	2035	Rural	4	2	8	3	0	0	5	1	5	4	0	0	13	$ 375,000	$ 2,300,000	Mexican Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Prairie Dog, Fish Sensitive	No
																				Phase III Total	**$ 82,348,000**	**$ 307,694,000**		

Project Legend

- Safety Improvements Project
- MP 0 to 4.6 (High Seal)
- Capacity Improvements (State Line to Bloomington)
- Under Construction or in Design
- Capacity Improvements (Dixie Phase II, Bloomington to Bluff)
- Capacity Improvements (Bluff to Washington)
- Capacity Improvements (Washington to Hurricane)
- MP 19 to 27 (High Seal)
- MP 19 to 27 (Pavement Rehab)
- MP 27 to 34 (High Seal)
- MP 34 to 42 (Pavement Rehab)
- MP 34 to 42 (High Seal)

Note

- 32* Preferred option is to change geometry of S Leeds NB off ramp, but at minimum it should be signed
- 55* Preferred option is to realign deficient curve, but at minimum it should be signed
- 33* Preferred option is to realign deficient curve, but at minimum it should be signed
- 43* Preferred option is to realign Browse NB on ramp to make it a standard diamond interchange, but at minimum the acceleration length should added to make it acceptable

Evaluation Criteria

Maintain What We Have - Importance Based

Value	Note
5	Maintenance of project is Critical
4	Maintenance of project is Important
3	Maintenance of project is Average
2	Maintenance of project is Helpful
1	Maintenance of project is Minor
0	Project Does Not Address Any Maintenance Concern

Improve Safety

Value	Note
5	Documented Geometric Deficiency Associated with an Accident Cluster
4	Roadside Deficiencies with safety index score of 4 or greater
3	Roadside Deficiencies with safety index score of 3 or less
2	Low Level of Safety Concern, Deer Traffic Areas
1	Minimal Safety Concerns
0	Project Does Not Address Any Safety Concerns

Make the System Work Better

Value	Note
5	Critical System Needs (Structural Maintenance)
4	Important System Needs (Vertical Clearance)
3	Average System Needs (Improve Ramp Accel/Decel Lengths)
2	Helpful System Needs (Climbing Lanes, Chain-up Area)
1	Minor System Needs
0	Project Does Not Address Any System Concerns

Maintain What We Have - Time Based

Value	Note
5	2008 to 2010
4.5	2011 to 2013
4	2014 to 2016
3.5	2017 to 2020
3	2021 to 2025
2.5	2026 to 2030
2	2031 to 2035
1.5	2036 to 2040
0	none

Increase Capacity

Value	Note
5	2008 to 2010
4.5	2011 to 2013
4	2014 to 2016
3.5	2017 to 2020
3	2021 to 2025
2.5	2026 to 2030
2	2031 to 2035
1.5	2036 to 2040
0	none

Figure 3-2: Prioritized Project Matrix