

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED - In alphabetical order by last name or organization

<p>Sent: April 5, 2004 Name: Donald <u>Aitken</u> Address: 3045 Richfield Drive City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919</p> <p>As a daily user of the I-25 corridor through Colorado Springs, I wholeheartedly support efforts to expand the roadway.</p>	<p>ISSUES</p> <p>General support</p>	<p>Sent: May 3, 2004 Name: John E. <u>Anderson</u> Address: 1616 Alamo Avenue City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80907</p> <p>CDOT has a budget and intends to widen I-25 through central Colorado Springs without adequate regard for the quality of life, particularly noise pollution) to adjacent neighborhoods. I am 62 and just want to live out my life in peace in the Old North End. The noise levels from I-25 in recent years have severely impacted our neighborhood in a negative way. Earth berms are a one-time capital expense that could help. Rubberized asphalt is another no-brainer. CDOT should use its superior technological knowledge and add a good measure of personal integrity toward doing a job that pleases all citizens, while completing its mission of better traffic flow.</p>	<p>ISSUES</p> <p>Noise: Old North End impacted</p> <p>Noise: Support for berms Support for use of rubberized asphalt</p>
<p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: Roger <u>Alliman</u> Address: 2550 Mirror Lake Court City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919</p> <p>There is no doubt that the most comprehensive solution to I-25 congestion in Colorado Springs is the construction of an East/West Freeway. It should follow a line roughly parallel, and close to, Constitution Ave.</p> <p>This is needed for reasons too numerous to count.</p> <p>First, however, we need decision makers in city leadership. This is a no-brainer that just takes some courage.</p>	<p>Alternatives considered</p>	<p>Sent: April 28, 2004 From: Mary Lou <u>Anderson</u></p> <p>Will the upgrade to I-25 and Bijou interchange have any effect on the VA Clinic?</p>	<p>Right-of-way impacts</p>

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED - In alphabetical order by last name or organization

<p>Sent: April 6, 2004 Name: Victor C. <u>Andrews</u> Address: 8215 Broughton Ct. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920</p> <p>The capacity improvements to I-25 through Colorado Springs and beyond are an absolute must if the economic vitality of the city is to continue.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p>	<p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: Paul <u>Apostoli</u> Address: 2095 Chapel Hills Drive City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920</p> <p>It has become obvious to me, driving in California and Colorado, that HOV lanes are not a real solution to moving traffic. The HOV lane does not carry the amount of traffic as a regular lane, yet costs as much to build. Also many non qualifying vehicles use these lanes to skirt traffic blockages. Another problem is caused when the HOV lane comes to an end, and traffic has to merge into the other existing lanes and/or cross over all of them to get to an exit. This causes bottleneaking at that location, and a possible unsafe lane change situation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed action: Opposition to HOV lanes</p>
<p>Sent: March 31, 2004 From: <u>Andrews</u>, Victor</p> <p>The widening and improvements to I-25 through Colorado Springs is critical to our community.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General support</p>	<p>I also personally feel that trucks should be relegated to use the far right lane within a designated stretch (Tejon St. to Monument) leaving the other lanes open for passenger vehicle traffic. Truckers have become very aggressive on the I-25 corridor. They take to the left lane, trying to pass other truckers only to find that they can not, and when and if they try to get back into the right lane they can't because other traffic has moved up behind the original truck they were trying to pass. This really causes traffic to back up. When an opening presents itself, everyone speeds up to get out of the traffic jam. This leads to drivers becoming irate and taking risks putting other drivers at risk.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed action: Lane restrictions for trucks</p>
<p>Sent: April 21, 2004 Name: David <u>Ankeney</u> Address: 1140 Big Valley Drive City: Colorado Springs State: Co Zip: 80919</p> <p>It is absolutely critical that you move forward as quickly as possible with the needed improvements to I-25 through Colorado Springs. PLEASE do not delay these improvements any longer!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General support</p>	<p>One more thing. When building the interchanges, make the merge lanes long enough so people can merge safely. Also provide longer exit ramps.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed action: Length of accel/decal lanes</p>

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED - In alphabetical order by last name or organization

