

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

<p>Sent: April 5, 2004  Name: Gary <u>Rackov</u>  Address: 8136 Fort Smith Road  City: Peyton  State: CO  Zip: 80831  The I must be increased to support the flow of traffic. Those who live by must realive they live by the biggest Interstate in the state and as such we should not hamper it's flow just because of a few minor drawbacks. Volume will not increase because of the widening, the flow will be better and C.S. will benefit greatly from it's expansion. In my opinion there should be no debate, the capacity MUST be increased - the results from not doing this will be more catastrophic.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>	<p>Sent: April 19, 2004  Name: Gwen <u>Reese</u>  Address: 5470 Villa Cir  City: Colorado  State: CO  Zip: 80918  As we all know the Colorado State highways are not up to par. As Colorado Springs grows it will only get worse for everyone trying to travel from the Southern States ---North. Plus our city is gaining more people every year and needs to have a safe and reliable route through the City. Now is the time to get things done. Thank you</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>
<p>Sent: April 17, 2004  Name: Sandra L. <u>Rech</u>  Address: 4843 Evening Sun Lane  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80917  Telephone: 719-574-4799  As a Colorado Springs resident since 1982 and a Realtor since 1986, I have seen/lived/and experienced the growth of our fair city personally EVERY DAY! Any improvement to our I-25 corridor would be a much needed improvement - long overdue. Please, please, let's get it done!! Our quality of life and living depends on it.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>	<p>Recorded April 22, 2004  Don <u>Reichert</u>  See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NEPA Process</p>
<p>Thomas <u>Rees</u>, along with a group of people representing TERRACON faxed identical faxes on May 12, 2004, please see under "TERRACON."</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>	<p>Sent: April 19, 2004  Name: Michelle Grove <u>Reiland</u>  Address: 5110 Langdale Way  City: Colorado Springs  State: co  Zip: 80906  I would like to vote to continue the improvements on I-25. Delaying action will only worsen the situation. Proceed with improvements. Thank you.</p> <p>Sent: March 31, 2004  Name: Jason <u>Reinhardt</u>  Address: 130 E. Kiowa  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80903  Yes, please add lanes to I-25, we can't possibly continue with the limited lanes and daily congested travel routes. Sorry if you wanted more detail.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>

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

<p>Sent: April 5, 2004  Name: Larry <u>Reisinger</u>  Address: 1118 War Eagle Ct.  City: Colorado Springs  State: co  Zip: 80919</p> <p>As an alternative to more lanes for more cars, I suggest you consider looking at offering incentives to city and county governments to zone and develop in a manner such that people can live near where they shop and work. It has been demonstrated elsewhere that such planned communities reduce (or eliminate) commuting costs and improve the quality of life for their residents. Productivity goes up and the negative impacts of commuting great distances via single occupancy vehicles is reduced. I know this is a radical idea to suggest that CDOT and FHWA promote such an alternative, but please consider it and "think outside the box". I haven't "run the numbers" but if your talking of \$25,000,000 per mile as a justifiable cost for some alternatives (like more lanes), I've got to believe that promoting planned communities can be a cost effective option to more lanes following more cars following more lanes, etc. Please understand that I'm not suggesting that we not build roads; hopefully, just not as many or as quickly as otherwise would be the case.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives considered: Planned development communities</p>	<p>Sent: April 5, 2004  Name: Larry <u>Reisinger</u>  Address: 1118 War Eagle Ct.  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80919-1520</p> <p>1. Move the Santa Fe Trail westward from near its planned closest encounter with the North Gate/Powers Blvd. Interchange (i.e, the portion of the Santa Fe Railroad Grade nearest the proposed interchange). In this area, move the trail into the pine forest to the west to restore a more rural, natural experience for trail users and, at the same time, reduce the amount of noise that trail users will be subject to.  2. To promote alternative modes of transportation east-west from the heavily populated residential areas west and north of the Garden of the Gods road but south of the Air Force Academy (e.g., Mountain Shadows, Rockrimmon, Peregrine subdivisions), add a trail crossing under or over I-25 for bikers/pedestrians near Pine Creek or Woodmen road and make it accessible to the Santa Fe Trail.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Parks and recreation: Move Santa Fe Trail, add trail on north end to connect to Santa Fe trail</p>
<p>Sent: April 29, 2004  Name: Larry <u>Reisinger</u>  Address: 1118 War Eagle Ct.  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80919-1520</p> <p>Please ensure that appropriate migration corridors are installed along the project length of I-25 north and south of Colorado Springs. It is important for the survivability of native animal populations that such pathways be established and maintained. In addition, providing such corridors will help minimized animal-vehicle strikes and make I-25 safer for both humans and animals. Please see the article at <a href="http://www.discover.com/issues/mar-04/departments/ecology-of-roadkill/?page=1">http://www.discover.com/issues/mar-04/departments/ecology-of-roadkill/?page=1</a> for recent successes in minimizing accidents and promoting animal mobility and survivability.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Wildlife: Preserve migration corridors</p>	<p>Sent: April 6, 2004  Name: John <u>Rendek</u>  Address: 3608 Windflower Circle  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80918</p> <p>I think that you have the basic idea but are missing the mark on the proposed capacity improvements. I-25 is bottled up in the proposed improvement section, however that section needs to be extended to Garden of the Gods from S. Academy or there need to be another lane added on each side for HOV from S. Academy to Garden of the Gods. Since the study has been completed I do not expect my voice to be heard. I doubt this will even be read. You may want to think a little further out than 5 years as well. Consider Chicago they improve for 5 years only to hit max capacity again. They then start all over. Think outside the box a little and add a commuter train to denver that links up with the light rail. I would rather take that on my commute than drive then you probably would not need to do it all over again in 5 years and bring this up again. I bet a friend of mine 100.00 that we will need to address this issue again in less than 7 years. So do not fail me make the wrong decision today!!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Transportation: Capacity from Garden of the Gods to S. Academy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives Considered: Rail</p>

