Response to Comment #176:

Response to Comment #176-1:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #176-2:
Section 2.5 Funding and Phasing of the EA provides estimates of the probable construction costs for the various transportation improvements that are included in the EA as well as for I-70/SH 58 project improvements and the local agency projects. Section 2.4 Funding Status of the FONSI identifies the various funding sources for each component of the Proposed Action. Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI identifies the schedule for implementation of the various components of the Proposed Action.
Response to Comment #176-3:
Project future conditions are based on DRCOG Metro Vision 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, as amended. Traffic forecasts and the consequent engineering design were developed from the DRCOG regional travel demand model. As part of final design, a sensitivity analysis will be conducted using the current DRCOG regional travel demand model to assess any potential additional improvements.

Ms. Manka Pavlik
Mr. Ed Martinez
November 15, 2006
Page 2

The improvements to the 32nd Avenue interchange may be insufficient to accommodate traffic in the long run, and it is worth noting that additional improvements beyond those identified in the EA may be necessary to allow the intersection of 32nd and Youngfield to function properly. It is important that CDOT and the local agencies study the need for those improvements and include additional projects in the Finally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan as soon as possible to ensure the proper operation of this intersection.

We are grateful for the opportunity to participate in the process and we emphasize, once again that, subject to the three points noted, the plan is both workable and a significant improvement from where it began.

We would be happy to answer any questions or respond to any comments.

Very truly yours,

DENVER WEST METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

By: [Signature]

Enclosure
cc: Patrick Thompson
    Wheat Ridge City Council Members
    Congressman Mark Udall
    Bill Salazar
    Governor Bill Owens
    Jefferson County Commissioners
    Joe John
    Prospect Recreation and Park District
    Senator Ken Salazar
    State Representative Cheri Jahn
    State Representative Gwen Gomer
    State Senator Mike Kalten
    Congressman Bob Beauprez
    Wheat Ridge Mayor Carvey
    Donna Pfeifer
    Senor Wayne Allard
    Tom Nelson
    Pam Hutton
### Planning Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Element</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH58/Cabot Dr. Interchange</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>$12.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70/22nd Interchange</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge/Jeffco/Developer(s)</td>
<td>$27.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabot Drive 22nd - 40th</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>$1.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70/55 Interchange</td>
<td>CDOT and Jeffco</td>
<td>$35.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70/55 phase 4, 44th &amp; Ward Road</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>$20.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngfield Widening</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>$2.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th Underpass</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>$5.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabot Drive 40th to Proposed North of Clear Creek</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>$7.0M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment #177:

Response to Comment #177-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #177-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #13-2 in regard to your comment on school safety.

Response to Comment #177-3:

CDOT sincerely regrets that private property sometimes needs to be acquired for transportation projects. This is an unfortunate reality of our work. We are well aware of the unique circumstances of each property and situation and that makes this difficult decision even harder. We are aware of the emotional toll that property acquisition takes on affected property owners, especially in circumstances where occupants are displaced and relocated to replacement properties. Rest assured that, at the future time when the decision is made to proceed with the acquisition of property, our right of way professionals will strive to provide each landowner and tenant with the courtesy and dignity they deserve in the process.

As part of the alternative screening process, CDOT developed several alternatives for the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange. These alternatives included a diamond interchange and a single point urban interchange. The diamond interchange at I-70/32nd Avenue was included in Alternatives 1 and 1B. Both Alternatives 1 and 1B were eliminated in the third-level screening due to additional right-of-way and relocation impacts (14 residential and 22 business relocations). A single point urban interchange, which was part of Alternative Package 1, was also evaluated and would have required the full or partial acquisition of 39 properties and the relocation of 14 residences and 22 businesses. Alternative Package 1 was eliminated in the fourth-level screening of alternatives. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations; however, FHWA and CDOT support these improvements. The alternatives screening process is summarized in Chapter 2 Alternatives.

All right-of-way acquisition will follow the procedures outlined under the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987 (as amended) and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended). These policies have measures intended to treat business owners, property owners, residents, and tenants fairly during the right-of-way acquisition process. CDOT Right-of-way specialists will work with the landowner and all displaced persons and businesses during the acquisition process to address their individual needs and desires as best possible as allowable under law.
Response to Comment #177-4:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection and #13-2 in regard to your comment on school safety.

Response to Comment #177-5:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Response to Comment #177-6
In addition to the proposed development, DRCOG forecasts that the study area is expected to experience a 22 percent increase in population and the number of households and a 40 percent increase in employment over existing land uses without the proposed development. With the proposed development, employment is predicted to increase 52 percent over the existing land uses.

Section 4.1 Land Use, Socio-Economics, and Community in the EA discusses land use forecasts in the study area. The purpose of the I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange EA is to address the issue of traffic congestion due to regional growth and the proposed development.

