I-25 Central PEL

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

General Notes:

Updated December 5, 2018

Criteria Questions:

"Yes" – The alternative meets or has the potential to meet the criteria in question.
"Neutral" – The alternative would likely not affect the criteria in question.
"No" – The alternative would likely negatively affect the criteria in question.

"Carried Forward" – The alternative is carried forward to Level 2 evaluation.
"Removed as a Standalone Alternative" – The alternative is removed from consideration, but specific elements (identified in the comments section) are carried forward for incorporation into other alternatives during Level 2 evaluation.
"Removed from Consideration" – The alternative is removed from consideration. No elements unique to the alternative are carried forward.

Alternative	Safety	Congestion	Travel Time Reliability	Access	Cross Connectivity	Summary of Results	Comments
	Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*		
No Action This alternative presents the expected future condition if no action is taken. This includes reasonably planned mobility improvements in the region within the 2040 regional planning horizon. On I-25 Central, these projects include adding one additional lane on I-25 between Alameda Avenue and Walnut Street and interchange capacity improvements at the I-25 and Broadway interchange. This alternative is not the same as the existing condition.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
I-25 Reroute with Urban Boulevard This alternative would include the rerouting of regional traffic around the urban core of the City and replacement of the existing I-25 with an urban boulevard. Regional traffic would be rerouted east using I-76, I-70, and I-225. A signalized urban boulevard would be created from approximately 20th Street to US 85/Santa Fe Drive that connects to the existing surface grid.	No A. Rerouting I-25 and providing an at-grade urban boulevard would not change driver expectations. B. Creating an at-grade urban boulevard could create additional intersections between the boulevard and the local roadway network. This increase in intersections could increase the number of conflict points which could reduce safety. C. An at-grade urban boulevard could have less capacity than a freeway facility. This reduction in capacity could increase congestion, thus reducing safety. D. An at-grade urban boulevard would not change the geometric conditions of the existing alignment. Discussion: Creating an at-grade urban boulevard could create additional intersections and conflict points and could increase congestion. This could have a negative impact to safety.	No A. An at-grade urban boulevard could have less capacity than a grade-separated highway facility and could therefore experience greater congestion. B. Providing an alternate regional route could reduce demand for I-25 Central. Discussion: An at-grade urban boulevard could have less capacity than the existing interstate facility. Although providing an alternate route for regional through traffic could reduce the overall demand for I-25 Central, it would likely not offset the reduction in capacity. The alternative route facilities are also unlikely to have the capacity to meet the additional demand. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have an overall negative effect on congestion.	No A. Integrating the at-grade urban boulevard with the existing local network could increase the number of alternate paths available thus increasing the travel time reliability. B. Rerouting I-25 and providing an at-grade urban boulevard would not provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Crashes and incidents on an at-grade urban boulevard (assumed to be a signalized facility) could have a larger impact than those on an interstate facility. Discussion: Although access to additional alternate routes could be created by integrating the at-grade urban boulevard with the existing local street network, these benefits are likely to be outweighed by the increase in frequency and impact of crashes and incidents. Therefore, the overall travel time reliability would likely be lower on an at-grade urban boulevard as compared to the existing interstate facility.	Neutral A. An at-grade urban boulevard could allow for more intersections with local streets. B. Increases in congestion, especially at intersections with major local cross streets, could reduce the quality of access to existing destinations Discussion: An at-grade urban boulevard could provide opportunities for additional access points to and from the I-25 corridor; however, increases in congestion could reduce the quality of access. The potential positive and negative effects of this alternative are considered to be equal, therefore this alternative is neutral for this criterion.	Neutral A. An at-grade urban boulevard could allow for more intersections with local streets increasing the number of crossings therefore increasing cross connectivity. B. High traffic volumes at intersections could create an uncomfortable crossing environment. Discussion: Although the total number of crossing opportunities could increase with an at-grade urban boulevard, the quality of crossings could be diminished by the high traffic volumes. Therefore, this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	Removed from Consideration	<u>Determination Justification:</u> An at-grade urban boulevard could result in increased congestion, safety, and travel time reliability issues along the corridor even if regional through-traffic is rerouted. Therefore, this alternative is removed from consideration because it does not meet the project's purpose and need.