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

<p>Sent: April 15, 2004  Name: Mark <u>Reyner</u>  Address: 511 North Tejon  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80903</p> <p>I think that for Colorado Springs to compete in any way with other communities around the country, I-25 NEEDS to be improved. Our EDC and the overall Quality Community Group work much too hard at attracting quality businesses to the Pikes Peak Region to have yet another obstacle put in the way. Not to mention improving the quality of life for our existing residents. This work has been needed for a very long time, if we don't act now I'm afraid that our community will suffer the consequences for a very, very long time to come.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p>	<p>Sent: April 15, 2004  Name: Karen joy <u>Reynolds</u>  Address: PO Box 1504  City: Palmer Lake  State: CO  Zip: 80133</p> <p>I feel that expanding the I25 to 6 lanes from south Colorado Springs to Monument is long overdue. In fact I believe 8 lanes in high-traffic areas will encourage carpooling and is also an idea long overdue. El Paso County's infrastructure has failed in keeping up with the fast pace of growth. I believe this issue should have been addressed 10 years ago.</p> <p>Expanding the number of lanes, will not increase traffic (with the exception of construction times) - especially if carpooling lanes are introduced. I feel it will decrease traffic and the number of accidents. This gives those individuals who insist on driving 90 miles an hour(or as fast as possible keeping only a distance of 2 car lengths between them and the car ahead of them) the space to do so with harming others. A larger presence of Hwy patrol would be greatly appreciated for the afore mentioned, although you probably have nothing to do with that. In any case, I will feel safer with more lanes to choose from.</p> <p>Of course building walls in highly populated areas will decrease noise pollution and I feel this is necessary. Increasing the number of lanes will probably decrease air pollution. Where there is less sitting in traffic for extended periods of time, there is less smog going into the air. Again, a carpool lane would be wise for the same reason. Keeping the amount of inconvenience down for the driver is the biggest challenge during construction. Thank you for your time and good luck with this project!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise:  Include noise  barriers</p>
---	---	---	--