As a state representative, FHWA and CDOT are certain that you understand the challenges that employment and population growth across the State of Colorado presents to the transportation system. CDOT’s mission is to “provide the best multi-modal transportation system for Colorado that most effectively moves people, goods and information.” CDOT appreciates your desire to limit access to the proposed development; however, CDOT must also consider projected regional growth and develop an integrated transportation system solution that most effectively meets the needs of the public. The EA and the System Level Feasibility Study, which preceded it, defined transportation problems and developed a Proposed Action for overall improvements in the study area to address the issue of traffic congestion due to both regional growth and the proposed development. Limiting access to the proposed development from SH 58 or the 40th Avenue underpass or from 32nd Avenue would not be an effective, integrated solution to the needs of the transportation system.
| Suzanne Alley Comment #178 | Comment received via the project website. Date : 11/15/06 07:06  
I live two houses in from the proposed 32nd/Cabela drive intersection.  
I've been unable to attend the public meeting. I would like to see a brick wall across our road and make Zinnia a cul-de-sac. Currently, 7 to 10 cars turn around at my house or my neighbor's on the corner because they've missed the on-ramp to I-70 westbound. A brick wall and cul-de-sac similar to the one across from Conoco break place would alleviate this problem and help with car exhaust. Thank-you for consideration. | Response to Comment #178:  
Converting Zinnia Street into a cul-de-sac would reduce traffic on Zinnia Street; however, it would do so largely by diverting the same traffic onto Zinnia Court and Alkire Street. CDOT appreciates your desire to limit access 32nd Avenue; however, CDOT must also develop an integrated transportation system solution that most effectively meets the needs of the public. |
Response to Comment #179:
In your May 15, 2006 and August 24, 2006 letters to CDOT, you presented a schematic for an urban design concept, which you reference in your comments during the microphone session of the public hearing. FHWA and CDOT appreciate you taking the time to express your ideas and concern. FHWA and CDOT have evaluated your comments in detail and our responses are provided below. Henry Van Fleet submitted similar verbal comments. Please refer to Comment #113 and 161.

Response to Comment #179-1:
The concept of side-by-side urban interchanges at I-70 and 40th Avenue represents a refinement of an earlier concept that you forwarded previously for a single urban interchange at this location. We appreciate your efforts. We have taken your sketch design and developed it further to better understand the spatial and operational effects of the concept (see below). The benefits of locating the I-70 interchange at 40th Avenue, as you state, are true if the concept can be realized. We looked at similar concepts to yours early in the process as we were working on the array of alternatives.

The challenge in advancing those alternatives, and in advancing your alternative, is influenced by three primary factors:

- the distance between the I-70/SH58 interchange and a new interchange north of 32nd Avenue would be short, affecting the ability to safely manage conflicting (weaving) traffic movements between on and off ramps
- the horizontal separation between I-70 and Youngfield Street is the least north of 32nd Avenue – generally 80’ between edges of the roadway
- providing laneage and traffic control devices necessary to mitigate the traffic demands.

Your alternative shows sensitivity to these concerns but FHWA and CDOT have identified the following challenges of implementation as it relates to those noted above:

- Your option addresses the consecutive ramp spacing issue well in that it combines traffic bound for SH58, 40th Avenue, and 32nd Avenue at one exit and entrance; it becomes difficult in that it carries freeway to freeway traffic movements through a signalized intersections with 40th Avenue. This introduces a challenging traffic operations solution at 40th Avenue.
As we drafted your concept, the combination of interchanges is rather unique as is attached. The Youngfield Street connection could be a partial single point urban interchange (urban) with access to and from the west and a traffic signal to control the movements. The I-70 interchange would need to provide north-south through and turning movements (which a traditional urban interchange cannot do) and therefore would look more similar to the westbound I-70 ramps at 32nd Avenue today but with that same configuration on the east side as well – a tight diamond interchange. This would then have two traffic signals, one on each side of the interstate. We have kept each of these intersections as close together as we believe to be prudent while allowing for reasonable intersection operations. They are generally spaced at 350’ which is similar to those on 32nd Avenue at I-70 today. This does result in moving Youngfield Street to the east which impacts existing adjacent businesses, church and some residential properties.

- We have estimated that this interchange configuration would attract Year 2030 PM peak hour traffic volumes on 40th Avenue that would be 25 to 30 percent greater than that which exists under I-70 at 32nd Avenue today. The difficulty is that this concept preserves intersection spacing along 40th Avenue in a similar fashion as it exists today on 32nd Avenue but needing to accommodate considerably greater traffic. Poor operations would be expected.

Due to the problems identified above, FHWA and CDOT do not believe that the side-by-side urban interchange concept that you have identified should be advanced for further consideration.