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety	Congestion	Travel Time Reliability	Access	Cross Connectivity	Summary of Results	Comments
	Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*		
Lane Reductions This alternative proposes removal of travel lanes to implement a more standard cross section (as achievable within the existing ROW).	Neutral A. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 would not change driver expectations. B. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 would not change the number of conflict points. C. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 could reduce the capacity on the freeway and therefore increase congestion and reduce safety. D. Improving the geometry of the freeway, such as providing shoulders and improving curvature, could improve safety. Discussion: Although reducing the number of lanes on I-25 could allow for improvements to the highway geometrics, the benefits could be offset by an increase in congestion. These tradeoffs to safety are considered to be equal; therefore, this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	No A. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 could reduce the capacity of the freeway. B. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 could reduce the capacity of the highway and increase congestion.	Yes A. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 would not provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Providing shoulders could reduce the delays/impacts from crashes and incidents. Discussion: Reducing the number of lanes on I-25 could allow for improvements to the roadway, such as providing shoulders. These improvements could reduce the impact from crashes and incidents.	Neutral A. Lane reductions would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. Lane reductions would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Lane reductions would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Lane reductions would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Lane reductions would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Lane reductions would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Removed from Consideration	<u>Determination Justification:</u> This alternative does not meet the criteria for congestion and is therefore removed from consideration.

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Shoulder Lane Use This alternative would bring shoulders up to standard, or construct new shoulders as needed to be used as flexible travel lanes during peak periods. Current shoulder space is inconsistent along the existing freeway between 20th Street and Santa Fe Drive/US 85.	No A. Using shoulders as travel lanes during peak periods could create driver confusion because the lane use would be variable. B. Using the shoulders as travel lanes would not change the number of conflict points. C. Using the shoulders as travel lanes during peak periods could reduce congestion and therefore improve safety. D. To use shoulders as travel lanes, existing geometric conditions would need to be improved, such as providing full shoulders throughout the corridor. These improvements could improve safety. Discussion: Improving the geometry of the roadway and providing shoulders would likely have a positive effect on safety. However, using the shoulders as travel lanes could also increase driver confusion and lead to additional crashes. Furthermore, when the shoulders are being used as travel lanes, there would be no shoulders. Although there are potential benefits to safety, the tradeoffs are considered greater. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have an overall negative impact to safety.	Yes A. Allowing use of the shoulders could increase the capacity of the highway and therefore reduce congestion. B. Using the shoulders as travel lanes would not affect the level of demand on I-25 Discussion: Allowing use of the shoulders as travel lanes could increase the capacity of the freeway and therefore reduce congestion.	Neutral A. Using the shoulders as travel lanes would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Using the shoulders as travel lanes would not provide a guaranteed travel time. C. Providing shoulders could reduce the impact of crashes and other incidents. However, a crash or incident occurring when the shoulders are being used as travel lanes would require the closure of the shoulders to travel which would negatively impact travel times. Discussion: Although providing shoulders could reduce the travel time impacts from crashes and incidents, their use as travel lanes during some periods of the day could result in an increased impact from crashes/incidents if the shoulders are required to be closed. The possibility for positive and negative consequences are considered equal, therefore this alternative is considered neutral for the travel time reliability criteria.	Neutral A. Allowing travelers to use the shoulder would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. Using the shoulders as travel lanes during peak periods would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Using the shoulders as travel lanes during the peak periods would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Using the shoulders as travel lanes during peak periods would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Using the shoulders as travel lanes during the peak periods would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Using the shoulders as travel lanes during peak periods would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Removed as a Standalone Alternative	<u>Determination Justification:</u> Although this alternative could provide benefits to some of the needs of the corridor, it does not meet the criteria for safety and is therefore not carried forward as a standalone alternative. However, the concept of using the shoulders as travel lanes during the peak periods could be considered in the future if the negative impacts to safety can be addressed.