<p><u>Ard-Smith</u>, Jane: See comments from <u>Sierra Club</u></p>	<p>ISSUES</p>	<p>(Continuation of Asfahl e-mail)</p>	<p>ISSUES</p>
<p>Sent: May 12, 2004 Name: Carolye <u>Asfahl</u> Address: 1225 N. Wahsatch Ave City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80903</p> <p>The expansion of I-25 will have significant impacts on neighborhoods, parks, air and water quality, endangered wildlife, local quality of life and the environment. CDOT should prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in order to better understand the impacts from the largest highway construction project in the history of Colorado Springs. During the past ten years CDOT has been incrementally adding capacity to I-25 through so-called "safety improvements" that escaped scrutiny under the National Environmental Policy Act. Section 4(f) of the 1966 Transportation Act requires "all possible planning to minimize harm" to parks and historic places. CDOT should have rigorously explored alternative pavement types to reduce noise levels and protect users of Monument Valley Park (the City's most used park) and the Greenway Trail. It was the intention of General Palmer that Monument Valley Park be a beautiful entryway into Colorado Springs. The proposed noise barriers continue the trend to cut off this view. CDOT failed to take a hard look at quieter alternatives to longitudinally tined concrete as a pavement type, such as rubberized asphalt—an alternative that is safer, durable, cheaper and more aesthetically pleasing than construction of more noise walls. Studies in Arizona and California continue to show that the use of rubberized asphalt can Rubberized asphalt could be used at a small fraction--less than 0.5%--of the total project cost; also, discarded tires would be used productively, a boon to the environment reduce noise levels by 4 to 6 decibels.</p>	<p>NEPA Process</p> <p>General opposition: Impacts are significant, requiring an EIS</p> <p>Past safety projects "escaped" NEPA process</p> <p>Noise, 4(f): Consider alternative pavement types</p> <p>Visual Resources, 4(f): Barriers will obstruct view into Monument Valley Park</p> <p>Noise: Support for rubberized asphalt</p>	<p>MITIGATION: CDOT has not looked at new, aggressive alternative solutions such as rubberized asphalt, except to say that it does not work in this climate (ignoring data in Flagstaff, AZ at 7000 ft. with an average of 100" of snow each year, among other colder areas) and the fact that this material, if properly processed and applied as an overlay, is a more cost effective solution over the long term, since it is a form of pavement preservation. Asphalt rubber preserves the concrete base of the roadway if reapplied every 10 to 12 years. There is ever-increasing new data taken from test projects across the US and Canada to substantiate this. CDOT has admitted to using old data (1990). According to the National Environmental Protection Agency (2001), a "broad evaluation of alternatives and future development impacts is needed for roadway changes proposed on I-25 in El Paso County...The potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to wetlands, water quality and other human environments and environmental resources are likely to be significant from the proposed I-25 capacity enhancements and warrant an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)." CDOT needs to do a more comprehensive job of studying the cumulative impacts of this project, including impacts to neighborhood stability and residential property values and the growth-inducing effects of expanding I-25's vehicle capacity by over 50%. CDOT should have considered the impacts of future growth made possible by the expansion and paid more attention to reasonable alternatives such as better mass transit or alternative routing.</p>	<p>Noise: CDOT needs to consider most recent data on rubberized asphalt</p> <p>NEPA Process EPA urged that an EIS be undertaken</p> <p>Cumulative impacts: More study needed</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Suggest mass transit or alternate routes</p>

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED - In alphabetical order by last name or organization

	ISSUES		ISSUES
<p>Sent: April 19, 2004 Name: John <u>Auld</u> Address: 7055 hazelwood ln City: colorado springs State: co Zip: 80918</p> <p>I thought it was well thought out and nicely done. As to the noise issue, I think people who build or buy homes near major roads take the risk of increased noise as time goes by. Much like people who buy homes near airports, you take a risk. I think the I25 improvement is needed badly and needed right now. If you could only get the Woodmen improvement going I'd really be happy.</p>	<p>General support</p> <p>Transportation: Duration of Woodmen interchange project</p>		
<p>Sent: April 15, 2004 Name: Mark <u>Aumen</u> Address: 710 W. Colfax City: Denver State: c Zip: 80204</p> <p>Please widen the highway. It needs to be completed to promote smart growth along existing development corridors. Thank you</p>	<p>General support</p>		