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

<p>Sent: May 9, 2004  Name: Mark <b>Reynolds</b>  Address: 2324 Wood Avenue  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80907</p> <p>The expansion of I25 will have significant negative impacts on neighborhoods and parks, as well as on the habitats of Endangered Species. It will affect the quality of air, water, and life along its entire corridor. The largest construction project in the history of Colorado Springs deserves - no, demands - the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement to properly address these effects and to comply with section 4(f) of the 1966 Transportation Act that requires "all possible planning to minimize harm" to parks and historic places. Previous CDOT projects during the past 10 years have incrementally added I25 capacity under the guise of "safety improvements", thereby avoiding the environmental scrutiny required under the National Environmental Policy Act. These changes have already negatively affected the noise environment in both Monument Valley Park and the Greenway Trail. Given that Monument Valley Park is both a park and an historic place (the gift and legacy of Colorado Springs' founder William Jackson Palmer), these previous projects should have rigorously explored alternatives that would have complied with both the spirit and letter of section 4(f). Instead CDOT chose to employ longitudinally tined concrete as a pavement type rather than seriously considering other mitigating solutions, such as rubberized asphalt and/or the construction of noise barriers.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>General opposition:  Conduct EIS</p> <p>NEPA PROCESS</p> <p>Neighborhoods</p> <p>Parks and recreation</p> <p>Threatened/Endangered</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>Noise:  Rubberized asphalt</p>	<p>Rubberized asphalt has been studied in both Arizona and California and been shown to significantly reduce noise levels (4 to 6 decibels), and its use would comprise only a small fraction (less than 0.5%) of the total project cost. Noise barriers would provide mitigation of tire noise as well as engine noise. Because these previous effects were incremental, each was judged to be below the threshold that would require mitigation. In my view, it is likely that the additional incremental effects from the proposed expansion will be argued to be more of the same. However, the cumulative effects of these projects have had and will continue to have profound effects on those living within the I25 environmental zone. It is these cumulative impacts that should be the focus of an Environmental Impact Statement. In addition, an EIS should also address impacts to neighborhood stability and property values, as well as indirect effects such as how increasing the I25 capacity by over 50% will effect future growth within Colorado Springs and the possible future use of other transportation alternatives such as mass Transit</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>Noise:  Provide noise barriers</p> <p>Cumulative impacts</p> <p>Alternatives considered:  Mass transit</p>
--	--	--	--

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

<p>Sent: May 12, 2004  Name: Judith <u>Rice-Jones</u>  Address: 1615 N. Wahsatch Avenue  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80907</p> <p>Please consider this an objection to your finding of no significant impact in the Environmental Assessment for the proposed widening of I-25 through Colorado Springs. The factors which make this finding incorrect are as follows:  CAPACITY ALTERNATIVES. As one who travels at least once a week to Denver for a meeting for work I do not believe that the installation of a transit alternative—light rail or rapid bus transit would not significantly decrease the number of single-occupant vehicles on I 25. Everyone I would prefer a similar option for driving north or south in the Front Range corridor.  BARRIER EFFECT. I do not find this issue discussed in the EA other than to dismiss any concern about dividing neighbors by saying that this issue is not relevant as the freeway is already there. There is a significant difference between crossing a four-lane interstate and an eight-lane one. Further, there used to be two pedestrian underpasses and one overhead pedestrian bridge. The three options have been collapsed into one. The barrier exists for wildlife as well.  Jackson, S.D. 2000. Overview of Transportation Impacts on Wildlife Movement and Populations. Pp. 7-20 In Messmer, T.A. and B. West, (eds) Wildlife and Highways: Seeking Solutions to an Ecological and Socio-economic Dilemma. The Wildlife Society. Abstract As long linear features on the landscape, railways, roads and highways have impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat that are disproportionate to the area of land that they occupy. In addition to impacts on habitat, highways and railways are sources of road mortality that threaten wildlife populations. Indirect effects on wildlife include reduced access to habitat due to road avoidance and human exploitation. Transportation infrastructure also undermines ecological processes through the fragmentation of wildlife populations, restriction of wildlife movements, and the disruption of gene flow and metapopulation dynamics. A variety of techniques have been used to mitigate the impacts of transportation systems on wildlife movements with mixed success.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Alternatives Considered:  Rail from Colorado Springs to Denver</p> <p>Neighborhoods:  Freeway divides neighbors</p> <p>Wildlife:  Freeway disrupts habitat</p>	<p>To make progress on these issues wildlife biologists must: 1) recognize the potential long-term effects of highways and railways on wildlife populations and advocate more strongly for appropriate mitigation measures, 2) document the impacts of transportation infrastructure on wildlife populations, 3) conduct landscape analyses to identify "connectivity zones" and use these analyses to engage transportation planners earlier in the planning process, 4) enlist transportation engineers to help solve technical problems, and 5) design and conduct good monitoring studies to effectively evaluate various mitigation techniques. PROCESS. In the previous EA, public meetings were true public meetings. Those conducted for this EA were 'open houses' where attendees were precluded from hearing the concerns of their fellow citizens unless they were willing to follow each individual around which would be logistically impossible.  BIJOU INTERCHANGE. At one of the few public open houses which I did not attend, one advertised as discussing options for the Cimarron/Colorado interchanges, a proposal was presented to remove the Bijou interchange entirely and increase the size of the next two interchanges to the south. I learned of this option when I attended the Transportation Committee meeting of the Downtown Partnership. When I expressed support for this option I was told by the CDOT representatives that this option had been taken off the table as the Downtown Partnership did not support it. The DTP does NOT represent all the citizens of Colorado Springs. Removing this interchange would allow for the reconnection of the south portion of Monument Valley Park with the rest of the Park. It would also allow for a pedestrian plaza uniting a number of Colorado Springs's distinguishing public buildings which are on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places: Carnegie Library, St. Mary's Cathedral and the Knights of Columbus Building.  NOISE. The day will come when man will have to fight merciless noise as the worst enemy of his health. Robert Koch, 1880  As a more than twenty-year resident and frequent user of Monument Valley Park, the increase in noise from the highway in the past few years is substantial. Contrasting the noise study done by a local engineer with that done by a national firm for the 1989-91 EA, one cannot but wonder at the differences in information and approach. The earlier noise consultant was quite open about the impossibility of mitigating noise due to the topography of the area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>EA Sections 5-12: Public Involvement, open houses should have been hearing formats</p> <p>NEPA Process</p> <p>Alternatives considered:  Bijou interchange concept</p>
--	--	--	---

**PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED – In alphabetical order by last name or organization**

<p>He also recommended against parallel sound walls which he said often had the effect of magnifying the noise. His recommendations supported the landscape plan done by EDAW for the same EA which called for berms and shorter sound walls using sound absorptive materials. CDOT and their consultants seemed to be unwilling or unable to investigate current mitigation techniques in use elsewhere in the US. Research on this topic was completed by concerned citizens and rejected out-of-hand by CDOT. Despite information presented from successful mitigation strategies in other communities, CDOT consistently refused to consider alternatives. Their preferred technique, tined concrete, is used in Europe only for airport runways. Indeed, in Great Britain, there is a national plan to phase out the use of concrete in urban areas in favor of the quieter asphalt. Clearly an issue there of looking out for residents before favoring the automobile. England also appears to be ahead of us in considering public facilities such as interstate highways "dirty public things" which benefit the community but must be mitigated for those who live in close proximity. In refusing to consider or acknowledge the research done by concerned citizens, officials were not acting as public servants but as their own policy makers. This is a classic example of professional resistance. "We still need expertise, science, and technology. What we no longer need, in most situations and especially in local government, is the negative side of professionalism, that is, people who insist on making unilateral technically based decisions that affect people's lives and strip them of the opportunity to function as citizens. The reinventing/customer service movement has much to recommend it, but it's dark side is importation of the economic metaphor into public life in a way that aggravates the problem of disempowerment of the people who "own" the community, the citizens, in favor of the secretive "mystery and mastery" of those who assume control of government through use of technical expertise. The question is whether these "experts" should be useful advisers, helping people to see the consequences of possible courses of action, or whether they should simply control public agencies, letting the rest of us know what they have decided to do with our money and community after they have made the decision." Professor Richard Box, University of Nebraska, Omaha</p>	<p align="center"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p align="center">Noise: Impact to parks, mitigate noise using newer technology</p>	<p>SIZE OF PROJECT. By any measure--length of highway, number of interchanges to be replaced, proposed cost, time spent on EA, length of EA and appendices, this is an ENORMOUS project. By any indice comparison with other projects in Colorado, this will have significant impacts in our community. It's difficult to understand why an EIS wasn't selected as the correct approach to analyzing the impacts in our community and giving due consideration to all the alternatives. PROPERTY VALUES AND STABLE NEIGHBORHOODS. It has been well documented that one of the causes of neighborhood decay is the widening of roadways and the concomitant decrease in amenities such as landscaping and the increase in noise and pollution. The North End, Roswell, the Mesa Springs neighborhoods have all been stable areas since before the interstate was built. Already the increased noise from the work done under the categorical exclusion is a constant topic of conversation and concern and this is without the proposed further widening. In decreasing property values and neighborhood decay, the community will not only loose important residential areas and tax base but will also lose a significant contribution to the character-defining neighborhoods which reflect the history and development of our city. VISUAL IMPACT. Almost one hundred years ago the citizens of Colorado Springs taxed themselves to bring Charles Mulford Robinson, father of the City Beautiful movement, to their town. One of his strong recommendations was to be sure and never place anything between the town and its mountain backdrop. In elevating the roadbed and adding sound walls beyond human scale, CDOT has effectively added a strong element of visual pollution to the view corridor of anyone on the east side of the highway. Proposed sound walls will only add to this negative impact.</p>	<p align="center"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p align="center">General Opposition: EIS needed</p> <p align="center">Land Use</p> <p align="center">Socioeconomics: Impacts to neighborhoods and property values</p> <p align="center">Visual Resources: Impact of highway and noise walls</p>
---	---	---	--