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety	Congestion	Travel Time Reliability	Access	Cross Connectivity	Summary of Results	Comments
	Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*		
I-25 Geometric Refinements This alternative would provide geometric refinements along the existing alignment. The intent of this alternative is to implement a more standard cross section (if achievable) with standard lane widths, shoulders, ramp lengths, etc. to the extent possible within the existing right of way, or with minimal additional right-of-way.	Yes A. Geometric refinements would not change driver expectations. B. Geometric refinements would not change the number of conflict points. C. Refining the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) could improve traffic flow thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Refining the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) could improve sightlines, provide recovery space, etc. This would improve safety. Discussion: Providing geometric refinements could improve congestion and improve geometric conditions without affecting driver expectation or the number of conflict points. Therefore, this alternative could improve overall safety.	Yes A. Refining the geometry of the roadway (providing standard lane widths, etc.) could improve overall traffic flow therefore increasing the capacity of the roadway. B. Geometric refinements would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Providing geometric refinements could improve the overall traffic flow of the highway thus increasing its capacity.	Yes A. Geometric refinements would not change the number of alternate routes available. B. Geometric refinements would not provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Adding standard shoulders could reduce the impact of crashes and incidents thus improving travel time reliability. Discussion: Providing geometric refinements could reduce the impacts of crashes and incidents, therefore improving travel time reliability.	Yes A. Geometric refinements would not affect the number of accesses. B. Geometric refinements could allow for improvements to accesses (full acceleration/deceleration lanes, smaller ramp departure angles, etc.) thus improving the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Providing geometric refinements could allow for improvements to access locations thus increasing the quality of access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Geometric refinements would not change the number of crossing opportunities B. Geometric refinements would not change the quality of crossings. Discussion: Providing geometric refinements would not affect cross connectivity.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
I-25 Geometric Improvements This alternative would provide major alignment alterations such as implementing a more standard cross section, improved access/egress ramp configurations, straightening curves, etc. Additional right-of-way would be acquired where necessary to achieve a standard cross section.	Yes A. Geometric improvements would not change driver expectations. B. Geometric improvements would not change the number of conflict points. C. Improving the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) could improve traffic flow thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Improving the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) could improve sightlines, provide recovery space, etc. This could improve safety. Discussion: Providing geometric improvements could improve congestion and improve geometric conditions without affecting driver expectation or the number of conflict points. Therefore, this alternative could improve overall safety.	Yes A. Improving the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) could improve overall traffic flow therefore increasing the capacity of the roadway. B. Geometric improvements would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Providing geometric improvements could improve the overall traffic flow of the highway thus increasing its capacity.	Yes A. Geometric improvements would not change the number of alternate routes available. B. Geometric improvements would not provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Adding standard shoulders could reduce the impact of crashes and incidents thus improving travel time reliability. Discussion: Providing geometric improvements could reduce the impacts of crashes and incidents, therefore improving travel time reliability.	Yes A. Geometric improvements would not affect the number of accesses. B. Geometric improvements could allow for improvements to accesses (full acceleration/deceleration lanes, smaller ramp departure angles, etc.) thus improving the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Providing geometric improvements could allow for improvements to access locations thus increasing the quality of access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Geometric improvements would not change the number of crossing opportunities B. Geometric improvements would not change the quality of crossings. Discussion: Providing geometric improvements would not affect cross connectivity.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