**Response to Comment #179-2:**
We appreciate your concern over the underpass at 40th Avenue. Please realize that this work is being done as a local agency project independent of the improvements identified in the Environmental Assessment. However, we do still appreciate your thoughts on this matter. CDOT, the City of Wheat Ridge, and the consultant have discussed this issue at some length. Youngfield Street and the 40th underpass have been designed and have been reviewed by the City of Wheat Ridge. FHWA and CDOT approved access to the I-70 right-of-way in July 2006. These reviews have resulted in design refinements and a solution that we believe to meet the needs of the corridor. Safety is always a key component in the design and this application has been developed sensitive to the public safety.

Attachement

CC: Applewood Valley Association
SCHEMATIC LAYOUT OF IMPROVEMENTS TO I-70
RE: CARBELA’S PROPOSAL

Nov. 11, 2006

EXISTING
NOW CONSTRUCTION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sheryl Ugolini</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #180</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please note this comment was forwarded to Monica Pavlik at FHWA by Floras Andrus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlik, Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: sheryl [<a href="mailto:harris23@yahoo.com">harris23@yahoo.com</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 8:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: Flora Andrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: 44th/hoilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Horn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I went to the open house on Thursday. I still was very discouraged after going to the meeting. I asked about what kind of options there was to put at the intersection. They went off by saying that they were going to put a sign of the neighborhood and to let you know access to local traffic only. I don't think anyone cares about what the name is of the neighborhood. I asked about barricade walls put up to block the noise and air pollution, and one of them was saying that that will not happen. I also suggested that a traffic light be put up at 44th/Indiana since no one will be able to get across anymore at that intersection. It appears that the CDOT is going to do what they have in mind no matter what is best for the community. I left the meeting very frustrated because I felt no matter what I said, it would not make any difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Ugolini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS I don't have any plans to sell just yet the house down the street sold a month ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Comment #180:**
Sheryl Ugolini also provided additional written comments. Please refer to Comment #71.

Please refer to our responses to Comments #16 in regard to your comment on 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street intersection and #25 in regard to your comment on the mitigation of the effect of the new signalized intersection at 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street.

**Response to Comment #180-1:**
Please refer to our response to Comment #11-1 in regard to your comment on relocating the interchange to Indiana Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cheryl Witt</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #181</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment received via the project website. Date : 11/17/06 09:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Cabela's approval, what will happen to Table Mountain Animal Shelter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Comment #181:**
The Table Mountain Animal Shelter will remain at its current location and will be accessed from 40th Avenue along the remaining Youngfield Service Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Connie Null</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #182</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment received via the project website. Date : 11/18/06 19:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why wasn't the issue of traffic and roads considered before they started doing all that grading and digging, and getting alot of peoples hopes up about having a Cabela's Store starte? We have been looking forward to having one Cabela's here, so we don't have to drive to Neb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am sure something can be worked out so they can get started on building. After all it is the prefect location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Comment #182:**
The grading conducted at the site of the proposed development was in relation to the reclamation of the site in accordance with the Coors Company's aggregate mine permit.
Response to Comment #183:
Response to Comment #183-1:
Please refer to our response to Comments #16 in regard to your comment on 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street intersection and #25 in regard to your comment on the mitigation of the effect of the new signalized intersection at 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street.

Response to Comment #183-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #11-1 in regard to your comment on relocating the interchange to Indiana Street.

November 19, 2006

Mr. Randy Young
City Manager
City of Wheat Ridge
7500 W. 26th Ave.
Wheat Ridge, CO 80033

Dear Mr. Young,

I strongly oppose the diamond exchange on Hwy 58 having Cabela Drive come up to 44th Ave. at Holman St. Why can’t Cabela Drive stop at Hwy 58? Or wind around to Indiana St. a through street or simple only have the new updated intersection at Hwy 58 and 44th Ave. McIntyre handle the traffic? I was told that they denied it necessary for fire safety. Fairmount fire department is not responsible for the Wheatridge area and if needed in a major disaster is close enough going to the Hwy 58 and McIntyre intersection.

I live (for 46 years) in the Golden Valley Subdivision a small-unincorporated Fairmount area of Jefferson County. We don’t need Cabela’s traffic to come up to 44th Ave. as a dead-end street with single-family housing. For that fact we don’t need Cabela’s. If you must join 44th Ave. which I find ridiculous then wind around Asphalt Paving and come up on Indiana St. I think Asphalt Paving and Ball owns this road for their trucks. State highway 58 was built to take truck traffic off of 44th Ave. Now look what you want to do. We are not part of Wheatridge who will reap the taxes.