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

<p>AIR QUALITY. The EA done in 1989-91 demonstrated that more lanes would attract more cars and thus, air quality would NOT improve. Cars might move faster but the increased number would result in no improvement in air quality. Many physicians have recommended that the standards for air quality be higher in areas of higher altitude where the pollution has a greater impact on lungs. Given that there are three parks which will be affected by the proposed expansion, any air pollution will have a significant impact on park users.</p> <p>WATER QUALITY. The amount of runoff from the interstate into Monument and Fountain Creeks is significant and a serious negative impact on water quality at a time when we are all concerned about the availability of water.</p> <p>MAUVAISE FOI. It is difficult to exactly explain the sense of this expression in French. It literally means 'bad faith.' In meetings, in presentations, in publications, it has been clear that Wilson and CDOT had already determined that the EA was just a required process prior to initiation of their desired project. As a fellow government employee I have been offended and angered by the arrogance and total absence of the notion of public employees as public servants. Having served on the I-25 Greenway Advisory Committee for the first EA, 1989-1991, I can not help but wonder what happened to the recommendations from the national firms which prepared studies for that project as well as the recommendations of our Council-appointed committee.</p> <p>MONUMENT VALLEY PARK. This remarkable gift to the citizens of Colorado Springs from the City's founder represents one of the most important amenities in the community. The last master plan from the City Park Department established this park as the City's most popular. Already the increased noise from the work done under the categorical exclusion (significantly raised road bed, cantilevered toward the Park, tined concrete, out of human scale sound walls, a monstrosously large pedestrian crossing and ramps) have had negative impacts on the quality of the experience of the Park. The minimal mitigation proposed under the EA will not be sufficient to offset the further adverse impacts of noise, air pollution, more walls, etc. Given that the donor intended this Park to be a place of respite and quiet contemplation, it is disingenuous at best to claim that there will be no or minimal adverse impacts. One of the most serious is at the gateway to the Park--its formal entrance from downtown at Bijou. CDOT proposes to elevate even more the Bijou interchange requiring that pedestrians use a stair to descend to the archway marking the formal entrance.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Air Quality: Impacts to parks, people</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Water Quality</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition: CDOT/Wilson had predetermined alternative</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Parks and Recreation: Impacts minimally mitigated</p>	<p>AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION. It is particularly disappointing to find professionals in any field who do not keep up with new advances in their area. Time and time again over the past decade, citizens have brought forward techniques and ideas used successfully in other communities and rather than receiving thanks from the Project staff, have been ignored or discounted as lacking professional expertise. This prevalent attitude in addition to the other shortcomings noted above have made the entire process a particularly negative one for those of us involved. I hope that the process for the EIS can start on a more positive note and that ideas brought forward by citizens will be considered in a more positive way.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to my concerns. I look forward to your responses to these issues.</p> <p>"The design of the ..Highway is premised on the idea that the road is a visitor and that it should respond to and be respectful of the land and the Spirit of Place... The Spirit of Place includes more than just the road and adjacent areas--it consists of the surrounding mountains, plains, hills, forest, valley and sky, and the paths of the waters, glaciers, winds, plants, animals and native peoples." US Highway 93 Memorandum of Agreement, page 1.</p> <p>Recorded April 22, 2004 Judith <u>Rice-Jones</u> See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">NEPA Process: Citizen suggestions not heeded with respect to new techniques and ideas</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Transportation Resources: I-25 is really 6 lanes now, not 4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Hazardous Waste Sites: EA does not address hazardous materials transported on I- 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">EA Sections 5-12: Holding open house on Earth Day callous</p>
--	--	---	--

