



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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Sent: April 15, 2004 Name: Maria <u>Salinas</u> Address: 940 Harbournes St City: Colorado Springs State: co Zip: 80911</p> <p>Something needs to be done to lessen the congestion in the Co Springs to make things safer for all of us</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>I have friends that live off of Chestnut further down where there are the walls, and it actually has helped. I am all for widening I-25 and increasing the traffic flow so it actually moves faster and more fluidly through town, since in the wisdom of the City's forefathers, no one considered any type of bypass system which is crucial to re-routing heavy traffic (trucks) and tourists around the town instead of through it, but it's too late for that option. Please send me any notices you would like as I want to stay involved on behalf of the citizens of Holland Park. Thanks for allowing me to express my opinions on this urgent matter.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support: Support for widening</p> |
| <p>Sent: March 29, 2004 Name: Diane <u>Salisbury</u> Address: 834 Darby Street City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80907</p> <p>As someone who is originally from a congested area in New York State, we have been in the Colorado Springs area for almost 20 years, and have always taken pride in the fact that planners took into consideration quality of life standards when building roads or developments, with consideration for peace and quiet, and the ability to enjoy your home. We moved from the south end of town to Holland Park last Summer because we love that neighborhood; older homes, lots of great big trees, beautifully-landscaped yards, nice neighbors who have lived there since the '60's. The only drawback we found was the noise level from I-25. Our house is in the middle of Darby Street, quite a ways from Chestnut Street and I-25, however, the noise is a constant background. I can't even imagine living on Chestnut Street. No wonder a lot of the homes there are for sale. It's tolerable at our house because we are tucked in a little bit, but to compound that noise and increase it with more traffic, I can't stand by and accept that. The only compromise would be extremely high sound barriers and noise-reducing berms along the Interstate to lessen the nose level</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Mitigation seriously needed</p> | <p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: Patrick <u>Salvador</u> Address: 7075 Blue Ocean Pt City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80922</p> <p>After looking over the I-25 EAS, I cannot find anything wrong with the proposal. The noise impacts are to be expected with any type if expansion, and affected residents should know that as any city grows, such road expansions are necessary. Frankly, this expansion should have been taken care of over a decade ago. I've been through many cities much smaller than Colorado Springs throughout the U.S., and most have significantly better interstate systems than we do. Colorado Springs will continue to grow, and putting off the I-25 widening project will only increase the costs of doing it later. Not to mention the added heartaches that will go with postponing it (longer commute times, increased pollution, etc). To the point, let's move ahead with this project ASAP.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Sent: April 29, 2004 Name: Ronald <u>Sanchez</u> Address: 4981 Cherry Springs Dr City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80918</p> <p>1. Consider extending HOV lanes to north of Baptist Road. 2. Be proactive in deleting or significantly changing the classification of the Pebles Jumping mouse from threatened list to something more benign would decrease overall cost along impacted creek corridors. We can't have a bunch of Monument type interchanges along the impacted corridors. 3. Use combination of berms and native trees for sound barrier construction vs. concrete walls. This is visually pleasing. If the residents can't see the road it will reduce the noise impact criteria significantly. 4. Incorporate wider shoulders to accommodate bicycle traffic. 5. Reconstruct entire Northgate interchange with the Powers interchange to increase efficiency. Constructing a new interchange less than a mile from an existing will create weaving and merging issues on a high speed interstate. Consider multi-level directional interchanges and fly-overs to minimize merging issues with mainline traffic. 6. Consider single urban point interchanges to increase intersection LOS by eliminating un-necessary traffic movements. 7. Coordinate lights at intersections with City Traffic to increase Level of Service at interchanges and surrounding intersections. 8. Provide for bicycle traffic under interchanges.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Continue HOV lanes to Baptist Rd.</p> <p>Threatened/Endangered: De-list Preble's mouse</p> <p>Noise: Use berms/trees to mitigate noise</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Wider shoulders to accommodate bicycle traffic</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Northgate/Powers interchange construction</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Consider SPUI's</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Coordinate signal timing</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Provide bicycle access under interchanges</p> | <p>9. Acquire enough ROW to accommodate rail or addition of extra lanes now instead of 50 years from now. Understandably outer limits of ROW may be limited in the future- more reason to plan acquisition now. Therefore plan for increase safety requirements in the future with less recovery area between the roadway and use of barriers between opposing traffic. 10. Consider use of reversible HOV Lanes to increase directional flow capacities during peak volumes. 11. Incorporate trails where appropriate near existing trails and trail heads to future trails. 12. Use T-Interchanges for ingress/egress from HOV lanes to minimize requirement to have HOV users back into main flow of traffic to exit at intermediate intersections. 13. Consider tolls for HOV for single occupancy users 14. Incorporate visual barrier between northbound and southbound lanes to minimize rubbernecking, gawking, and slowdowns due to curiosity. Educate the public on the impact of rubbernecking on traffic flows. 15. Use concrete throughout to obtain favorable life cycle costs and minimize frequent repairs/maintenance associated with asphalt.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>Right of Way: Acquire ROW for future rail expansion</p> <p>Alternatives considered reversible HOV lanes</p> <p>Alternatives considered Incorporate trails</p> <p>Alternatives considered T intersections for HOV lanes</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Make HOV lanes toll for single occupant vehicles</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Visual barriers along median</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Use concrete versus asphalt</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Sent: April 29, 2004 Name: Shirley Sanden Address: 2541 Chilson Lane City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80904</p> <p>Third/fourth lanes need to be added to maintain quality of living, period. It is a bit difficult to understand why funds have been spent to widen I-25 north to Wyoming or a new overpass will have appeared seemingly overnight somewhere between Lincoln and 120th when El Paso County's needs are so great....or, perhaps not. We are not going to prevent growth, nor am I a proponent of restricting growth. However, growth without being prepared will greatly impact the quality of our community. EPC needs I-25 widened period. Thank you for providing this forum.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> | <p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: Thomas Savage Address: 6140 Canyon Springs Place City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80918</p> <p>Overall, this appears to be a very thorough analysis; congratulations on a job well done. This project is long overdue, as are many other transportation infrastructure projects in Colorado. In general, I could not care less about the Prebble mouse. As far as the noise, the measures planned to be taken to reduce it seem to me to be sufficient. If the people on the North End are not satisfied, let 'em eat cake. Regarding car pool lanes: In today's Gazette there was an article titled "Monument bus halted." For the last 18-months, Springs Transit ran this service between the town of Monument and two city locations; only 15 riders used the service. I am not aware of any HOV success story along the front range. In my opinion, HOV lanes through the Springs would be a big waste of money. Where are these car pools supposed to be headed? From one end of town to the other? Think again. Regarding the Nevada-Rockrimmon interchange, I did not see provision for the Vincent Street connector that would allow traffic to access Dublin Blvd. Hopefully, it is not pertinent to the environmental study and is still in the plan. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives considered: HOV lanes a waste</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives considered Vincent St connector to Dublin Blvd.</p> |
| <p>7/11-12-2004 WED 10:07 AM TERRACON FAX NO. 3 P. 02</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Assessment Open Forum Public Hearing April 22, 2004</p> <p>Required information for tracking purposes. Please fill in information below: Name: <u>Cooki Santa</u> Address: <u>4620 Blueberry Lane</u> Representing: <u>1</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">COMMENTS</p> <p><i>In heavy congestion in our I-25 corridor - I do agree with the notion of widening/expanding lanes thru town - Woodmen Rd - South. The Environmental Assessment seems to be adequate to mitigate, make this happen - Our city is expanding, our growth is enormous and the commuters here here, would benefit from two or more lanes. I am pleased to see that we are working towards a better, safer, and much friendlier I-25!</i></p> <p>PLACE your completed form in one of the marked baskets. MAIL this form to: Wilson & Co., Attn: Cheryl Evertt, 455 E. Pikes Peak Ave., Ste. 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 FAX (719) 520-0108, Attn: Cheryl Evertt. VISIT www.I25environment.com and click on EA Comment Form. Thank you for attending the open forum public hearing and for taking the time to share your comments with us.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> |  <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Assessment Open Forum Public Hearing April 22, 2004</p> <p>Required information for tracking purposes. Please fill in information below: Name: <u>STEVE JAYE</u> Address: <u>1611 WOOD AVE. C/S, CO 80907</u> Representing: <u>OPEN NEIGHBORHOOD / FUTURE GENERATIONS</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">COMMENTS</p> <p><i>THE EXPANSION OF I25 IS A NEEDED PIECE OF A LONG TERM TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION. HOWEVER, THE FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT VIA THE EA IGNORES REALITY. THE EFFECTS OF NOISE AND POLLUTION ARE BOTH MEANINGFUL AND PERMANENT. MONUMENT VALLEY PARK AND THE OLD NORTH END SPECIFICALLY SHOULD BE MEASURED AND PROTECTED. THE CITY OF COS IN PARTICULAR SHOULD BE EMPOWERED BY ITS HANDS OFF APPROACH TO THIS ISSUE. I HOPE COIT CAN RECOGNIZE THE TRUE IMPACT AND GET TOGETHER WITH A FEASIBLE CITY TEAM TO FIND A SOLUTION. BEYOND LEGAL MAIL this form to: Wilson & Co., Attn: Cheryl Evertt, 455 E. Pikes Peak Ave., Ste. 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 NEEDS TO BE SOLVED. FAX (719) 520-0108, Attn: Cheryl Evertt. VISIT www.I25environment.com and click on EA Comment Form. Thank you for attending the open forum public hearing and for taking the time to share your comments with us.</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support: Supports widening</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Mitigate for north end and parks</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Sent: April 17, 2004 Name: Linda L. <u>Schauer</u> Address: 9965 Otero Ave. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920 I commend you on the huge undertaking of this very necessary study. I-25 is an ancient and fragile freeway system that is no longer adequate to meet the needs of Colorado. Your study seems to meet the needs today but I wonder if it will really be sufficient for the years through 2025. You did not state how many lanes you will be adding. Will this become a three lane highway with that third lane becoming the car pool lane (which seems barely adequate) or will it become a four lane with the fourth lane a carpool lane? The four lanes will open up the flow of traffic and in my opinion be able to handle the traffic farther into the future. Thank you for your hard work and for asking for us the ones who drive I-25 daily, our opinion.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Transportation: Questions number of lanes, future viability</p> | <p>Sent: April 20, 2004 Name: Patrick <u>Scheetz</u> Address: 9070 Charity Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: Co Zip: 80920 I Support the improvement.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> |