This is another unjustified move by big corporations and money hungry cities like Wheatridge and Lakewood to push on all of us choosing to keep Fairmount and our housing area out of development for your profit. I have the sick feeling that this is all a move point that any of our opinions don’t matter and that this is another slick done deal.

Sincerely,

Jeannette L. Scully
4605 Gardenia St.
Golden, CO 80401
Response to Comment #184:
No response necessary.
Response to Comment #185:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Response to Comment #185-1:
Please refer to our response to Comments #39 and #61 in regard to your comment on bicycle trails.

Response to Comment #185-2:
The Proposed Action will include wider sidewalks under I-70 on the south side of 32nd Avenue to better accommodate bicycles and pedestrians and to connect with the 32nd Avenue Trail.

Tom Colburn
Comment #185

I-70 / 32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental Assessment
PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM

November 9, 2006

Public Hearing Comment Form

Thank you for attending the I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Project Environmental Assessment (EA) Public Hearing. Your comments are important to aid in making the best decision for transportation improvements in the project area. They will be combined with others, addressed in the decision document, and used by FHWA and CDOT in making the appropriate course of action to follow. Please use this form to record your comments and either submit them in the comment boxes provided tonight or mail it to one of the addresses below prior to December 8, 2006.

Submit your comment at the November 9, 2006 Public Hearing or mail to the address below – comments must be received by December 8, 2006.

Monica Povika
Federal Highway Administration, Colorado Division
12000 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180
Lakewood, CO 80228
Fax: (720) 384-3001

Ed Martinez
Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 6
4570 N. Holly Street
Denver, CO 80216
Fax: (303) 398-0781

COMMENT: I strongly disagree with your plans for the live oaks at 27th Ave. Placing that pump track is going to impact some long established businesses and residences, and it’s not going to create more traffic congestion. On the other hand, development near 32nd Avenue is going to be a good thing. Keep all your ramps out of the neighborhood and put them in the commercial development zone to the north.

Another important thing I would like to see is a dedicated bike path access to the green belt that would be available both during and after construction of that shopping center. Not just some half-assed three foot wide sidewalk with multiple accident crossings, but a 6 foot plus dedicated access roadway from main through traffic in addition to the future (frontage road too many little trees)

32nd Ave. is currently a major thoroughfare for bicyclists to and from Golden. There needs to be a better shoulder along 32nd, especially with the increased traffic caused by the 32nd Avenue.

Name: Tom Colburn
Address: 20465 Ellis St.  City: Golden  Zip Code: 80471
Phone: 303-271-6307  Email: TomColburn@concert.net
Date: 11/21/2006
Response to Comment #186:
No response necessary.

Vance Kolesar
Comment #186

Public Hearing Comment Form

Thank you for attending the I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Project Environmental Assessment (EA) Public Hearing. Your comments are important in aiding the decision-making process for transportation improvements in the project area. They will be combined with others, addressed in the decision document, and sent by FHWA and CDOT in establishing the appropriate course of action to follow. Please use this form to record your comments and submit them in the comment boxes provided tonight or mail it to one of the addresses below prior to December 6, 2006.

Submit your comment at the November 9, 2006 Public Hearing or mail to the address below—comments must be received by December 8, 2006.

Montea Pavlik
Federal Highway Administration, Colorado Division
1200 West Colfax Avenue, Suite 100
Lakewood, CO 80228
Fax: (303) 931-3501

66 Martinez
Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 6
4670 N. Holly Street
Denver, CO 80216
Fax: (303) 389-5781

Comment:

Approve because
1) Does not traffic through wider area rather than concentrated on 32nd South of I-70.
2) Reasonable grade off on 38th Ave., relocating the I-70 exit from 32nd location and not allowing westbound traffic on the I-70 - 32nd three congested area.
3) Improve I-25 - I70 interchange interaction with heavy 38 traffic building and no access from 38th onto southbound I-70. This has been a major shortcoming for this interchange for years.

Name: Vance Kolesar
Address: 11626 W. 37th Pl.
City: Wheat Ridge
Zip Code: 80033

Phone: 303.279.7140
Email:

Date: 11/08/2006

C-208
Response to Comment #187:
Jerol Novacek also provided additional written comments. Please refer to Comment #4 and #157.

Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue and to Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps in the FONSI in regard to your comments related to these hook ramps and traffic increases along 27th Avenue and the associated impacts to the residential neighborhood.

Response to Comment #187-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #187-2:
As discussed in Section 2.4 Proposed Action of the EA, the westbound I-70/32nd Avenue on and off-ramps will be relocated north along Cabela Drive to approximately 35th Avenue on the west side of I-70 with paired hook ramps. The existing westbound I-70 off-ramp that exits to 32nd Avenue will be closed. The existing westbound I-70 on-ramp will remain open but access will be limited to eastbound 32nd Avenue traffic. Hook ramps in general, are not the most desired transportation solution to an interchange. However, this was the Proposed Action that emerged from the System Level Feasibility Study and EA with the least impact on the study area.