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

<p>Sent: May 3, 2004  Name: Michelle <u>Richards</u>  Address: 1337 N Cascade  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80903</p> <p>We don't need to waste years of time and millions of dollars studying the effects of the inevitable widening of I-25. Unless you want to immediately stop all growth in Colorado Springs, the interstate needs to be widened.</p> <p>Why don't you focus your efforts on getting rid of the never ending, speeding traffic on Cascade Avenue instead. That is causing more direct smog, noise, pollution, and decrease in quality of life and property values than widening the interstate.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Transportation:  Improve speeding traffic on Cascade.</p>	<p>Sent: April 21, 2004  Name: Lloyd <u>Ripenburg</u>  Address: 102 N. Cascade  City: Colorado Springs  State: co  Zip: 80903</p> <p>These improvements are sorely needed and the sooner the better.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p>
<p>May 10, 2004  Dawn <u>Richert</u>  Please see the same comments from Susan M. Dewey</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p>		




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

<p>Sent: April 28, 2004  Name: Steve <u>Rodemer</u>  Address: 1903 wood Ave  City: Colorado Springs  State: Co  Zip: 80907</p> <p>The EA goes to length discussing neighborhoods and how certain problems will be mitigated but in the only historic neighborhood and Park in Colorado Springs, CDOT provides no noise mitigation. The Comprehensive Plan of Colorado Springs and many resolutions sent to CDOT by City Council all contain language that neighborhoods are important and they should be protected and enhanced. The I-25 project has already negatively impacted the historic Old North End Neighborhood (ONEN) and it's quality of life. Homes listed for sale have had contracts pulled because of noise while CDOT says that the residents aren't affected because their levels are below their noise abatement criteria. The 66 DBA level required by CDOT for abatement, is higher than the 65DBA the FAA uses for airports. The 66 DBA level is an abatement criterion that assumes such noise level will impact a neighborhood and does warrant serious consideration. Levels in the Historic Monument Valley PARK exceed, as admitted to by CDOT, the higher 66 DBA level and all CDOT has proposed are 3 non feasible solutions while posturing that it has worked hard to arrive at solutions. The requirement for parks to give up land so mitigation can be done begs the question why an EA wasn't done first before construction so as to find the problems and be proactive. Because the levels exceed 66DBA in the Park CDOT should use extraordinary measures to mitigate noise as required in Section F of NEPA. The only reasonable assessment of the models used showing that heavy trucks passing the park and the ONEN at the rate of one every 9 seconds, dictate that CDOT should aggressively seek to mitigate the noise problem.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Impacts to neighborhoods and parks, mitigation needed</p>	<p>A further inaccuracy is the language that "longitudinally cut concrete is "quiet" when numerous studies verified within the US and internationally demonstrate than this cut increases the noise by 2-3 DBA and is 6+ DBA louder than rubberized asphalt A solution barely given any ink (just one small paragraph) is rubberized asphalt which is used extensively by Arizona's DOT and CA's DOT and others. The statement that "alternative pavement measures are not considered a proven noise mitigation measure by FHWA and CDOT rings hollow. Simply because there is no credit for rubberized asphalt doesn't mean it shouldn't be considered and implemented. ADOT and CA DOT both use it extensively with great benefits. For a small cost of the total project a substantial noise and preservation treatment of the exiting roadbed is obtained. Further the installation of noise barriers and rubberized asphalt is in conformance with FHWA policy and would not be classified as noise abatement but rather result from the need to satisfy the serious section F provisions that are being violated. Strikingly, ADOT receives a 4 DBA credit for using rubberized asphalt. Their successful use of this product has been at elevations higher than Colo Springs, with! more inclement weather and pr oven to be more durable, last longer and save lives, while being ecologically friendly. There are significant impacts to Colorado Springs and the EA does not consider the cumulative impacts of all transportation projects to include those outlined in the EA. CDOT should aggressively and honestly work to solve the noise problems in the Historic Park and affected neighborhoods utilizing creative, innovative techniques. Surprisingly, even though the community has voiced concern numerous times over the same issue at many if not all of the 47 public meetings, the Comprehensive Plan of the City demands it and City Council asked for "diligence in recognizing the value of neighborhoods and parks in the area and in striving to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts upon them" CDOT continues to ignore those affected close to the I-25 corridor by obfuscating the issues, with inaccurate statements and non feasible solutions while plowing ahead.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Rubberized asphalt</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Neighborhoods</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Historic Resources</p>
---	--	---	--