| <p>Sent: May 12, 2004 Name: Ann <u>Scheer</u> Address: 7221 Antelope Lane City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920 I am FULLY IN FAVOR of the proposed I-25 Improvements. I believe Colorado Springs is WAY behind the times of keeping up with the growth we have had over the years. I have lived in the Springs 46 years and saw the tremendous growth, yet no one had the common sense to address the impact these thousands of people moving to our lovely city had on the traffic situation. I believe this issue should have been addressed 20 years ago. It is embarrassing when visitors talk about how hi-tech Colorado Springs is, and yet, there seems to be no intelligence and action when it comes to our traffic and freeway problems. When I speak of "Common Sense," I am referring to the fact that it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that ONE FREEWAY (with only 4 lanes until fairly recently) is not nearly enough for more than half a MILLION people. This didn't just happen overnight. Our city leaders should have addressed this issue years ago. Again, I applaud those who have addressed this public necessity and give my full support for furthering their endeavors in improving I-25. Thank you so much for allowing me to present my views and frustrations in regards to this issue of utmost importance.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>Sent: May 11, 2004 Name: Richad <u>Schell</u> Address: 225 West Caramillo City: Colorado Springs State: Co Zip: 80907 I urge this study to continue as it affects my Life greatly. I Live on a beautiful corner of Colorado Springs Old North End! Did I say Beautiful Yes But Its so Loud from the interstate now I cant imagine what my life will be like to hear even a higher volume of noise if CDOT is allowed to widen the intersate without taking measures to build sound walls, and any other quiet measures... I purcased my home knowing that there were some noise and I heard it some,But its not like it is when you live here ..I cant even sleep at times and have done all I can in my outdoor living to Muffle the noise,ie Speakers fountains, unfortunately I cant play music during the rush hour, as a Courtesy to my neighbors.. Yet I dont think they could hear it I barely can.. My dream home that I have completely remodled and sunk a ton of money and energy into has almost become a burden based on that I truly dont know if I have made a big mistake.. Please do all that you can to Protect this beautiful n! eighborhood as it is one of the finest places to be(except for the noise of the interstate..) No kidding I invite to host a coffee in my home on and given weekday morning to allow CDOT to experience what I do everyday from inside and out of my Home.. PLEASE hear the voice of the people in the North End of colorado Springs...Thank you for caring,</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Sound walls or other mitigation measures</p> |


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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Sent: April 4, 2004 Name: sandy <u>schenecker</u> Address: 8135 spire ct City: cos State: co Zip: 80919 i think this needs to be done, however, if it takes as long or is managed as inefficiently as the woodmen exchange is being done, no thank you. Look how long it has taken to do one and the mess of traffic is has made and you are proposing to do 4+ more?</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> | <p>Sent: May 10, 2004 Name: Sharon <u>Schriner</u> Address: 1319 Culebra Ave. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80903</p> <p>I feel that Monument Vally Park is impacted greatly from I-25! I can't understand how the EA could over look this. The park has had a loud roar since the day the wall went up on the west side of the highway. I feel that the very best mitigation possible is needed to save the character of this historic park! AS you proposed north of Unitah, Recreation Way could be closed and a berm put down the center of the road ---which might help some. But,I definitely think an Asphalt Rubber overlay down I-25 along the park would be extremely helpful. My worst fear is that the improvements proposed to I-25 will make the park unusable. I'm not in favor of more walls added to the south of Unitah because I worry that the sound will bounce off and make the noise level worse in the adjoining neighborhood. Plus how sad not to be able to see the mountains as General Palmer had planned for the park users. Thanks for listening,</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Parks and recreation: Noise impacts to park, visual impacts from noise walls, suggests berms</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 18, 2004 Name: robert <u>schickler</u> Address: 6520 Glade Park Dr City: Colo Sprgs State: Co Zip: 80918 Please widen I-25 thru the City of Colorado Springs</p> | <p>General Support</p> | | |
| <p>Sent: April 19, 2004 Name: Susan <u>Schooler</u> Address: 5085 Platinum Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80918 The proposed improvements are greatly needed to keep up with growth. We can not continue to jeopardize our lives each time we travel throughout the city. We need to travel around Colorado Springs in a safe and effective manner. We must allow others to enjoy our city and make room just as we were allowed the same room!</p> | <p>General Support</p> | | |
| <p>Recorded April 22, 2004 Terry <u>Schooler</u> See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p> | <p>General Support</p> | <p>Sent: April 28, 2004 Name: Joan <u>Schulz</u> Address: 1325 N. Cascade Ave City: Colo. Sprgs. State: CO Zip: 80903</p> | <p>Noise: Noise barriers</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 6, 2004 Name: Jon <u>Schreiber</u> Address: 9917 English Ivy Court City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920 I think it is complete and well done. I-25 needs to be widened to support future growth. This town is becoming a big city and additional access is required. I like the 8 lane highway approach. Press on.</p> | <p>General Support</p> | <p>I live 3 blocks off of I-25 in the area that was upgraded several years ago. I walk in Monument Valley Park every morning at 5AM. The noise in the park after I-25 switched over to the ribbed concrete has been terrible. There are many mornings when it is an awful roar. I would like to see some noise barriers put in place. I appreciate your accepting comments.</p> | |




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

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Sent: April 27, 2004 Name: anton <u>schulzki</u> Address: 3178 soaring bird circle City: colorado springs State: co Zip: 80920 I favor all the proposed improvements except the bus and high occupancy lanes. They are a waste. They will lead to more congestion than they will alleviate. Not to mention the added pollution they will generate.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> <p>Alternatives considered: HOV lanes a waste</p> | <p>Sent: April 16, 2004 Name: Clint <u>Scruggs</u> Address: 6329 Maroon Mesa Drive City: Colorado Springs State: co Zip: 80918 We need to consider the impact on the environment for sure! More importantly we need to catch up with the growth that we have allowed here already. The environmental choices were already decided by our government earlier. We need improved roads and highways yesterday. Let's build them with the least impact we can without killing the overburned tax payer who will drive on these roads not some mouse. Thank you for your time to read this concern!</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 25, 2004 Name: Mike <u>Scott</u> Address: 2305 Tabor Ct City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919 Study is a thorough review of a long needed effort to improve transportation. Government should proceed with I-25 widening/capacity improvements now.</p> | <p>General Support</p> | | |
| <p>Sent: April 5, 2004 Name: Thomas A <u>Scott</u> Address: 12820 Stone View Road City: Monument State: CO Zip: 80132 I appreciate the years of study and the results in the proposal that was presented in the local paper in the past week. I support the proposal for adding the additional lanes to accommodate the increase in the number of cars and trucks using the I 25 road on a daily bases. The sooner the project begins the better.</p> | <p>General Support</p> | <p>Sent: March 28, 2004 Name: Charles W <u>Sebald</u> Address: 3475 Monarch Pass dr City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80917 I feel very strongly that the complete widening of I 25 should be completed. So far as the mouse habitat I feel this area should be used for this highway project with no restrictions. No restrictions, for the mouse area, should be placed upon the project to potect this habitat. Any additional costs incurred by restrictions should be funded by non-profit organizations wanting to protect this type of habitat. I will be glad to come before any meeting and present my feelings and views on this project.</p> | <p>General Support</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 21, 2004 Name: Peter M <u>Scoville</u> Address: 2 N. Cascade Ave. Ste.800 City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80903 This study and the proposed improvements are crucial to the sustainabilty of our city. We are a city that can not afford both financially and infrastrutre wise to not pursue these improvements. I wholly support this study.</p> | <p>General Support</p> | <p>Sent: April 16, 2004 Name: Tony <u>Seran</u> Address: 10935 Chiming Bell Circle City: Peyton State: CO Zip: 80831-6849 Although the I-25 corridor is important, the need for an additional North/South corridor further East would relieve a lot of the pressure from I-25.</p> | <p>Alternatives considered: East bypass also needed</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Sent: April 2, 2004 Name: Jeremy <u>Shaver</u> Address: 11555 Lexie Ln City: Black Forest State: CO Zip: 80908 We need to increase capacity as soon as possible not only is it holding our city back from it's potential, but also the longer we wait the more money will be spent in the future!</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> |  <p>Environmental Assessment Open Forum Public Hearing April 22, 2004</p> <p>Required information for tracking purposes. Please fill in information below: Name: <u>Todd SHERMAN</u> Address: <u>615 WUTHERING HEIGHTS DR.</u> Representing: _____</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p><i>to take #1 priority should be to add at least one more lane between southbound Woodmen and Nevada interchanges on I-25. The new Woodmen interchange has not improved that traffic flow. Woodmen to Nevada is still a bottleneck nearly every morning of traffic backing up 7-8 miles. It is at the site of the most accidents in the city. Until you add a third lane between Woodmen and Nevada, you will not improve the traffic congestion.</i></p> <p><i>2. Very few cars have more than one occupant on the morning commute. An HOV lane would be a waste of needed traffic capacity.</i></p> <p><small>PLACE your completed form in one of the marked baskets. MAIL this form to: Wilson & Co., Attn: Cheryl Evertt, 405 E. Pike Peak Ave., Ste. 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80905 FAX (760) 520-0108, Attn: Cheryl Evertt. VISIT www.23environment.com and click on EA Comment Form. *Thank you for attending the open forum public hearing and for taking the time to share your comments with us.</small></p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>Alternatives considered : Additional lane needed between Nevada and Woodmen</p> <p>Alternatives considered : HOV lanes a waste</p> |