Response to Comment #187-3:
CDOT sincerely regrets that private property sometimes needs to be acquired for transportation projects. This is an unfortunate reality of our work. We are well aware of the unique circumstances of your property and your situation and that makes this difficult decision even harder. We are aware of the emotional toll that property acquisition takes on affected property owners, especially in circumstances where occupants are displaced and relocated to replacement properties. Rest assured that, at the future time when the decision is made to proceed with the acquisition of your property, our right of way professionals will strive to provide you with the courtesy and dignity you deserve in the process.

Please refer to our response to Comments #99 and #203 for other affected properties.
Response to Comment #188:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Response to Comment 188-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.

Response to Comment 188-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to your comment on the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Response to Comment 188-3:
You express concern as to the adequacy or safety of the dam (located approximately 600 feet east of Youngfield Street). Through investigation and conversations with the City of Lakewood, CDOT Bridge staff, and Consolidated Mutual Water, it was discovered that the load posting by the City of Lakewood was a voluntary effort by the city to keep heavy truck traffic off local streets. The increased traffic on the dam and bridge is not a concern with regard to dam safety, as the dam and bridge are not deficient from a load capacity. Heavy truck traffic (greater than 7,000 pounds) is currently restricted from using 27th Avenue by the City of Lakewood. These restrictions would not be removed as part of the Proposed Action.

Although wildlife is present in the area, Lena Gulch is crossed by several residential areas and does not serve as a major wildlife corridor as compared to Clear Creek.
Response to Comment #189:
No response necessary.
<p>| <strong>M.J. Bright</strong> &lt;br&gt;<strong>Comment #190</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Comment #190-1</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Comment #190-2</strong>| <strong>Comment received via the project website. Date : 11/20/06 10:19</strong>&lt;br&gt;What is an ADA structure?&lt;br&gt;What consideration has been given to protecting Consolidated Mutual’s water storage from traffic?&lt;br&gt;What is the predicted rate of increase in truck as well as car traffic along 26th and 27th sts?&lt;br&gt;What is the status of the Novack property? Obviously, we are not happy with the changes being inflicted on the local neighborhoods and probable negative impacts on property values and quality of life. | <strong>Response to Comment #190:</strong>&lt;br&gt;An ADA structure is one which is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act and ADA design standards. We presume your comment is with regard to the present 26th Avenue pedestrian bridge over I-70 and the proposed replacement structure&lt;br&gt;<strong>Response to Comment #190-1:</strong>&lt;br&gt;You express concern as to the adequacy or safety of the dam (located approximately 600 feet east of Youngfield Street). Through investigation and conversations with the City of Lakewood, CDOT Bridge staff, and Consolidated Mutual Water, it was discovered that the load posting by the City of Lakewood was a voluntary effort by the city to keep heavy truck traffic off local streets. The increased traffic on the dam and bridge is not a concern with regard to dam safety, as the dam and bridge are not deficient from a load capacity.&lt;br&gt;Since no improvements are proposed as part of this project east along 27th Avenue to the Consolidated Mutual Water dam, stormwater discharges from 27th Avenue right-of-way will be managed in accordance with the City of Lakewood’s MS4 permit.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Response to Comment #190-2:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Heavy truck traffic (greater than 7,000 pounds) is currently restricted from using 27th Avenue by the City of Lakewood. These restrictions would not be removed as part of the Proposed Action. Please refer to <strong>Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps</strong> in the FONSI in regard to your comments related to these hook ramps and traffic increases along 27th Avenue and the associated impacts to the residential neighborhood.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Response to Comment #190-3:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Full acquisition of the property at 2635 Youngfield Street (the Novacek property) will be required as part of the Proposed Action. All right-of-way acquisition will follow the procedures outlined under the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987 (as amended) and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended). These policies have measures intended to treat business owners, property owners, residents, and tenants fairly during the right-of-way acquisition process. CDOT Right-of-way specialists will work with the landowner and all displaced persons and businesses during the acquisition process to address their individual needs and desires as best possible as allowable under law.&lt;br&gt;Please refer to <strong>Section 3.4 Novaceks’ Carnation Nursery, 2635 Youngfield Street</strong> in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the Novacek property. |
| <strong>Kate Polesovsky</strong> &lt;br&gt;<strong>Comment #191</strong>| <strong>Comment received via the project website. Date : 11/20/06 13:54</strong>&lt;br&gt;Several neighbors and I have commented on the fact that the j-exit/entrance at W. 27th may not really be necessary. Many people in the neighborhoods have already begun using Denver West and Kipling exits in order to avoid traffic at 32nd and Youngfield. This alternative would save money. | <strong>Response to Comment #191:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heather Guthless</th>
<th>Comment #192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I thought the preferred alternative will help with much of the traffic congestion currently at the 1-70/32nd Avenue interchange. However, two things concerned me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The attached sidewalk from Alkire to Cabela Drive. Recently, I attended a workshop about multi-modal transportation design. An emphasis was put on a separation between the pedestrians and the cars. What is being proposed is pedestrian tolerant, not pedestrian friendly. A detached sidewalk will make walking a less threatening experience, thus encouraging people to walk more. Also, since there is a school nearby and youths may be walking along 32nd, I would encourage a landscape strip between the road and the sidewalk. A 6-8 foot pedestrian buffer is recommended in “Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities” published by the ITE, with help from the EPA and FHWA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The fly-over from eastbound I-70 to westbound SH-58 will not be completed until 6-12 months after Cabela’s is constructed. This means that until that time people coming from areas west of Cabela’s will be using the 27th interchange. My concern is that most people that visit Cabela’s will do so in the first 6-12 months of its opening. Therefore, after the fly-over is built, they will continue to use the way they know (27th) to get to Cabela’s and impact those roads further into the future than anticipated. I would encourage the fly-over to be completed prior to Cabela’s opening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your time and consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Comment #192:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #192-1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of a landscaped area between the 32nd Avenue trail sidewalk and 32nd Avenue was investigated as part of the EA process. The inclusion of a 6 to 8-foot buffer as suggested would require the full and partial acquisition of several of the residences located south of 32nd Avenue. The landscape buffer was not included because of the additional right-of-way acquisition and displacements required. Although not ideal, FHWA and CDOT have agreed to this approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #192-2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSi in regard to your comment on the construction timing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment #193:
Please note that the Environmental Assessment released for public and agency review on October 25, 2006 is not a draft document and has been approved by FHWA and CDOT. The NEPA requirements for an EA differ slightly. We are not required to evaluate all reasonable alternatives or a reasonable range of alternatives in an EA. However, in this EA, an extensive alternatives analysis was performed and a complete discussion of what the alternatives analysis resulted in is included in Chapter 2 Alternatives in the EA. The information on the traffic operations, engineering considerations, and environmental consequences associated with the alternatives considered in getting to the Proposed Action are included in Appendix C Proposed Action Screening Matrix in the EA.