I-25 Realignment The alternative proposes the substantial realignment of the highway (new right-of-way) using the Consolidated Main Line (CML) or other corridor that may serve I-25 traffic.	Yes A. Realigning I-25 would not change driver expectations. B. Realigning I-25 would not change the number of conflict points. C. Realigning I-25 could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) which could improve traffic flow thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Realigning I-25 could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) which could improve sightlines, provide recovery space, etc. This would improve safety. Discussion: Realigning I-25 could improve geometric conditions which could improve safety.	Yes A. Realigning I-25 could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) which could improve overall traffic flow therefore increasing the capacity of the roadway. B. Realigning I-25 would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Realigning I-25 could improve the geometry of the roadway which could improve the overall traffic flow of the highway thus increasing its capacity.	Yes A. Realigning I-25 would not change the number of alternate routes available. B. Realigning I-25 would not necessarily provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Realigning I-25 could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway, such as adding standard shoulders. These improvements could reduce the impact of crashes and incidents thus improving travel time reliability. Discussion: Realigning I-25 could allow for geometric improvements to be made which could reduce the impacts of crashes and incidents, therefore improving travel time reliability.	Neutral A. The exact number of access locations to/from I-25 for this alternative is not known at this level of detail. However, it is not the intent of this alternative to dramatically alter the number of access locations to/from the interstate. It is assumed that access to/from I-25 is provide to/from the same cross streets where access exists today. For this criterion the number of access points is considered to be unchanged from existing conditions. B. Realigning I-25 could allow for the interchanges to be built to current engineering standards. This could improve the quality of access as compared to the sub-standard geometry of the existing accesses. However, moving interstate access locations, even if still along the same cross street, could reduce the convenience of access to destinations currently adjacent to the highway (for example, Mile High Stadium). This could have an overall negative effect on the quality of access. Discussion: Moving I-25 from its current alignment could change the overall quality of access to the interstate. This has the potential to be both positive (by creating the opportunity to improve the geometrics of the access locations) and negative (by changing the convenience of access to adjacent destinations). Because these potential impacts are considered equal, this alternative is neutral for this criterion.	Neutral A. Moving I-25 to a different alignment could allow for additional crossings opportunities throughout the existing I-25 corridor; however, it could reduce the cross connectivity within the new corridor (for example, if the highway is moved to a corridor that has a dense local street network, it is unlikely that every street within the existing local network would have a connection over the new I-25. Although the total number of crossing of I-25 may remain unchanged from existing conditions, there is a chance that the overall cross connectivity within the new corridor is reduced.) B. Moving I-25 to a different alignment would not change the quality of crossings provided. Discussion: Moving I-25 from its existing alignment could increase cross connectivity opportunities along the current I-25 corridor, but also could reduce them within the new corridor. These tradeoffs are considered equal and therefore this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Lane Conversion This alternative proposes converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes.	Neutral A. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change driver expectations. B. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could create additional conflict points (merging and weaving areas) near express lane ingress and egress locations. C. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could increase the capacity of the highway, thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not affect the geometric conditions of the highway. Discussion: Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could create additional conflict points near express lane ingress and egress locations; however, they could also improve overall safety by reducing congestion. The possibility for positive and negative consequences are considered equal, therefore this alternative is considered neutral for the safety criteria.	Neutral A. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change the capacity of the highway. B. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change the capacity of or the demand for I-25; therefore, this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	Yes A. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could provide the option of a guaranteed travel time (for example, if the express lanes are managed through tolls or vehicle restrictions). C. The configuration of the express lanes (buffer separated versus barrier separated) could affect the level of impact from crashes and incidents. For example, if the lanes are barrier separated, crashes may have a larger impact on the express lane operations because vehicles may not be able to reroute. This kind of detail is not available at this time; therefore, it is assumed that this consideration is neutral at this time. Discussion: Express lanes would create the opportunity to provide a guaranteed travel time; therefore, this alternative is considered to improve travel time reliability.	Neutral A. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could create the opportunity to provide direct connections between local roadways and the express lanes which could increase the number of accesses to I-25. At this level of detail, it is not known if direct connections would be provided. Therefore, this consideration is neutral at this time. B. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could create the opportunity to provide direct connections between local roadways and the express lanes which could provide an improved quality of access for express lane users by reducing their need to merge and weave on I-25. At this level of detail, it is not known if direct connections would be provided. Therefore, this consideration is neutral at this time. Discussion: Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes could create opportunities to affect access; however, at this level of detail these opportunities are uncertain. Therefore, this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	Neutral A. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Converting existing general-purpose lanes to express lanes would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Additional General-Purpose Lanes This alternative proposes adding travel lanes to the freeway that could be used by any driver or vehicle type.	Yes A. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change driver expectations. B. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the number of conflict points. C. Adding general-purpose lanes could reduce congestion therefore improving safety. D. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the existing geometric conditions. Discussion: Adding additional general-purpose lanes could reduce congestion which could improve safety.	Yes A. Adding general-purpose lanes could increase capacity on I-25 therefore reducing congestion. B. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the level of demand on I-25. Discussion: Adding additional general-purpose lanes could increase the capacity of I-25 and therefore reduce congestion.	Yes A. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the number of alternate routes available. B. Adding general-purpose lanes would not provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Adding general-purpose lanes could provide additional space to navigate around a crash/incident therefore improving travel time reliability. Discussion: Adding general-purpose lanes could provide additional space for drivers to maneuver around a crash or incident which could improve travel time reliability.	Neutral A. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Adding general-purpose lanes would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Adding general-purpose lanes would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Adding general-purpose lanes would not impact the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Adding general-purpose lanes would change the cross connectivity of I-25.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Added Express Lanes This alternative proposes adding travel lanes to the highway that could be used by regional (through) traffic or managed for specific users such as high occupancy vehicles (HOV), tolled vehicles, etc.	Neutral A. Express lanes would not change driver expectations. B. Express lanes could create additional conflict points (merging and weaving areas) near express lane ingress and egress locations. C. Express lanes could increase the capacity of the highway, thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Express lanes would not affect the geometric conditions of the highway. Discussion: Express lanes could create additional conflict points near express lane ingress and egress locations; however, they could also improve overall safety by reducing congestion. The possibility for positive and negative consequences are considered equal, therefore this alternative is considered neutral for the safety criteria.	Yes A. Express lanes could add capacity to the highway and therefore reduce congestion. B. Express lanes would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Express lanes could increase the capacity of the highway and therefore have the potential to reduce congestion.	Yes A. Express lanes would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Adding express lanes could provide the option of a guaranteed travel time (for example, if the express lanes are managed through tolls or vehicle restrictions). C. The configuration of the express lanes (buffer separated versus barrier separated) could affect the level of impact from crashes and incidents. For example, if the lanes are barrier separated, crashes may have a larger impact on the express lane operations because vehicles may not be able to reroute. This kind of detail is not available at this time; therefore, it is assumed that this consideration is neutral at this time. Discussion: Express lanes could create the opportunity to provide a guaranteed travel time; therefore, this alternative is considered to improve travel time reliability.	Neutral A. Constructing express lanes could create the opportunity to provide direct connections between local roadways and the express lanes which could increase the number of accesses to I-25. At this level of detail, it is not known if direct connections would be provided. Therefore, this consideration is neutral at this time. B. Constructing express lanes could create the opportunity to provide direct connections between local roadways and the express lanes which could provide an improved quality of access for express lane users by reducing their need to merge and weave on I-25. At this level of detail, it is not known if direct connections would be provided. Therefore, this consideration is neutral at this time. Discussion: Express lanes could create opportunities to affect access; however, at this level of detail these opportunities are uncertain. Therefore, this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	Neutral A. Adding express lanes would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Adding express lanes would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Adding express lanes would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Dedicated Transit Lanes This alternative proposes adding travel lanes to the highway that are for transit only (bus, express bus, BRT, or other new technology type, etc.).	