| <p>Sent: May 11, 2004 Name: Dr. Frank H. <u>Shelton</u> Address: 1327 Culebra Ave City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80903 CDOT should prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. CDOT has added capacity to I-25 and has escaped requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act. CDOT should come into the present era, like many other states, and get with it on reducing noise with rubberized asphalt. CDOT means Currently Deficient Out of Times. CDOT needs to get with it, and really do an impact study on its I-25 expansion effects on "The Old North End."</p> | <p>General opposition: EIS needed</p> <p>NEPA Process</p> <p>Noise: Rubberized asphalt</p> | <p>Sent: April 23, 2004 Name: todd and gretchen <u>sherman</u> Address: 615 Wuthering Heights Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: co Zip: 80921</p> <p>I've attended your meetings, talked to your engineers, and scoured your web site but I can't find out what you are planning to do to solve the most serious congestion cause in Colorado Springs: I-25 southbound between Woodmen and Nevada. That short stretch is the primary bottleneck to traffic coming into Colorado Springs and causes frequent traffic jams for miles and more accidents than any other spot in Colorado Springs. Your first priority should be to add at least one lane to I-25 southbound from Woodmen to N. Nevada to alleviate the congestion. All other plans will have much less impact and should be done later. Please do an extra lane on an emergency basis now! Please tell me how I can find out about these plans and your progress. Thank you.</p> | <p>Alternatives considered : Questions why the plans are for I-25 between Woodmen & Nevada</p> |
| <p>Recorded April 22, 2004 Todd <u>Sherman</u> See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p> | <p>Alternatives considered</p> <p>NO HOV Lanes More capacity southbound I-25</p> | <p>Sent: April 23, 2004 Name: todd and gretchen <u>sherman</u> Address: 615 Wuthering Heights Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: co Zip: 80921</p> | <p>Alternatives considered : Questions why the plans are for I-25 between Woodmen & Nevada</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Sent: April 6, 2004 Name: Ann <u>Simpson</u> Address: 6875 Dauntless Ct City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919</p> <p>I think the study was very good. However, I was wondering if there are ever considerations of aesthetics. I recognize that this could be considered subjective, but it seems like some objective criteria or process for public input could be put into place to make sure that these projects add to the beauty of the front range as well as the efficiency of traffic flow. Aesthetics (especially in a state known for its beauty) do have positive economic impacts. In my opinion, we should consider how the project will look in the end as well.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and the ability to easily comment via the web.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> <p>Visual Resources: Make aesthetically pleasing</p> | <p>Sent: April 21, 2004 Name: James T. <u>Skadden</u> Address: 7025 Defoe Ave. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80911-2926</p> <p>The plans for the up-grade of I-25 not only look well thought-out and thorough, but the alternatives have been researched as well.</p> <p>I would suggest that you look closely at the relatively new activity at exit 132 (Colo. Hwy 116). Several new builders in the Widefield-Fountain area have geometrically added pressure to this interchange, and to the lanes from Exit 132-135 (South Academy) within just the last year. It is not uncommon, in the 3:30-6:00 PM time frame, to have 30-50 cars on the off ramp (Exit 132) of southbound I-25 waiting, many pulled over on the shoulder to avoid blocking southbound traffic, trying to get onto Hwy 116 (Mesa Ridge Parkway). Together with the exit traffic of Ft. Carson's Gate #20, this creates a particularly hazardous situation.</p> <p>I am fully in favor of the improvements on I-25. They are long over due. I am a Realtor and am in my car a lot with clients. Their comments are often negative about the traffic in the area. I personally have seen the travel time from one end of town to the other double and sometimes triple! Not only is the current situation frustrating, it is unhealthy. Sitting in traffic is never healthy, economic, or effecient. When traffic is stalled, often due to an accident, there really isn't any other reasonable alternatives around the problem. I have tried them all! I often have to travel to Denver from Colorado Springs. The amount of traffic north of the Springs to Denver is phenominal, day and night. Both lanes are literally bumper to bumper all the way, at 75+ MPH! If a truck pulls over into the left lane to pass (often taking almost a mile to accomplish the feat uphill), the traffic is effected for miles! Please consider having trucks stay in the right 2 lanes in all areas where there are more than 2 lanes in that direction. This seems to work well in the East (New York for instance). Thanks for your work, and the opportunity for some input.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> <p>Transportation: Exit 132 issues</p> |
|   <p><i>Apr 5 2004</i></p> <p><i>Wilson and Company 450 E. Pine Knoll Dr, Suite 200 Colorado Springs, Co 80913 Re: I-25 project</i></p> <p><i>Dear Sirs:</i></p> <p><i>As a local citizen I wanted to encourage the project to widen and expand capacity of I-25 through Colorado Springs area to be built and completed as soon as possible.</i></p> <p><i>The plans I have seen on CDOT website and descriptions in newspaper, all look good to me, and I urge quick action to build project.</i></p> <p><i>Sincerely yours</i></p> <p><i>L. Wayne Six</i></p> <p><i>LWAYNE SIX 302 Rembrandt Park Dr. Colorado Springs, Co 80920</i></p>  <p><small>3710 Simon Road, Suite 100, Colorado Springs, CO 80907 • (719) 590-9990 • FAX (719) 590-9992 Denver Office: 390 Lincoln Blvd., Suite 100, Lakewood, CO 80226 • (720) 962-0930 • FAX (720) 962-0942</small></p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> | <p>Alternatives considered</p> <p>Consider confining trucks to right 2 lanes</p> | |


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

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Sent: May 12, 2004 Name: Jane Ard-Smith Address: 522 North Royer Street City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80903</p> <p>These comments to the draft EA are submitted on behalf of the Pikes Peak Group of the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the <u>Sierra Club</u>.</p> <p>Our comments are directed to four issues: (1) the information and analysis in the draft EA indicate that the proposed action will have a significant impact on the environment and as a result, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires CDOT to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) rather than issue a finding of no significant impact (FONSI); (2) By not evaluating the eight safety improvements that have been constructed since 1997 in conjunction with the proposed action in a single EIS, CDOT will effectively segment the overall expansion project; (3) The inclusion of a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in the proposed action seems to require the preparation of an EIS; and (4) The draft EA does not sufficiently analyze or consider certain aspects of the proposed action.</p> <p><u>The draft EA indicates that the proposed action will have a significant impact on the environment.</u> We believe that the draft EA clearly describes a significant impact on the environment. We offer two examples. First, the draft EA indicates that over 10% of the WPA Floodwall along Monument Creek will be disturbed, only about half of which will be restored after construction. This results in a permanent loss of more than 5% of an historic resource. There is no mitigation proposed for this 5% permanent loss. In addition, the draft EA indicates that the proposed action will increase the impervious surface area of the existing roadway by slightly more than 50%, resulting in a 57% increased runoff of certain contaminants, such as total suspended solids and heavy metals.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General opposition: Consider impacts to be significant, requiring an EIS 2. NEPA Process: An EIS is required, combining the Proposed Action and the previous safety projects 3. NEPA Process: Inclusion of HOV lanes requires EIS 4. NEPA Process: EA is deficient 5. Historic resources: Impact to historic WPA floodwall is significant | <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Continuation of Sierra Club e-mail:)</i></p> <p>It is unclear how the increased impervious surface area created by the ongoing and completed safety improvement projects figures into these calculations (i.e., were they considered part of the existing roadway for purposes of calculating the increased impervious area or part of the expanded roadway?). If the safety projects were not included in the calculations, however, it is possible that the impact could be higher. In any event, the increased contaminant runoff will directly impact the waterways along the I-25 corridor and, as identified in the EA, will result in increased levels of heavy metals in those waterways.</p> <p><u>Segmentation.</u> We believe that the proposed action and the safety projects along the I-25 corridor are part of a single plan to improve the I-25 corridor through Colorado Springs. As a result, NEPA requires CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to evaluate the proposed action and the safety improvements in a single EIS. We base this proposition on the I-25 Corridor Feasibility Study, which identified the need for I-25 capacity improvements and recommended that the project be phased given the limited available funding. Specifically, the Study recommended that the improvements be divided into three phases: safety projects, transportation system management improvements, and capacity improvements. However, these phases are interrelated as they part of an overall plan to improve the I-25 corridor. Moreover, the safety projects were designed with the anticipated capacity improvements in mind. There is nothing in the EA indicating that the safety projects will have to be reconfigured or otherwise changed in order to accommodate the proposed action.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Water quality: How was impervious area of safety projects taken into account – as existing or as part of Proposed Action? 7. Water quality: Increased roadway runoff would be significant impact 8. NEPA Process: An EIS is required, combining the Proposed Action and the previous safety projects |