Response to Comment #193-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Response to Comment #193-2:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Jim and Elizabeth Anderson
Comment #193

Ms. Monica Pavlik
Federal Highway Administration
Colorado Division
12100 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180
Lakewood, Colorado 80228

Dear Ms. Pavlik:

We are commenting on the draft environmental assessment (EA) for the 1-70 / 32nd Avenue Interchange. We live within the study area and are opposed to the proposed action to construct the eastbound hook ramps located at Youngfield Street and 27th Avenue. The completion of this proposed action would result in a marked increase in traffic on Youngfield Street and adjacent residential streets, including those in our neighborhood.

We are also concerned that only two alternatives are analyzed in detail in the draft EA. A reasonable range of alternatives needs to be examined, and this does not appear to have occurred. Of the twenty-one original alternatives, all but two were eliminated for further study. There were rejected alternatives that would have steered traffic away from our neighborhood, and would not have resulted in the destruction of a current business on Youngfield Street.

Finally, we feel very strongly that any improvements listed under a proposed action need to be completed prior to Cabela’s and other retailers opening for business. If businesses open within the project area prior to the completion of a proposed action, then the result will be very serious traffic problems on already congested streets.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

Jim & Elizabeth Anderson

Comment #193-1:

Response to Comment #193:
Please note that the Environmental Assessment released for public and agency review on October 25, 2006 is not a draft document and has been approved by FHWA and CDOT. The NEPA requirements for an EA differ slightly. We are not required to evaluate all reasonable alternatives or a reasonable range of alternatives in an EA. However, in this EA, an extensive alternatives analysis was performed and a complete discussion of what the alternatives analysis resulted in is included in Chapter 2 Alternatives in the EA. The information on the traffic operations, engineering considerations, and environmental consequences associated with the alternatives considered in getting to the Proposed Action are included in Appendix C Proposed Action Screening Matrix in the EA.

Response to Comment #193-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Response to Comment #193-2:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Terry Amalfitano
Comment #194

Comment received via the project website. Date : 11/24/06 10:42

My husband has worked in the proposed development area for 15 years. His vehicle (with him in it) has been struck twice during that time while he sat stationary waiting for stoplights. It is way past time to reconstruct these intersections to smooth traffic flow.