Yes A. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change driver expectations. B. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the number of conflict points. C. Adding dedicated transit lanes could encourage people to take transit instead of driving which could reduce congestion on I-25, thus reducing the number of crashes. D. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the geometric conditions on the highway. Discussion: Adding dedicated transit lanes could reduce congestion on I-25 and thereby improve safety.	Yes A. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the capacity of the highway. B. Adding dedicated transit lanes could reduce the level of demand for I-25 by shifting more people to transit instead of driving. Discussion: Adding dedicated transit lanes could reduce the demand for I-25 and therefore reduce congestion.	Yes A. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Adding dedicated transit lanes could provide the option for a guaranteed travel time. D. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the impacts from crashes/events/incidents. Discussion: Adding dedicated transit lanes could provide the option of a guaranteed travel time and therefore improve travel time reliability.	Neutral A. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Adding dedicated transit lanes would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Adding dedicated transit lanes could create the opportunity to provide additional crossing of I-25, such as near on-highway transit stations. At this level of detail, it is not known if on-highway transit stations would be provided nor if additional crossing would be provided. Therefore, this consideration is neutral at this time. B. Adding dedicated transit lanes would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Adding dedicated transit lanes would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Collector/Distributor Roads This alternative would add a system of roads adjacent to the highway which could allow for the consolidation of access.	Yes A. Adding collector/distributor roads would not change driver expectations. B. Adding collector/distributor roads could reduce the number of conflict points along the mainline freeway. However, they could also increase the number of intersections and therefor conflict points where local roadways meet the collector distributor roads. C. Collector/distributor roads could allow for the consolidation of access points to the mainline freeway thus reducing turbulence on the freeway reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Adding collector distributor roads could allow for access to the mainline freeway to be improved, such as reducing the curves on ramps and providing full acceleration lanes. Discussion: Although additional conflict points could be created through new intersections along the collector/distributor roads, this could be offset by the benefits gained through a reduction in sub-standard merging and weaving areas which currently exist along the corridor. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have the potential to provide and overall improvement to safety.	Yes A. Adding collector/distributor roads could reduce the turbulence on the mainline and therefore improve traffic flow. However, combining the volume from multiple ramps onto collector/distributor roads could cause congestion at collector/distributor road intersections and I-25 ramp terminals. B. Collector/distributor roads would not change the level of demand on I-25. Discussion: Because the collector/distributor roads would be new facilities, they would likely be designed to accommodate the required traffic volumes to ensure they operate in an acceptable fashion. Therefore, the overall benefits to the mainline will likely provide an overall benefit to congestion on the corridor.	Neutral A. Collector/distributor roads could reduce the number of access points to and from the mainline freeway which could reduce a driver's opportunities to reroute in response to delays. B. Collector/distributor roads would not provide for a guaranteed travel time. C. Collector/distributor roads could allow for better control of traffic into and out of event venues which could reduce the impact of events on I-25 travel times. Discussion: Collector/distributor roads could both improve and reduce travel time reliability. These opportunities are considered balance; therefore, this alternative is considered neutral for this criterion.	Yes A. Collector/distributor roads could reduce the number of access locations to the I-25 mainline by consolidating multiple access points together. However, collector/distributor roads could also provide connections to remaining access locations which could maintain the same level of access to existing destinations. B. Collector/distributor roads could allow for a consolidation of access which could allow for remaining access points to be improved, such as through longer acceleration/deceleration lanes. This could improve the overall quality of access. Discussion: Collector/distributor roads could reduce the total number of access points to the I-25 mainline; however, they could also provide connections between existing destinations and the remaining access locations. Furthermore, the remaining access locations could be of better quality because there could be opportunities to improve the geometrics of the ramps. Therefore, this alternative is considered to have an overall benefit to this criterion.	