|--|---|---|--|

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

| | ISSUES | | ISSUES |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p><i>(Continuation of Sierra Club e-mail:)</i></p> <p><u>Inclusion of an HOV lane.</u> The proposed action includes the addition of an HOV lane. Under 23 C.F.R. § 771.115(a)(4), it appears that this addition may require CDOT and the FHWA to prepare an EIS rather than an EA if the term "separate roadway" includes a new HOV lane where none presently exists.</p> <p><u>Sufficiency of the draft EA.</u> The draft EA indicates that the increased impervious surface from the proposed action is minimal when compared to the impacts created by increased growth. We believe that the proper comparison is between the impervious surface of the existing roadway and the impervious surface of the expanded highway. Thus, to the extent that the draft EA relies on this comparison to conclude that the increased surface area from the expanded highway will not have a significant impact on the environment, it is in error. While it may be true that an ever-increasing population will increase the amount of impervious surface area in the region, the impacts of that increased surface area will be widespread. The increased impervious surface area of the expanded highway, on the other hand, will directly impact Monument Creek and the waterways along the I-25 corridor. If any comparison is to be done between the region as a whole and the proposed action, it should be based on the impacts to Monument Creek and the waterways along the I-25 corridor - not the region as a whole. The draft EA does not sufficiently address the cumulative impacts of the safety improvements that have already been constructed or are under construction along the I-25 corridor. For example, the congestion data relied on to justify the proposed action was based on information obtained prior to the completion of several of the projects (i.e., in 2000).</p> | <p>9. NEPA Process: Addition of HOV lanes requires an EIS</p> <p>10. Water quality: Significance of project-level water quality impacts should not be determined by comparison to regional impacts</p> <p>11. Water quality: Need to evaluate impervious surface impacts to Monument Creek</p> <p>12. Transportation resources: Congestion data did not account for safety projects</p> | <p><i>(Continuation of Sierra Club e-mail:)</i></p> <p>But three of the safety projects have been completed since then. Have those safety improvements impacted congestion at the interchanges affected and if so, in what way? Similarly, the right-of-way impacts of the proposed action should not be considered in isolation for purposes of determining whether there has been a significant impact to residences, businesses, and low income or minority populations. Rather, the impacts created by the safety improvements should also be included to obtain an adequate evaluation. For example, how many minority businesses were impacted by the safety improvements at Tejon and Nevada, between Bijou and Fillmore, and along the Circle corridor?</p> <p>In comparing the socioeconomic impacts of the proposed action, the proper comparison is between the businesses along the I-25 corridor and the businesses impacted by the proposed action. The draft EA suggests that the proper comparison is to the city as a whole.</p> <p>Finally, we believe that the draft EA does not sufficiently evaluate the potential health risks associated with expanding I-25 in urban Colorado Springs. The draft EA simply punts the issue by summarily concluding that there are likely to be localized concentrations of air toxins and that emissions in the projected area will decrease over time. However, a number of peer-reviewed and published studies conclude that there is a link between traffic-related air pollution and health risks, such as the likelihood of asthma, premature and low birth weight babies, cancer, and generally higher risk of death. Attached is a summary of 22 such studies, along with contact information for the researchers. An evaluation of the potential health impacts to people who use and live along I-25, especially children, must be included in the EA.</p> | <p>13. Right-of-way impacts: What are the cumulative effects of past safety projects?</p> <p>14. Environmental justice: What are the cumulative impacts of past safety projects?</p> <p>15. Socioeconomic impacts: improper to assess I-25 corridor impacts with the city as a whole.</p> <p>16. Air quality: An evaluation of potential health impacts of traffic-related air toxics is needed</p> |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Sent: April 23, 2004 Name: John <u>Skar</u> Address: 3024 Virginia Ave. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80907</p> <p>I am strongly in favor of the project to widen I-25 through Colorado Springs by adding lanes. This has been a need for some time, and will only get worse if not fixed. Obviously, noise concerns must be addressed, but those concerns should not stop the proposed project. Safety issues and overall traffic flow are the paramount issues/needs, and they impact the entire community.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General support</p> <p>Noise: Concerns should be addressed</p> |  <p>Environmental Assessment Open Forum Public Hearing April 22, 2004</p> <p>Required information for tracking purposes. Please fill in information below: Name: <u>Michael Skar</u> Address: <u>4200 Franklin St., Colorado Springs, Co. 80905</u> Representing: <u>- self -</u></p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p><i>I'm convinced that more lanes will not mitigate the traffic problem. They will only get larger & worse. Widen the I-25 through Colorado Springs. The side issue to plan the widening expansion is a much greater public use and more transit options. More highways will mean more cars traveling at higher speeds. That always means more accidents and more deaths & loss. Don't increase the number of highways/ express lanes & hospital services? But people live in the west to drive. I realize this is a hard core fact, but to take public transit. It is a lifestyle not a transportation choice. I think the solution for with lower speed limits & better traffic law enforcement is more than adequate for Colorado Springs. I also have hearing & vision is devoted to the protection of what I need like the development of PWD - cat alternatives exist in Colorado Springs. Bikes are a great transportation mode. Thank you for attending the open forum public hearing and for taking the time to share your comments with us. I think it is safe, it is just a form of occasional recreation.</i></p> <p>PLACE your completed form in one of the marked baskets. MAIL this form to: Wilson & Co., Attn: Cheryl Everitt, 455 E. Pikes Peak Ave., Ste. 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 FAX (719) 520-0108, Attn: Cheryl Everitt VISIT www.I25environment.com and click on EA Comment Form.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Transportation: More lanes doesn't mitigate traffic</p> <p>Other Alternatives: Six lanes and lower speed limits adequate</p> <p>Widenings impact on ambulance fleet</p> <p>Parks and recreation: Bicycle trails</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: C Stuart <u>Sloat</u> Address: 101 Alsace Wy. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80906</p> <p>Increasing interstate capacity will need to happen sooner or later. I am frustrated than another lane was not added during all of the recent construction through the Colorado Spring's core. I feel we should tackle this now, while traffic problems are becoming an issue, vs. too late. It will always take time, will always cost money, but once done the benefits are here to stay vs. years of frustration down the road to get to the same point. Whenever anyone mentions the need to drive to Denver, traffic issues are almost always brought up. Let's not let that be the case with Colorado Springs.</p> | <p>General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: Anna M. <u>Smith</u> Address: 108 Old Broadmoor Road City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80906</p> <p>The improvements are absolutely needed and long overdue. This is the state of Colorado not Denver and I am glad to see dollars being spent in Colorado Springs. I have been a resident since 1975. I suggest a colony of democratic cats to oversee and "protect" the Prebles Jumping mouse.</p> | <p>General Support</p> |


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

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Sent: May 7, 2004 Name: Carl W. <u>Smith</u> Address: 3820 Camels View City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80904</p> <p>I believe the Environmental Assessment Study is thorough and has considered all of the issues that may impact the residents of Colorado Springs. The traffic in and through Colorado Springs has reached the point where improvements have to be made and I am in favor of proceeding with the work immediately. We cannot wait another ten years before this issue will be addressed again. Carl Smith</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 29, 2004 Name: John and Mary <u>Smith</u> Address: 2012 N Cascade Ave City: Colorado Springs State: co Zip: 80907</p> <p>Please please please install noise barriers all along east side of the I-25 from Fillmore to Bijou. When the west barriers were installed it was unreal how much louder the sound level was. When the new lanes were added the level was even worse. We no longer can have open windows,even sitting in the back yard has become a challenge!! Please help us.</p> <p>I do walk every morning in Monument Valley and have gone on both sides of the I-25. The west side with the wall is so much better and there is no city park on that side. We have lived in the north end for more than 45 years it is a true shame that progress and life style can not find a solution that works.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Install noise barriers</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 7, 2004 Name: Ginger <u>Smith</u> Address: 4240 Saddle Rock Rd City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919</p> <p>My opinion is that the improvements might as well be done now, done properly and done quickly. I25 being the only interstate roadway in the area, it has quickly reached it's capacity it was originally designed for. And since there is only 2 ways out of this town, either going north or south, with a large enough road to accomadate the masses, improvements would only increase the safety and efficiency of the intended design of the interstate. If I25 was ever used for the purpose it was originally designed for, our military would be the only ones on the road in times of crises, and the rest of us would be bottled up forever. Fix it. Great plan.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> | <p>Recorded April 22, 2004 John <u>Smith</u> See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Install noise barriers</p> |
