



Review of Existing Studies in US24 West Corridor

<p>Study Name</p> <p>Environmental Assessment and Draft 4(f) Evaluation, I-25 Improvements through the Colorado Springs Urbanized Area</p>	<p>Study Author</p> <p>Wilson & Company with CH2MHILL et al. Doug Eberhart (WCI), Andrea Garcia (CH2MHILL)</p>
<p>Study Sponsor</p> <p>CDOT Region 2 – Dick Annand, James Flohr</p>	<p>Study Date</p> <p>March 17, 2004 (FONSI approved on 9-10-2004)</p>
<p>Study Area and Purpose of Study</p> <p>Interstate 25 corridor was studied from Pueblo County Line to Douglas County Line, resulting in improvements recommended between South Academy Boulevard (milepost 135) and the Monument interchange (milepost 161). Purpose was to identify and evaluate alternatives to relieve existing and future traffic congestion on Interstate 25.</p>	
<p>Key Points of Study</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased capacity is needed, and would be most effective as widening on I-25 (not other modes or other corridors) 2. The Proposed Action, needed by 2025, is 8 lanes between US24 Bypass (MLK) and Briargate, 6 lanes from there to South Academy, and 6 lanes from Briargate to Monument. Lanes 7-8 will be HOV-only during peak periods, but open to general traffic the rest of the day. 3. Key issue to public was noise; key issue to biologists was Prebles Mouse. 4. This study included the Regional Cumulative Effects Analysis (RCEA) as an Appendix, and used that report as a basis for discussing cumulative effects associated with the I-25 Proposed Action. 5. The Proposed Action had widespread support throughout the community, but vocal opposition by the Old North End Neighborhood. ONEN strongly advocated use of rubberized asphalt as the roadway surface, but CDOT/FHWA have not seen conclusive evidence to support that idea as a noise mitigation strategy. 	
<p>Relevance to US24 West project</p> <p>I-25 does, of course, connect to US24 near downtown Colorado Springs, and their connection is very important to the regional transportation network. Various configurations for the I-25/US24 interchange were considered and evaluated, leading to selection of a proposed configuration. This was done based on 2025 traffic forecasts, prior to adoption of the PPACG 2030 plan. The traffic analysis is contained in a related Interstate Access Request document. There were numerous public meetings to discuss the alternatives, and documentation of those meetings is available from Wilson & Company.</p> <p>The water quality analysis conducted and documented by CH2MHILL for the I-25 EA resulted in confusion, necessitating a formal clarification in the FONSI. For US24, it will be important to address water quality somewhat differently, and to get clear agency buy-in along the way.</p> <p>The RCEA document mentioned above has an important role in the US24 study and should be examined for use in addressing US24 cumulative effects.</p>	
<p>Review by</p> <p>Doug Eberhart, Charles Gustafson (719) 520-5800</p>	<p>Review date</p> <p>February 1, 2005</p>