Response to Comment #194:
Signal timing to optimize traffic flow will be part of final design of the Proposed Action.
| **John Slattery**  
**Comment #195** | Comment received via the project website.  
To Whom It May Concern - A Comment:  
We live just south of the intersection of Youngfield and Colfax. We use Youngfield to Applewood on a daily basis, frequently several times a day. My wife, Sherry, and I strongly object to the so-called road "improvements" to the Applewood/Youngfield area in support of the Cabela's et al. development. This expensive and outrageous "Californication" of the Applewood area in the name of commercial enterprise is a disgrace to responsible government and manifests the greed of local government and large businesses over the interests of citizens. Having lived in the Los Angeles area for many years, we can speak to the destructive nature of these proposed changes, with authority. The changes will severely negatively affect the Applewood neighborhoods and cause us, as one family, to take our business elsewhere, as the construction and subsequent traffic will be an unending nightmare on Youngfield. Be assured that, if these inexcusably expensive and disruptive changes are implemented, we will never shop in Cabela's. |
| **Response to Comment #195:** | The purpose of the Proposed Action is to relieve traffic congestion (both existing and future) at the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange and to address future transportation demands on the interchange and local street network due to regional growth and expanding local retail/commercial development. In addition to the proposed development, DRCOG forecasts that the study area is expected to experience a 22 percent increase in population and the number of households and a 40 percent increase in employment over existing land uses without the proposed development. With the proposed development, employment is predicted to increase 52 percent over the existing land uses. **Section 4.1 Land Use, Socio-Economics, and Community** in the EA discusses land use forecasts in the study area. The need for the Proposed Action is discussed in **Section 1.4 Need for the Proposed Action in the EA**, and **Figure 1-3 Operational Deficiencies** in the FONSI identifies existing operational deficiencies at the interchange and local street network. |
Response to Comment #196:
Barbara Evans also provided additional written comments. Please refer to Comment #138.

Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on the public involvement process.

Response to Comment #196-1:
The question specifically deals with traffic from the 27th/26th Avenue area heading to I-70 westbound. The Proposed Action would require this element of traffic to travel a bit further north out of direction given the new orientation of the westbound on-ramp being off of Cabela Drive. The perception of additional travel distance may encourage some drivers from the 27th/26th Avenue area to instead turn south onto Youngfield (rather than north) and make use of the Denver West interchange. With the congestion that occurs at the I-70/32nd Youngfield interchange today, this might already be happening to some degree. While the Proposed Action might entail more vehicle-miles for this specific pattern, the analysis also shows that the Proposed Action would result in less delay at each of the intersections that this traffic component would travel through (as compared to the No Action), thus offsetting any travel-time increase created by out-of-direction travel. From the year 2030 traffic projections developed as part of the EA, any increase along Youngfield Street south of 27th Avenue (due specifically to this traffic pattern in question) would be approximately 100 to 200 vehicles per day. In other words, while some traffic might do this, it is not a large amount of traffic when compared to the other traffic patterns in the area, and travel-time wise it might be wash when considering the lower delays anticipated at the intersections.

Please refer to our responses to Comment #4-2 and to Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps in the FONSI in regard to your comments related to these hook ramps and traffic increases along 27th Avenue and the associated impacts to the residential neighborhood.

Response to Comment #196-2:
The study area for the traffic analysis extends well beyond the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange to determine the future volume increases of the surrounding transportation system. Figure 2-1 Study Area Traffic Analysis Zones in the FONSI identifies the limits of the study area for the traffic analysis. The study area extends east to Kipling Street and south to Colfax Avenue. Traffic impacts to 27th Avenue are included in the traffic analysis.

Response to Comment #196-3:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.
Response to Comment #196-4:
You describe a phone conversation with Kevin Maddox, an environmental scientist with Felsburg Holt and Ullevig. We do not generally feel it is appropriate to debate the content of specific conversations. However, Mr. Maddoux has indicated that his recollection of this conversation is different than you have stated. He has indicated that his intention was to encourage you to make specific written comments to voice your concerns, not discourage comments or indicate that they would not be considered.

Response to Comment #196-5:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-1 in regard to the letter received by CDOT from Murray Wilkening P.C.
Response to Comment #196-6:
FHWA and CDOT were involved in each of the decisions made regarding the EA and provided oversight to the project team throughout the NEPA process. As indicated by the signatures on the first page of the document, the EA is a FHWA and CDOT document.

Response to Comment #196-7:
All right-of-way acquisition will follow the procedures outlined under the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987 (as amended) and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended). These policies have measures intended to treat business owners, property owners, residents, and tenants fairly during the right-of-way acquisition process. CDOT Right-of-way specialists will work with the landowner and all displaced persons and businesses during the acquisition process to address their individual needs and desires as best possible as allowable under law.