| | | <p>Sent: April 22, 2004 Name: Mark T <u>Smith</u> Address: 1310 Holland Park Blvd. City: COS State: CO Zip: 80907</p> <p>Finally...Progress moves South from Denver Projects. It's about time, although about 20 years too late. However, better late than never. Looking forward to this expansion to improve our commute from Monuement to COS. Hurry up and get this moving. Thanks for allowing us to comment.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Recorded April 22, 2004 Phyllis <u>Smith</u> See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>Alternatives Considered Fillmore has back-ups</p> | <p>Sent: March 29, 2004 Name: Richard <u>Sobottka</u> Address: 9925 Otero Ave City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920 I believe additional noise studies need to be done in the I-25 Exit 151 area. The residential housing areas near the Hwy 83/Briargate Pkwy and Hwy 83/Old Ranch Road intersections (Pine Creek, Pine Woods, Springcrest, North Briargate) have experienced significant noise increases in recent years. If additional lanes are added to I-25 from the north end of Colorado Spings to Monument, the problem will only get worse. What noise barrier plans are there for these areas? Thank you for your time.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>Noise: Studies needed near exit 151</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 19, 2004 Name: Ronald D. <u>Smith</u> Address: 5024 Prairie Grass Ln. City: Colorado Springs State: co Zip: 80922 The proposed capacity improvements and the funds available to begin that process should be immediately begun. I will personally vote out any official I learn about that does not work to insure the improvements and all funds allocated are used for this project. Make it happen and we all will benefit in more ways than ever could be listed.</p> | <p>General support</p> | | |
| <p>Sent: April 1, 2004 Name: Susan <u>Smith</u> Address: 6713 Northface Lane City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919 As much as I dislike the appearance of more concrete, both in the form of highways and walls to mitigate sound, I do not believe we can delay widening I-25 any longer. This area is going to grow even larger in terms of population resulting in increased traffic which must be accomodated. I am concerned about the noise levels impacting the Old North End homes. I would not want that in my back yard. Everything that can be done should be done to mitigate the increased road noise in that area.</p> | <p>General support</p> <p>Noise: Mitigation old north end neighborhood noise</p> | <p>Sent: April 15, 2004 Name: Shawn <u>Sommer</u> Address: 9142 Oakmont Road City: Falcon State: CO Zip: 80831 I am impressed with the effort and information that was collected and feel that the improvement has been thouroughly thought out. You have my support for the project and hope that you can begin it soon.</p> | <p>General support</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 4, 2004 Name: Iris <u>Snow</u> Address: 4982 Chariot Drive City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80918 I read with interest the Environmental Assessment and it seems to me that careful consideration was taken to address many issues. I feel that you can't get something without giving up something, however, what must be given up will be small compared to what will be gained in the long run. When the project is approved it will have my support, although I will do my best to avoid I-25 during the construction process.</p> | <p>General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 18, 2004 Name: Ron <u>Sommers</u> Address: 106 north circle City: colorado springs State: co Zip: 80909 We need to increase capacity handling of I25 through Colorado Springs. For too long Colorado in general has had the attitude that growth was something that happened to other states. The "mousetrap" in Denver is a prime example. Only after 6 Navy torpedos were dumped on the I25/I70 interchange did the State decide that planning for growth was perhaps something they should consider. Colorado Springs is long over due for 6 lanes through town. Do it now.</p> | <p>General support</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
|  <p>Environmental Assessment Open Forum Public Hearing April 22, 2004</p> <p>Required information for tracking purposes. Please fill in information below.</p> <p>Name: <u>Rally Soronen</u></p> <p>Address: <u>2122 Wood Ave</u></p> <p>Representing: <u>self and neighborhood</u></p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p><i>Your information shows that you expect the greatest volume of vehicles on I-25 through Colorado Springs to be between Bison and Fillmore streets, but you have not proposed any noise mitigation on the east side of the roadway between Fontaners and Fillmore. This does not make sense to me. Acknowledging the high volume should indicate the need to protect our neighborhood from the vehicle sounds. This situation should be addressed.</i></p> <p>PLACE your completed form in one of the marked baskets. MAIL this form to: Wilson & Co., Attn: Cheryl Everitt, 435 E. Pikes Peak Ave., Ste. 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 FAX (719) 520-0108, Attn: Cheryl Everitt. VISIT www.i25environment.com and click on EA Comment Form. Thank you for attending the open forum public hearing and for taking the time to share your comments with us.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>Noise: Highest volume predicted to be where no noise mitigation is provided</p> | <p>Sent: April 14, 2004 Name: James E. <u>Spittler</u>, Jr. Address: 655 Big Valley Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919</p> <p>I first came to the Pikes Peak area in 1961 to attend USAFA. At the time I-25 was virtually new and Academy Blvd was a 2 lane dirt road from Templeton Gap to I-25. Traffic moved very well on I-25, but the population of COS was about 100,000. We moved back in 1978. Many things had changed when we came back and may more have changed in the subsequent 26 years. One thing that has changed very little since then is the configuration of I-25 and its ability to accommodate traffic. As a community we have missed some opportunities in the past to fix the problem that I-25 has become. We cannot afford to miss another chance and wait 5-10 years or more to address the problem. We cannot turn back the clock. I have reviewed the "I-25 Environmental Assessment Study Completed for Public Review" in its summary form, and am impressed with the number of issues that have been addressed. The summary appears to be very thorough, so I can only imagine how thorough the full EA must be. I'm sure that there will be some who try to make the case that more should be done and more should have been done. I doubt that there has ever been a process in which everyone felt that everything that could have possibly been done had been done. The community need for this project is overwhelming. We cannot risk the \$120 million that has been set aside for Phase I of this project to satisfy a small minority of people who, for whatever reason, feel that a very large and comprehensive report does not address their personal issues. It appears that most people in the community understand the importance of fixing the I-25 problem. It is a matter of the greater good offsetting the lesser inconvenience. If! we don't fix the problem the people who are concentered with noise levels will instead be complaining about pollution and air quality when the cars are making less noise because they are in the new I-25 parking lot emmiting exhaust because they can't move in the gridlock. This may not be the perfect solution, but it is the best one we have. I am going on record as a long time resident who is strongly in favor of fixing this problem before it cripples the city.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General support</p> <p>NEPA PROCESS</p> |
| <p>Sent: May 3, 2004 Name: Melissa <u>Southwick</u> Address: 15647 Split Creek Drive City: Monument State: CO Zip: 80132</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment on I-25 is a MUST. The proposed improvements need to be completed. The improvements need to be done now, or it will be too late!</p> | <p>General support</p> | <p>we don't fix the problem the people who are concentered with noise levels will instead be complaining about pollution and air quality when the cars are making less noise because they are in the new I-25 parking lot emmiting exhaust because they can't move in the gridlock. This may not be the perfect solution, but it is the best one we have. I am going on record as a long time resident who is strongly in favor of fixing this problem before it cripples the city.</p> | |
| <p>Sent: April 27, 2004 Name: Robert <u>Speer</u> Address: 56 Elm Ave. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80906</p> <p>I feel that if improvements to the I-25 corridor are not addressed, it will only be a matter of time before living and driving in Colorado will not be desirable but a real pain. Then it will begin to affect the state economically.</p> | <p>General support</p> | | |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: right;">MAY 12 2004</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Karen A. Spory ◆◆◆ 1608 Colebra Place Colorado Springs, CO 80907 Phone 719 630-3506 Fax 719 634-6843</p> <p>Wilson & Co. Attn: Cheryl Everitt 455 E. Pikes Peak, Ste. 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80903</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>RE: Comments to the Environmental Assessment for Expansion of I-25</p> <p>I am very concerned with the validity of the noise study completed by Hankard and Associates. Mr. Hankard took most of his noise measurements in the Old North End Neighborhood and Monument Valley Park when the "safety improvements" construction between Bijou and Fillmore was still ongoing. Due to the equipment and piles of dirt and building materials, the traffic was much lighter than normal for that section of freeway. In addition the traffic was much, much slower than the speeds witnessed today. Mr. Hankard said at the time, his modeling was based on the 55mph speed limit. As any one can see today, the traffic speed on this stretch of freeway is 65 to 75 mph and even greater late at night.</p> <p>I also understand that when the noise consultant hired by the Old North End Neighborhood asked to meet with Mr. Hankard, he was told that Mr. Hankard had left the state. I am not comfortable with the fact that Mr. Hankard would not discuss his work with a colleague who was trying to understand the parameters of the Hankard Study.</p> <p>For the above reasons alone an Environmental Impact Study should be completed to accurately determine the noise impacts to the Old North End Neighborhood and Monument Valley Park and provide the necessary mitigation of these impacts.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sincerely, <i>Karen A. Spory</i> Karen A. Spory</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Noise study has validity issues, EIS warranted on noise</p> | <p>Comments to the Environmental Assessment and Draft 4(f) Evaluation, I-25 Improvements Through the Colorado Springs Urbanized Area.</p> <p>General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An Environmental Assessment (EA) is not the appropriate environmental document to address significant environmental impacts of this Major Federal Action, the expansion of 26 miles of freeway through an urban area, with the construction and expansion of more than a dozen interchanges. Several communities adjacent to the I-25 freeway and several city parks have been or will be impacted by this major construction. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires a detailed statement (Environmental Impact Statement) for major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The purpose of an EIS is to ensure that agencies consider all possible courses of action in assessing the environmental consequences of each proposed action. Environmental concerns are to be part of the decision process. CDOT did not assess the environmental consequences of each proposed action. Contrary to the process used in Colorado Springs, CDOT has prepared an Environmental Impact Statement for the I-25 expansion in the Douglas County and CDOT is preparing an EIS for the I-25 expansion in the Pueblo area. Citizens/parties in identical situations/positions are being treated differently by CDOT. 2. Major construction has already been completed on several interchanges (Uintah, Circle, Woodman, Nevada/Tejon, and Fontanero) and 2.2 miles of freeway between Bijou and Fillmore. This work was accomplished under the "Categorical Exclusion" provisions of the Federal Regulations. Wilson Engineering and CDOT have continuously stated that no capacity was added and that there were no significant impacts. In fact, additional lane capacity was added to each of the interchanges and four lanes were added between Bijou and Fillmore. In addition, over two hundred homes were relocated, and two businesses and a church closed. This Environmental Assessment does not consider the direct and indirect cumulative impacts of these segmented projects. "Cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." 3. Wilson and Company has segmented this Major Federal Action for the purpose of environmental analysis. An obvious example is the work completed between Bijou and Fillmore. The roadbed was elevated and realigned, interchanges were reconstructed with added and additional lane capacity, additional lanes were added between Bijou and Fillmore, a new tiled concrete surface was constructed and a massive sound wall was added to the west side of the freeway. This work was completed in July, 2001, all with a categorical exclusion. Now, the only part of the | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p> <p>NEPA Process: EIS needed</p> <p>Cumulative impacts: Due to past projects</p> <p>NEPA Process: Project segmented for the purpose of EA</p> |
| <p>Ralph M. Spory</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MAY 11 2004</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1608 Colebra Place Colorado Springs, CO 80907 Phone 719 630-3506 Fax 719 634-6843</p> <p>Wilson & Company Attn: Cheryl Everitt 455 E. Pikes Peak Ste. 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80903 Fax: (719) 520-0108, attn: Cheryl Everitt</p> <p>Dear Ms Everitt,</p> <p>I have attached my comments to the Environmental Assessment and Draft 4(f) Evaluation, I-25 Improvements Through the Colorado Springs Urbanized Area. Please ensure that they are included in the record of comments. I have separated my comments into general comments and specific comments. There a total of six pages.</p> <p>Thank you for your courtesies in this matter.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sincerely, <i>Ralph M. Spory Jr.</i> Ralph M. Spory Jr.</p> | | <p>total project evaluated in this EA, is the one additional lane which will be added in each direction to provide four through lanes in each direction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. There seems to be many major conflicts of interest in the entire I-25 planning, analysis and construction process. Wilson and Company completed the original analysis, performed the engineering work for "safety improvements" that have already been completed, prepared and coordinated the Environmental Assessment, and will continue to provide the prime project engineer design for the I-25 expansion. A Wilson and Company employee was chairperson of the Community Advisory Committee at the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments and advocated the expansion of I-25. In addition, when CDOT was asked by PPACG to coordinate with local communities to explain the noise mitigation criteria, the mayor's daughter was employed by Wilson and Company to interface with community participants. 5. Since the "safety improvements" between Bijou and Fillmore, noise and air quality impacts to Monument Valley Park and the Old North End Neighborhood have already significantly affected the quality of life in this adjacent community. Because Monument Valley Park is so near and intertwined with life in the Old North End, it is almost impossible to separate the two for a discussion of the impacts. In the winter it is almost impossible to breathe the air in Monument Valley Park in the morning hours due to auto and truck exhaust fumes in the park. The users of the park at this time of day include many Old North End Neighborhood residents. Likewise, when noise levels are intolerable in the park, they are loud in the neighborhood. The park and neighborhood have been significantly impacted by the cumulative impacts to air quality, increased and continuous freeway noise, and the loss of view scopes from the park. 6. An Environmental Impact Statement should be completed to evaluate all direct and indirect cumulative impacts Monument Valley Park, the Old North End Neighborhood, as well as other communities adjacent to I-25. These cumulative impacts should include those impacts caused by the construction completed as segmented projects under categorical exclusions as well as the future expansion, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such actions. For example the interchange at Fontanero has been expanded to accommodate a major cross street and additional traffic. This additional traffic would impact both Monument Valley Park and nearby communities. There is no analysis of this reasonably foreseeable future action. 7. I-25 noise mitigation is a critical concern to communities adjacent to the freeway. Although CDOT studies have concluded that noise mitigation is not justified for the Old North End Neighborhood or the northern part of Monument Valley Park, the cumulative impacts from I-25, including extremely high levels of noise over many hours each day, have had a significant impact on the quality of life in the community. The Old North End Neighborhood was established in the late 1800s and early 1900s, long before I-25. The economic impact to this community caused by the expansion of I-25 is not justified when proven methods exist to lower highway noise levels. Rubber | <p>General: Conflicts of interest with Wilson & Co</p> <p>Noise: Impacts to north end and parks</p> <p>Air Quality: Impacts to north end and parks</p> <p>Cumulative impacts: EIS should be completed due to past projects</p> <p>Noise: Rubberized asphalt, mitigation needed for parks/north end</p> |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>asphalt is being used in Arizona with outstanding results. Recent findings have documented a 6 to 8 decibel-level improvement with the application of rubber asphalt to highway surfaces. There should be an experimental program on I-25 adjacent to Monument Valley Park to assess this technology. The cost is minor, compared to the potential benefit statewide.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>1. Page 1-3, Importance of I-25 to the Region (2nd paragraph). The paragraph states: <i>"I-25 is El Paso Counties only freeway and due to a relatively lack of alternative north-south routes, it is the region's most highly traveled roadway."</i></p> <p>Even though I-25 is the only freeway and there are few other north-south routes, CDOT and Wilson Engineering have not proposed additional north-south routes. The expansion of I-25 does not provide additional routes and continues to force traffic to the West Side of town to travel north and south. This decision was in lieu of an opportunity to provide an eastern north-south by-pass to accommodate the city's rapid growth to the east and northeast. This decision only exacerbates the city's east-west mobility problem and adversely impacts the east-west traffic patterns.</p> <p>2. Page 1-6, Additional Considerations, Safety Improvements. The 2nd paragraph states: <i>"The I-25 Corridor Feasibility Study completed in 1991 identified the looming need for I-25 capacity improvements. Given a lack of available funding at the time, the study recommended a three-phase approach to implementing overall corridor improvements:</i> 1. <i>Safety Improvements</i> 2. <i>Transportation system management</i> 3. <i>Capacity Improvements"</i></p> <p>The "safety improvements" have been ongoing since the mid 1990s and were done under the Categorical Exclusion provisions of the Federal Regulations. The work between Bijou and Fillmore required the removal of 224 west-side homes, two businesses, and a church. Additional lane capacity was added to the Uimah overpass and the Fontanero Interchange. Two additional lanes were added to both the north bound and south bound lanes. This resulted in six continuous lanes between Bijou and Fillmore and continuous acceleration lanes between interchanges (effectively four lanes in each direction). In addition the roadbed was elevated as much as 30 feet, a massive sound wall was added to the west side, and the surface was changed to tined concrete. This construction, completed in July 2001, resulting in significant environmental impacts to noise levels and view scapes as well as the dislocation of over a hundred families. This</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>Alternatives considered: Alternative north/south routes north't exists, this project exacerbates that problem</p> | <p>(Please see Figure 3-11 on page 3-43 of the EA document). In addition, park amenities in this part of the park include more than the soccer field and open spaces identified in the referenced quote from the EA.</p> <p>There is a soft ball field approximately at Fontanero, there is a children's playground, picnic area and public restroom in the same approximate location. In addition, there are several picnic tables and park benches located throughout the area. One of the primary amenities not mentioned is the Geologic Wall. The visible traffic on the elevated freeway and extensive sound wall impact most of this area, as they now predominate the view scape toward the mountains. Prior to the I-25 "safety improvements" between Bijou and Fillmore the area was still somewhat serene and the freeway was not visible.</p> <p>This understatement in the EA as to the character and amenities of this portion of Monument Valley Park plays down the importance of mitigation and is one more reason as to why a more detailed and complete EIS should be required.</p> <p>4. Page 3-42, Impacts of Proposed Action, Parks, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs state: <i>"The proposed action includes noise barriers to protect portions of Monument Valley Park. With the noise barriers in place, the majority of the activity areas in Monument Valley Park would be protected... Areas that would remain unprotected and would experience noise levels in excess of 66 decibels also can be seen on Figure 3-11."</i></p> <p>CDOT previously provided a plan to mitigate the noise levels in portions of the park that are now unprotected. That proposal included a combination of walls and berms north of Uimah. The sound wall was to be north of Uimah for several hundred yards and the berm was to be on the East Side of the railroad and would have required the closure of City Street, Recreation Way. This proposal was unacceptable to the city. CDOT claimed they could not construct sound walls adjacent to the freeway because of the lack of space. This statement appears disingenuous at best, because sound walls were constructed south of town at the Circle Interchange on a very similar topography to protect the Harrison School. To not protect the park from noise impacts when it also impacted with obstruction of views and air pollution is contrary to the protection of 4(f) properties. To not protect Monument Valley Park when there are methods and ways to do so would seem to be a constructive use or constructive taking of the park for I-25 purposes. It would also seem that there has been a constructive use and taking of the park by destroying the Mountain View scapes, an historical and beneficial aspect of the park.</p> <p>A properly prepared EIS would properly identify all the significant impacts to Monument Valley Park and identify the options available to avoid or mitigate these impacts. An EIS should be required.</p> <p>5. Page 3-115, Monument Valley Park (SEP613), the 4th paragraph states: <i>"Since the construction of Interstate 25 in the late 1950s there have been gradual changes to the original environmental setting and feeling of the park, including increased traffic and visual impacts such as adding acceleration and deceleration lanes</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>Parks and recreation: Monument valley park inadequately characterized, downplays parks importance which should require EIS, questions CDOT's claim of no space for noise walls</p> |