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

<p>Richard <u>Rogozn</u>, along with a group of people representing TERRACON faxed identical faxes on May 12, 2004, please see under "TERRACON."</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>	<p>David L. <u>Root</u> - continued</p> <p>local, city, county, and state. The money should be there, the desire to future-think isn't. Colorado Springs leaders seem to be 40 years behind, and today (2004) are planning for the year 1980 ....not 2020. If we want an easy drive into, through, out of Colorado Springs, then we should be paving six or seven lanes for I-25 in each direction, right now! Then we should also build a similar, five-lanes in each direction, an I-25-E from Fountain north along the Marksheffel corridor (it's too late and would be too expensive to make Powers a freeway). In 2020 (when such a project could be completed) the traffic demand will more than double today's demand. We must match demand with capacity, or suffer the consequences of our inaction. Just like today, we suffer the inaction of the "Mayor Bob," and his prediccissors, era!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p>
<p>Sent: March 31, 2004          Name: David L. <u>Root</u>          Address: 19435 Kershaw Court          City: Monument          State: CO          Zip: 80132</p> <p>I was first stationed at the USAF Academy in march of 1982. I have been a resident of Colorado Springs since that time. I grew up in San Bernardino, California (a city that over the last 50 years has very closely matched Colorado Springs in growth and Population). Because COS has a similar population and geographic size to San bernardino, one would think that it would have similar infrastructure. However, I-25 remains mostly the same two-lanes in each direction that it was when constructed 40+ years ago. One Freeway, two lanes going North and two lanes going South. San Bernardino has four (4) Freeways. One of them, I-10, is six lanes in each direction. The others are three or four lanes in each direction. Capacity is amazing, but it is very similar to what Colorado Springs NEEDS, not wants, but NEEDS! Our gas taxes are much the same as in California. What is different is the clearly understood dedication to the future of the area displayed by our elected leaders;</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p>		<p>Transportation:</p> <p>Alternatives considered:          East bypass in addition to I-25 improvements</p> <p>6-7 lanes per direction needed</p>