Yes A. Collector/distributor roads would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Collector/distributor roads could include sidewalks and/or bicycle lanes which could provide more direct connections to crossings of I-25 as compared to what exists today. Discussion: Collector/distributor roads could provide better connections to crossings of I-25, thereby improving the quality of crossing opportunities.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Multi-Level Highway This alternative would include reconstruction of the existing I-25 as a viaduct (elevated), tunnel, or an open lowered freeway. These improvements may be consistent throughout the corridor or only proposed in specific segments.	Yes A. A multi-level highway would not change driver expectations. B. A multi-level highway would not change the number of conflict points. C. Constructing a multi-level highway could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) which could improve traffic flow thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Constructing a multi-level highway could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) which could improve sightlines, provide recovery space, etc. This could improve safety. Discussion: Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could improve geometric conditions which could improve safety.	Yes A. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway (straightening curves, providing standard lane widths, etc.) which could improve overall traffic flow therefore increasing the capacity of the roadway. B. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway would not change the level of demand for I-25. Discussion: Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could improve the geometry of the roadway which could improve the overall traffic flow of the highway thus increasing its capacity.	Yes A. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway would not change the number of alternate routes available. B. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway would not provide an option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could provide the opportunity to improve the geometry of the roadway, such as adding standard shoulders. These improvements could reduce the impact of crashes and incidents thus improving travel time reliability. Discussion: Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could allow for geometric improvements to be made which could reduce the impacts of crashes and incidents, therefore improving travel time reliability.	Yes A. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway would not affect the number of accesses. B. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could allow for improvements to accesses (full acceleration/deceleration lanes, smaller ramp departure angles, etc.) thus improving the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could allow for improvements to access locations thus increasing the quality of access to/from I-25.	Yes A. A multi-level highway configuration could allow for new cross connections to be made above or below the highway. B. Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could improve the quality of crossings by creating visual and auditory barriers between the crossings and the freeways (for example, by providing a cover over the highway). Discussion: Constructing I-25 as a multi-level highway could allow for both a greater number of crossings and an overall more comfortable crossings experience. Therefore, this alternative could improve the cross connectivity of I-25.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Congestion Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Travel Time Reliability Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Access Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Cross Connectivity Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*	Summary of Results	Comments
Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Operational, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) This alternative includes strategies designed to reduce travel demand and improve the use of the current transportation system, while reducing the need for major capital investments. TDM strategies would address traffic congestion by reducing travel demand rather than increasing transportation capacity. TDM programs provide user information, incentives, and encourage behavior change to reduce travel demand. ITS improvements may include active traffic management (ATM), variable message signs (VMS), and variable speed limits to help improve traffic flow on the existing transportation system.	Yes A. ITS devices could align driver expectations with real time conditions. B. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the number of conflict points. C. TDM strategies could reduce congestion, thus improving safety conditions. D. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the geometric conditions of the highway. Discussion: ITS devices could help alert drivers to real-time travel conditions and TDM strategies could reduce congestion. Both could provide a benefit to safety.	Yes A. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the capacity of the highway. B. TDM strategies could reduce the number of vehicles on the road, which could reduce congestion. Discussion: TDM strategies could reduce the demand for I-25 and thus improve congestion.	Yes A. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. TDM strategies and ITS devices would provide a guaranteed travel time. C. ITS devices can reduce the impact of incidents and events along the corridor by alerting drivers which could reduce the changes of follow-on crashes and incidents and/or allow drivers to reroute. Discussion: By altering drivers to crashes, incidents and/or events, ITS devices could reduce the impacts of these things on I-25 travel times.	Neutral A. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: TDM strategies and ITS devices would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. TDM strategies and ITS devices would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: TDM strategies and ITS devices would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Carried Forward	

