



Q: Is there a “preferred alternative” for interchange improvements?

A: We are in the early stages of the study and have yet to develop a "preferred alternative", which is an official term for the planned improvements as determined through the EA process. The previously completed Arapahoe Road Corridor Study and subsequent Interchange System Level Feasibility Study identified the partial cloverleaf with Costilla underpass connection as the earlier technical improvement recommendation. The term "publicly preferred option" was prematurely used by others in public comment since the EA process to determine the preferred alternative is just now underway.

Q: Why is the Improved Partial Cloverleaf with Costilla Connection alternative shown in the project discussion materials?

A: The improved partial cloverleaf alternative is the interchange improvement recommendation from the System Level Feasibility Study, completed in December 2008. Numerous other interchange alternatives were previously considered. These will be documented in the EA.

Q: How will alternatives be evaluated?

A: Decision-makers will inherently be faced with considering tradeoffs during the EA process. The EA will determine impacts (potentially both adverse and beneficial) of various interchange improvements. Consideration of planned and on-going land development, the environment, and community values, as well as following sound engineering standards, will shape the alternatives. The alternatives will be evaluated for consistency with the purpose and need and objectives of the project. The determination of a preferred alternative will involve comparing the tradeoffs among the various alternatives as well as a review of the public comments. NEPA requires that a No Action alternative be fully considered in the EA in addition to any action alternatives. All public and agency comments will be considered. The EA document will include a summary and outcome of this process and the identification of a preferred alternative.

Q: Are other supplemental crossings of I-25 north of Arapahoe Road being considered?

A: A previous study by Greenwood Village of a proposed Caley Avenue crossing of I-25 indicated that it would divert traffic from the nearby Yosemite Street overpass, but would divert very little traffic from Arapahoe Road. The City also considered a Peakview Avenue crossing but concluded it would be too steep and not meet required design standards. These and any other previously suggested crossings of I-25 will be considered in the EA.

Q: Will the Improved Partial Cloverleaf with Costilla Crossing interchange improve interchange Level of Service (LOS)?

A: Previous traffic analysis indicated that the interchange improvements alone would result in congested traffic conditions within the interchange in 2030. The supplemental east-west capacity of the Costilla connection would help divert sufficient traffic volume from the interchange to improve its projected LOS. The EA will be based on new 2035 traffic forecasts and analysis to confirm the need for more than just the interchange improvements. Evaluation of the No Action alternative will also be included to document and contrast the benefits and impacts of the proposed improvements.





Q: Why can't the necessary improvements all be made at Arapahoe Road and I-25 without involving other nearby streets (such as providing an underpass of Arapahoe Road from Yosemite to Boston/Clinton)?

A: In conjunction with the Arapahoe Road Corridor Study conducted in 2007, the concept of a tunnel beneath the I-25 interchange was considered. The tunnel was part of a three level diamond interchange concept that extended between the Yosemite/Arapahoe and Boston/Clinton intersections. Further extension under the Yosemite and Boston/Clinton/Arapahoe intersections was noted as a consideration if the amount of forecasted through traffic was substantial. However, this concept was eliminated from further consideration due to several factors:

- *The amount of through traffic is not as substantial as the high percentage of traffic turning onto and off of Arapahoe Road at I-25, Yosemite and Boston/Clinton.*
- *Substantial walls, bridges and drainage accommodations would be required along Arapahoe Road to separate the through movements. Construction cost was estimated two to three times that of the improved partial cloverleaf concept.*
- *Focusing all necessary improvements to accommodate 2035 traffic on Arapahoe Road would require Arapahoe Road to essentially become a freeway, which is not consistent with community vision or character of the adjacent business community.*
- *Ultimate approval of the proposed improvements by FHWA requires that a plan for sufficient funding be in place. Currently, only \$83M has been identified for the interchange improvements in the DRCOG Regional Fiscally Constrained Plan.*

Q: Can the general origin and destination of traffic through the interchange be estimated in order to confirm that proposed improvements are consistent with travel desires and needs?

A: During the Arapahoe Road Corridor Study, analysis of the 2030 traffic forecasts of the Costilla crossing shows that a high proportion of users would be drawn from the immediate vicinity, with more than 50% of the trips coming from the area between Quebec Street and I-25 on the west side and more than 60% of trips coming from the area between I-25 and Havana Street on the east side. This travel origin data will be updated once the 2035 traffic forecasts are completed.

Q: How effective is public feedback during the EA process in shaping the improvement recommendation? It is a concern that government agencies will move ahead with improvements regardless of public input.

A: Improvement plans on many projects have been modified to address issues raised through the public input process. Roadway alignments have been adjusted, mitigation of community impacts included, and phasing of construction adjusted to respond to community and agency concerns. Examples include noise mitigation and LRT station design along I-25 south during the TREX project in response to public concerns, and proposed southeast quadrant ramp design at the planned Arapahoe/Parker interchange for consistency with Town of Foxfield development plans. NEPA requires that public input be considered during the EA process.