| <p>work was done with no EA or EIS under the Categorical Exclusion provisions of the Federal Environmental Regulations.</p> <p>A CDOT official was quoted as saying that the removal of 200 homes was not a significant impact. "It was the judgment of both CDOT and Federal Highway Authority that relocation wasn't a significant impact."</p> <p>When asked why an Environmental Impact Statement would not be prepared for the I-25 expansion, the CDOT official explained that an Environmental Assessment would produce better decision making and a much more open exchange between us and the community. "An Environmental Assessment" he said, "is like people sitting around a table and talking." An [Environmental Impact Statement] is like going to court with lawyers doing the talking."</p> <p>Wilson Engineering and CDOT have sidestepped the requirement for preparing an Environmental Impact Statement by improperly segmenting the I-25 Corridor Project into several related projects and calling them safety improvements. In fact, capacity has been added to I-25 by all of these projects and these segmented projects are part of 26 mile I-25 Corridor Improvement Project. An Environmental Impact Statement should have been completed prior to the construction which removed over two hundred homes and large amounts of vegetation and impacted noise levels, view scapes, air quality, and local traffic.</p> <p>Federal regulations require an EIS for a project of this magnitude and prohibit the segmentation of major federal actions into smaller projects to avoid the requirement for an EIS.</p> <p>In addition, by calling these projects safety improvements instead of what they really were, freeway capacity improvements, local communities and citizens were not given proper notice of the actual federal project. When a "safety improvement" results in removal of homes, addition of lanes and destruction of the serenity in a public park, the true impact is hidden from the public.</p> <p>An EIS before this construction would have provided proper notice of the work to be done and provided for identification and mitigation of the impacts.</p> <p>3. Page 3-37, Parks and Recreation, Parks, the 5th paragraph states: <i>"The northern portion of the park, between Uimah and Fontanero Streets, lies predominantly on the East Side of Monument Creek. Park amenities in this portion of the park include a soccer field, open spaces (both landscaped and native), and the Pikes Peak Greenway..."</i></p> <p>This is a mischaracterization of Monument Valley Park north of Uimah. Monument Valley Park extends four blocks north of Fontanero to approximately Jackson Street.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> | <p>NEPA Process: CDOT segmented projects to avoid doing an EIS</p> | <p><i>and adding a sound wall on the West Side of I-25 opposite from the park. The past action occurred in the 1990s when the park was considered not eligible to the National Register of Historic Places."</i></p> <p>The changes referenced in this paragraph did not occur gradually. The acceleration and deceleration lanes were added as part of the segmented safety improvements. The sound wall was also added as part of the segmented safety projects. The Categorical Exclusion for construction of the southbound lanes between Bijou and Fillmore was signed and approved by FHWA on April 3, 1998. The Categorical Exclusion for construction of the northbound lanes was signed and approved on December 1, 1999.</p> <p>The work was completed after July, 2001. In other words the work was not completed until this EA was actually underway. This is a perfect example of why the I-25 Corridor Improvements should not have been segmented and why an EIS should have been completed prior to construction. The Monument Valley Park was eligible or would shortly be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, but there was no EA or EIS to determine the impacts</p> <p>There is no reason to commit the same mistake again. An EIS needs to be completed to identify all alternatives, potential impacts and methods to avoid or mitigate the unavoidable impacts.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> | <p>Parks and Recreation: Impacts to park not gradual, EIS warranted</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Sent: May 3, 2004 Name: Paul <u>Sprehe</u> Address: 7540 Margarita Pl City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919 I'm all for it. I believe that CS is long overdue for improving our main N-S transportation system. Our forefathers had more foresight than we seem to have today are were more willing to accept the fact that as our nation continues to mature so do the roadways. For those who got here first cry foul over this growth is so narrow minded and unfair to their offspring as well as others. Our great nation affords us the privilage to grow up where we want and for some people to want to restrict how this is accomplished again goes against the fundamentals of our country. I can see no major problems with the study submitted and only hope that we accomplish as much improvement as we can. I know many would love to see 4 lanes in each direction all the way to Denver. Doing it now would be less complicated than doing it later. the same goes for Powers' or Marksheffle.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 28, 2004 Name: anthony <u>stanulonis</u> Address: 1432 wood ave City: colorado springs State: co Zip: 80907 The conclusion that residences farther than 500 feet from the freeway would not experience significant increases in noise level and therefore not require mitigation is inaccurate. Many streets in the Old North End, especially Alamo and Wood Ave. have experienced significant increases in noise from changes already made to the adjacent areas of I-25, including reflection of noise from the barrier wall built on the west side of the freeway. The proposed barrier walls will not mitigate the problem in this area and further mitigation with the construction of a berm on the east side or rubber- asphalt surfacing of I-25 in this area should be undertaken .</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Barrier walls won't mitigate, consider using berm or rubberized asphalt</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 7, 2004 Name: Robert <u>Spriggs</u> Address: PO Box 385 City: Peyton State: CO Zip: 80831 The study appears thorough and complete. The additional traffic capacity through town is badly needed and an East-West route through town should be developed and built as soon as possible. What about the future? In five (5) years there should be something started that will shuttle through traffic around the town, probably out near Mark Shuffel? It will help relieve the rush hour traffic to a certain degree.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives considered: East west route needed also</p> | | |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Sent: May 7, 2004 Name: mary <u>stanulonis</u> Address: 1432 wood ave City: colorado springs State: co Zip: 80907 The expansion of I-25 will have significant impact on neighborhoods, parks, air and water quality, wildlife and environment. The quality and aesthetics of Monument Valley park will be negatively affected by increased noise,destroying the quiet and tranquility of the park.The sound walls already erected and to be erected destroy the view of Pikes Peak and the Front Range.This park was a gift to the city by the city's founder-General Palmer and the expansion project will violates Palmer's conditions in gifting the park to the city.I urge you to adhere to the written intention and conditions Palmer spelled out in his gift to the people and city of Colorado Springs.CDOT needs to be strongly reminded of Colorado Spring's history and the irreplaceable historical value of the Old North End as the initial area settled in the city and the very negative effect the project will have on this irreplaceable nationally registered Historic Area.CDOT has not seriously assessed the alternative! of rubberized asphalt as a safer, cheaper, and durable alternative to sound walls. Studies in AZ and CA have shown the effectiveness of rubberized asphalt in reducing noise levels by 4-6 decibels at a less than 0-5% of total project cost. CDOT is INCORRECT in stating that it does not work in this climate and altitude, basing that conclusion on 14 year old data. Experience in Flagstaff AZ and colder climates has proven that rubberized asphalt WOULD be successful here in Colorado.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Parks and recreation: Monument valley park impacted by noise, existing sound walls destroy view</p> <p>Noise: Rubberized asphalt</p> | <p>Sent: April 3, 2004 Name: Beth <u>Starkey</u> Address: 3679 Bareback Drive City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80922 Do it! Do it! Do it! It's about time that we ease some of the congestion on the interstate, so let's get it started. Plan looks great and that the homework has been done.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 28, 2004 Name: Daniel <u>Starch</u> Address: 1333 Pike Dr City: Colo Sps State: CO Zip: 80904 I think the I-25 project is a neccessity and is long overdue. Now seems like a great time to proceed before costs and other possibilities for some monies are found!</p> | <p>General support</p> | <p>Sent: May 3, 2005 Name: Robert and Mary <u>Stephenson</u> Address: 1109 Panorama Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80904 Don't let a little mouse cost human lives I-25 needs to be widened for safety reasons, to cut down on accidents and make people drive more safely when traffic gets bottled up people angry and careless and it increases the chance of accidents.</p> | <p>General Support</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 28, 2004 Name: Daniel <u>Starch</u> Address: 1333 Pike Dr City: Colo Sps State: CO Zip: 80904 I think the I-25 project is a neccessity and is long overdue. Now seems like a great time to proceed before costs and other possibilities for some monies are found!</p> | <p>General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 2, 2004 Name: Doug <u>Stimple</u> Address: 2505 Stratton Forest Hgts City: Colorado Springs State: Co Zip: 80906 Increasing capacity on I 25 is critical to the future of Colorado Springs and to sustaining the quality of life here. Being the predominant north/south route through our community it is readily apparent that the needs are significant. There is nothing in the EA which should lead to any conclusion but to proceed with the capacity improvements as soon as possible.</p> | <p>General Support</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Sent: April 5, 2004 Name: Bonnie <u>Stonerock</u> Address: 2852 Serendipity Cir W #D City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80917</p> <p>think the Environmental Assessment Study and proposed capacity improvements looks like the best solution to the congestion on I-25. I believe much has been considered well into the future and would certainly make travel on I-25 much smoother and more pleasant. I support adopting this proposal!</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 6, 2004 Name: Larry <u>Strauch</u> Address: 1259 Amstel Drive City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80907-4001</p> <p>I agree with the proposed capacity improvements. We need to move forward with the project ASAP.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 2, 2004 Name: Terry <u>Storm</u> Address: 3206 Springridge Drive City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80906</p> <p>EAS is fine; just took too long. The improvements as stated need to go forward sooner than later. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>Sent: April 16, 2004 Name: Richard C. <u>Strauch</u> Address: 1416 W. Pikes Peak City: Colo. Spgs. State: CO Zip: 80904</p> <p>I think it is geat and long over due. I'm for starting this project as soon as possible. I would also like to see a high speed rail system put in place on the front range as it will be needed in a few years even after this project is completed.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives considered: High speed rail in addition to project</p> |