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

<p>Sent: April 7, 2004          Name: Roger <u>Ross</u>          Address: 1275 North Newport Road          City: Colorado Springs          State: CO          Zip: 80916</p> <p>I fully support the proposed initiative of widening the intercity I-25 corridor to reduce congestion and provide capacity for future growth. Additionally, to increase the attractiveness of Colorado Springs for new businesses, airport access needs to be improved. Perhaps the 24 bypass/south powers boulevard needs to be improved to provide a direct route from I-25 to the airport.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>General Support</p> <p>Alternatives Considered:          Improve 24 bypass/Powers for airport access as well</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Department MAY 13 2004</p> <p>To the Colorado Department of Transportation          Re: Proposed widening of I-25 in Colorado Springs</p> <p>I've listened to your spin-answers to the valid questions put to you by the Old North End Neighbors, CONO, Friends of Monument Valley Park, the Sierra Club, etc. Now I'd like to ask you Why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-25 in Denver is lined on BOTH sides of that highway?</li> <li>When residents of a Denver neighborhood banded together to protest your taking portions of their backyards along 1-25, you acceded to their demands?</li> <li>When a local TV station aired news that residents of Pueblo were shown protesting your taking portions of a city park, your spokesperson assured viewers that you would build walls on Both sides of 1-25 for them?</li> <li>Why did you do an EIS in Pueblo and Douglas County but did only an EA in Colorado Springs?????</li> </ol> <p>WHY are you so unwilling to listen to residents who have long endured the roar of 1-25 and the pollutants it spreads when we ask you not to expand the highway without at the least providing a wall or berms or rubber asphalt along the stretch which borders an historic park where residents of the ENTIRE city hike, bike, play soccer, and enjoy its beauty and where children play in its many playgrounds?????</p> <p>Don't we deserve equal rights as Coloradans as residents of other counties? I would like direct answers to these questions. I must remind you that the North End was an established neighborhood long before 1-25 was on your planning boards.</p> <p><i>Joy B. Rucker</i>          Joy B. Rucker          2348 Wood Avenue          Colorado Springs 80907</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Noise:          Denver has noise barriers on both side of I-25</p> <p>Right of Way:          Denver residents fought land acquisition, Pueblo residents protested taking of park</p> <p>NEPA Process:          Why was an EIS not conducted</p>
 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Environmental Assessment          Open Forum Public Hearing</b>          April 22, 2004</p> <p>Required information for tracking purposes.          Please fill in information below.</p> <p>Name: <u>ROBERT L. RUTTHACK</u>          Address: <u>7174 METROPOLITAN ST. COLO SPRS, CO 80909</u>          Representing: <u>HOME OWNER</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">COMMENTS</p> <p><u>GET STARTED ON THE I-25 PROJECT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE</u>  <u>EVERYONE WHO DRIVES ON I-25 REALIZES THE NEED FOR NUMEROUS</u>  <u>IMPROVEMENTS, THE TRAFFIC SITUATION WILL CONTINUE TO GET WORSE.</u>  <u>THERE IS NO NEED TO WAIT FOR ANY FURTHER STUDIES. LETS</u>  <u>GET STARTED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE</u></p> <p>PLACE your completed form in one of the marked baskets.          MAIL this form to: Wilson &amp; Co., Attn: Cheryl Everitt,          455 E. Pikes Peak Ave., Ste. 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80903          FAX (719) 520-0108, Attn: Cheryl Everitt.          VISIT <a href="http://www.i25environment.com">www.i25environment.com</a> and click on EA Comment Form.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Thank you for attending the open forum public hearing and          for taking the time to share your comments with us.</p>	<p>General Support</p>	<p>Sent: April 17, 2004          Name: Ken <u>Rudy</u>          Address: 2001 Rampart Range Road          City: Woodland Park          State: CO          Zip: 80863</p> <p>I think we need to improve this section of freeway. The bridges are crumbling and must be repaired or replaced. In light of our projected future use it seems to be the only environmentally responsible thing to do.</p> <p>Go for it.</p>	<p>General Support</p>

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

<p>Sent: April 28, 2004  Name: David <u>Ryan</u>  Address: 233 N. El Paso  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80903</p> <p>I don't think that the answer to our congestion problems is to keep adding lanes to the interstate. Alternative transportation modes are the answer. I don't agree with the conclusions reached regarding light rail. The study is making certain assumptions about how few people would use light rail and I think those assumptions are wrong. They were wrong about the light rail in Denver. Usage has far exceeded the initial expectations. Adequate parking, convenient feeder systems (i.e. connecting busses) and logical destinations such as downtown, the World Arena area, and Fort Carson would make light rail a huge success!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Alternatives considered:  Light rail</p>	<p>Sent: April 15, 2004  Name: Eric <u>Ryan</u>  Address: 230 Mayfield Lane  City: Colorado Springs  State: CO  Zip: 80906</p> <p>I work in downtown Colorado Springs. We absolutely need the widening of I-25 through the city!!!!!! Please improve our capacity improvements.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>General Support</p>
---	--	---	---