Draft Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternative	Safety	Congestion	Travel Time Reliability	Access	Cross Connectivity	Summary of Results	Comments
	Does the concept improve safety on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramps, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) driver expectations, (B) conflict points, (C) congestion, (D) geometric conditions*	Does the concept reduce congestion on the I-25 mainline, on the I-25 on or off-ramp, and/or at the I-25 ramp terminals? *Considerations: (A) capacity, (B) level of demand*	Does the concept improve travel time reliability on the I-25 mainline? *Considerations: (A) availability of alternate routes, (B) guarantee of travel time, (C) impacts from crashes/events/incidents*	Does the concept improve access to and/or from I-25? **Note: This criterion does not consider access to express lanes.* *Considerations: (A) number of accesses to I-25 (including I-25 collector-distributor roads), (B) quality of access*	Does the concept improve connectivity across I-25 for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and/or local traffic? *Considerations: (A) number of crossing opportunities, (B) quality of crossing opportunities/experience.*		
Congestion Pricing This alternative proposes a mechanism to reduce peak congestion by shifting or reducing trips to off-peak times by implementing variable charges during the commuter peaks. These charges may apply to specific lanes of a roadway (similar to express toll lanes); variable tolls on an entire roadway; cordon charges that require a toll to enter a congested area of the city; or per mile charges in a specific congested area.	Yes A. Congestion pricing would not change driver expectations. B. Congestion pricing would not change the number of conflict points. C. Congestion pricing could reduce the demand for I-25 thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. Congestion pricing would not change the geometric conditions of the highway. Discussion: Congestion pricing could reduce the demand for I-25, thus reducing congestion and improving safety.	Yes A. Congestion pricing would not change the capacity of I-25. B. Congestion pricing could reduce the demand for I-25 and therefore reduce congestion. Discussion: Congestion pricing could reduce the demand for I-25, thus reducing congestion.	Yes A. Congestion pricing would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Congestion pricing could be used to manage travel demand during peak periods, thus guaranteeing a reliable travel time. C. Congestion pricing would not change the impacts from crashes, events, and/or incidents. Discussion: Congestion pricing could provide a guaranteed travel time along I-25, thus improving travel time reliability.	Neutral A. Congestion pricing would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. Congestion pricing would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Congestion pricing would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Congestion pricing would not change the number of crossing opportunities. B. Congestion pricing would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Congestion pricing would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Carried Forward	
New Transit Facility This alternative includes the construction of a high capacity transit facility (rail or other new technology type). The new transit facility may be located adjacent to the I-25 corridor (in new ROW) or follow another corridor in the region depending on the transit corridors' ability to serve similar origins and destinations as I-25.	Yes A. A new transit facility would not change driver expectations. B. A new transit facility would not change the number of conflict points. C. A new transit facility could reduce the demand for I-25 thus reducing congestion and improving safety. D. A new transit facility would not change the geometric conditions of the highway. Discussion: A new transit facility could reduce congestion on I-25 and therefore improve safety.	Yes A. Adding a new transit facility would not change the capacity of I-25. B. Adding a new transit facility could reduce the demand for the freeway, thus reducing congestion. Discussion: A new transit facility could reduce the demand for I-25 and thus improve congestion.	Yes A. Adding a new transit facility would not change the availability of alternate routes. B. Adding a new transit facility could provide the option for a guaranteed travel time. C. Adding a new transit facility would not change the impacts from crashes, events, and/or incidents. Discussion: A new transit facility could provide a guaranteed travel time, thus improving travel time reliability.	Neutral A. Adding a new transit facility would not change the number of accesses to/from I-25. B. Adding a new transit facility would not change the quality of access to/from I-25. Discussion: Adding a new transit facility would not affect access to/from I-25.	Neutral A. Adding a new transit facility could create the opportunity to provide additional crossing of I-25, such as near on-highway transit stations. At this level of detail, it is not known if on-highway transit stations would be provided nor if additional crossing would be provided. Therefore, this consideration is neutral at this time. B. Adding a new transit facility would not change the quality of crossing opportunities. Discussion: Adding a new transit facility would not affect cross connectivity opportunities.	Carried Forward	