| <p>Sent: April 27, 2004 Name: John H. <u>Strathman</u> Address: 715 Hidden Valley Road City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80919</p> <p>The upgrades to this portion of I25 are needed badly. I have reviewed the EA study, and don't find anything that I would consider to be a reason not to move ahead with this project. I highly endorse what is being proposed.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> | <p>Recorded April 22, 2004 Jim <u>Strub</u> See comments in "Public Hearing Transcripts" in Appendix C</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> |
| | | <p>Sent: April 7, 2004 Name: Thomas <u>Struve</u> Address: 2212 vintage Dr. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80920</p> <p>We are in complete need of this project. I can live with the inconvenience. My only concern is the overrun costs when a project of this magnitude does not stay on budget.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">General support</p> |

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

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Sent: April 2, 2004 Name: Dan Stuart Address: 14 N. Sierra Madre City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80903</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the EA document. My office is adjacent to the I-25 corridor, just south and east of the Bijou bridge. My continuing interest in CDOT's efforts to improve this corridor stretches over the past 20 years. This community is in agreement that the existing capacity of I-25 is not adequate to meet the projected demand. The safety improvements in the corridor in recent years helped traffic move more safely, particularly in the Bijou - Fillmore and the Circle/Lake and Academy interchange areas. Capacity improvements for the entire corridor are long overdue and critically needed. Overall, I found the EA study to be a very thorough, thoughtful and sensitive analysis. It appears to be a balanced approach to the environmental impact of potential improvements in the I-25 corridor. Particularly impressive was the description of the public involvement process. I have attended a number of the meetings related to the corridor in recent years and have found the efforts made to understand and respond to public concerns to be extraordinary. While there will always be a few who will never be satisfied with the suggested solutions, I believe the report adequately addresses those concerns. Specifically, I have the following comments:</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> | <p>1) Noise. The proposals to mitigate noise along Monument Valley Park are adequate, appropriate and appreciated. They appear to be both feasible and reasonable. I would appreciate seeing an extension of a sound barrier north of Uintah, as well. Utilizing 1990 as a base year for the noise studies was helpful and fair to the community, in light of the changes constructed in the past ten years. The longitudinal saw-cut grooves in the concrete surface were helpful in addressing noise concerns.</p> <p>2) HOV Lanes. This proposal is an excellent solution to our growing congestion problem. HOV lane use at rush hour should help ease the problem. Their availability as bus lanes will also assist local transit to become more functional over time. I suspect that the explosive growth in northern El Paso County will have many people wondering in a few years why the need to expand to 8 lanes north of Briargate wasn't foreseen in 2004.</p> <p>3) Cumulative Impacts. This approach appeared innovative, but I am unable to assess whether it was truly useful.</p> <p>4) Other modes/Long Term. CDOT should partner with the railroad companies to relocate most heavy rail out of this corridor.</p> <p>5) Thanks for your hard work. It's time to get moving on these critically important projects for the future of our community.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Mitigation adequate, extending the noise barrier north of Uintah would be helpful</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Utilize 1990 as base year</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternatives Considered: HOV lanes an excellent idea</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cumulative impacts: Innovative</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

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

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Sent: April 25, 2004 Name: Anita <u>Stubblefield</u> Address: Box 156 City: Bogata State: TX Zip: 75417</p> <p>I have read the assessment study and feel that it is very thorough. I believe that the improvements to I-25 would be very beneficial and that the negative impact would be minimal.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Support</p> | <p>Sent: May 12, 2004 Name: Richard M. <u>Sullivan</u> Address: 1421 Wood Ave City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80907</p> <p>I have lived at my current address for 11 years, pre-dating the raising of the roadbed, bridge rebuilding, continuous access lane and soundwall on the west side of the interstate through downtown Colorado Springs. While I believe that I-25 needs to be designed to carry a reasonable volume of traffic and keep the traffic moving, I think the livability of the environment around the roadway has been seriously downplayed. The work done over the past several years has created a new level of noise pollution and dust that is unprecedented prior to the previous being completed. Road surface treatment and the hard wall on the west side of the right-of-way have added a serious increase to the noise that emanates from the interstate, especially during the early morning hours of 4am to 6am when the air is still and the surrounding noise sources are still. The dust that comes off the roadway is considerably more in volume than in the past. This has not been considered at all in the e! valuation of environmental impacts of an expanded roadway.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: Recent projects significantly increased noise</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Air Quality: Dust a problem</p> |
| <p>Sent: May 10, 2004 Name: John & Beth <u>Suess</u> Address: 2020 N. Cascade Ave City: Colorado Springs State: Co Zip: 80907</p> <p>Clearly the study was not performed by anyone living in our neighborhood. The noise volume from the interstate begins as a low rumble during off peak hours to a roar during peak traffic hours of the morning and evening. It is very annoying to be outdoors and forced to listen to the freeway noise. There are so many ways to mitigate highway noise, and the lack of support from CDOT to reduce it is disappointing. I understand the cost factor involved but this is such an important issue for our future, cost cannot rule the decision. It is important to consider the historic nature of this neighborhood and the necessity to preserve it's heritage which includes what was the peaceful tranquility of one of the Cities most beautiful parks adjacent to the interstate and our neighborhood. It has been proven many times over that increasing traffic capacity never resolves traffic congestion. Thanks</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Noise: CDOT doesn't support mitigation methods available</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Opposition</p> | | |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Sent: April 23, 2004 Name: Ellie Stites <u>Swanger</u> Address: 5130 Omega Way City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80917</p> <p>I think we definitely need to expand I-25. The traveling is already very difficult, especially from downtown Colorado Springs to Denver. I can't see we have any other choice. One more note: IF THE STATE PATROL WOULD PULL OVER PEOPLE TRAVELING AT A SNAIL'S PACE IN THE PASSING LANE, TRAVEL WOULD BE MUCH EASIER AND PROBABLY ELIMINATE ACCIDENTS. ACCIDENTS OCCUR WHEN PEOPLE "TRYING" TO DO THE SPEED LIMIT HAVE TO GO IN AND OUT TO PASS.</p> <p>I WAS GOING TO DENVER ABOUT 1 MONTH AGO DOING 50 - 55 ALL THE WAY TO CASTLE ROCK,BECAUSE SO MANY WOULDN'T MOVE OVER TO THE SLOW LANE. THINK OF THE REVENUE THAT WOULD BRING IN???? STATE TROOPERS.. WHERE ARE YOU?????</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Support</p> | <p>Sent: May 12, 2004 Name: David <u>Swint</u> Address: 1230 N. Cascade Ave. City: Colorado Springs State: CO Zip: 80909</p> <p>I have lived at the above address for over 20 years and have continued to experience growing noise from increased traffic on I-25. The widening of I-25 is important to reduce the increased traffic congestion, but at what environmental expense? I am very concerned that I-25 traffic noise will reach a point well beyond the decibel levels claimed by the traffic engineers. I strongly favor more aggressive alternatives to reducing the noise levels. Many have proposed the use of rubberized asphalt on I-25 based upon the results from Arizona and California. CDOT claims that will not work for Colorado Springs because of the temperature swings. That seems to be a very weak argument. I would be in favor of applying this alternative pavement to the entire section of I-25 through Colorado Springs, or at least a trial section to witness the effectiveness of such an alternative. Empirical data could be collected over an extended period to validate the claims by other states to the! virtues of such an alternative. I am definitely against the decision makers pushing hard for a FONZI without attempted other alternatives to mitigate the increased noise levels that a certain to come with the I-25 expansion. I strongly favor a EIS to ensure a more thorough and complete study be accomplished.</p> | <p>ISSUES</p> <p>General Opposition</p> <p>Noise: Mitigation measures needed, rubberized asphalt, noise should warrant EIS</p> |
| | | <p>Sent: April 15, 2004 Name: Bob <u>Syme</u> Address: 443 West Oter Way City: Sedalia State: CO Zip: 80135</p> <p>This is something the Colorado Springs area will need if the City is to survive. Traffic is becoming too congested. Let's finally build what has been needed for the past ten years!!</p> | <p>General Support</p> |