In summary, FHWA and CDOT have heard and understand your concern regarding the 27th Avenue hook ramps. However, we believe these ramps are needed part of the transportation solution for this area. We further believe that the analysis has been adequate, and that the Proposed Action includes mitigation to minimize the impact on the community.
November 30, 2006

Monica Pavlik
Federal Highway Administration, Colorado Division
12300 W. Dakota Avenue, Suite 180
Lakewood, CO 80228
FAX: 720-963-3001

Re: I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Pavlik,

While recognizing the need for growth and development it is critical to preserve the attributes that make Applewood a special place within the Denver metropolitan area. Those attributes are best characterized by low density, single family homes set in a suburban, if not, semi-rural environment.

The proposed development for the area southwest of I-70 and SH 58 is perhaps a beacon for the prospsective retailers but it’s a nightmare for the long time residents. As such, it will unequivocally change the charm and character of Applewood. Nonetheless, meaningful mitigation to this change may be achieved through reasoned and thoughtfully designed public access.

As indicated in the preferred alternative, achieving direct, easy and safe access to the site is best accomplished via the proposed diamond interchange off SH 58. That interchange appropriately identifies the “front door” or entry to the development. Using the I-70 logic of linking either entrance and exit ramps for ease and identification of navigation, the SH 58 interchange should also function as the exit from the site. Thus, one should depict the Cabela’s development at the same place as one arrived. No amount of ‘re-design’ to the I-70 and 32nd Avenue interchange can do the same. The lack of available public land, coupled with existing public infrastructure make this option much more untenable and costly.

Presently 32nd Avenue is heavily congested and needs relief from the current traffic volume. Moreover, it serves as a key arterial to a junior high and elementary school. Additional community traffic that supports commercial retail activity is not in the best interest of school children’s safety - no matter what the degree of sidewalk widening, pedestrian way-finding and traffic signalization. Assuming this project proceeds, emergency access is both critical and required. It does not, however, necessarily need to be open to the public. Therefore, the Cabela Drive connection to 32nd Avenue should be sized for and restricted to only local traffic.

Additionally, it is only 3.2 miles from the Ward Road/I-70 interchange to the Denver West/I-70 interchange. That short distance does not meet the need for constructing a third interchange in-between. The projected cost for the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange with hooka ramps is $27.6M. This one aspect of the project represents 24% of the total cost. The only more expensive component is the I-70/SH 58 interchange. Therefore, given the existing, neighborhood impacts and

Response to Comment #197:
Rodger Evans also provided additional written comments. Please refer to Comment #134.

Response to Comment #197-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning.

Response to Comment #197-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #197-3:
Please refer to our response to Comment #13-2 in regard to your comment on school safety.

Response to Comment #197-4:
This EA is not proposing another interchange on I-70, but the reconstruction and redesign of the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange. In the Proposed Action, the eastbound I-70 on- and off-ramps are split from the westbound I-70 on- and off-ramps with offset hook ramps. The westbound I-70 ramps will be located at approximately 35th Avenue on the west side of I-70, and the eastbound I-70 ramps will be located at 27th Avenue on the east side of I-70.
Response to Comment #197-5:
Please refer to our response to Comment #2-1 in regard to an EIS.

Response to Comment #197-6:
Currently, the Cabela's store is not scheduled to open until June 2008. As part of the City of Wheat Ridge's approval process for the development plan that includes the Cabela's store, the City of Wheat Ridge City Council has stipulated that the I-70 westbound hook ramps, the 40th Avenue underpass of I-70, widening of 32nd Avenue, Cabela Drive, and the SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange improvements must be constructed prior to the City of Wheat Ridge issuing a Certificate of Occupancy for the development.

Response to Comment #197-7:
The question specifically deals with traffic from the 27th/26th Avenue area heading to I-70 westbound. The Proposed Action would require this element of traffic to travel a bit further north out of direction given the new orientation of the westbound on-ramp being off of Cabela Drive. The perception of additional travel distance may encourage some drivers from the 27th/26th Avenue area to instead turn south onto Youngfield (rather than north) and make use of the Denver West interchange. With the congestion that occurs at the I-70/32nd/Youngfield interchange today, this might already be happening to some degree. While the Proposed Action might entail more vehicle-miles for this specific pattern, the analysis also shows that the Proposed Action would result in less delay at each of the intersections that this traffic component would travel through (as compared to the No Action), thus offsetting any travel-time increase created by out-of-direction travel. From the year 2030 traffic projections developed as part of the EA, any increase along Youngfield Street south of 27th Avenue (due specifically to this traffic pattern in question) would be approximately 100 to 200 vehicles per day. In other words, while some traffic might do this, it is not a large amount of traffic when compared to the other traffic patterns in the area, and travel-time wise it might be wash when considering the lower delays anticipated at the intersections.

Please refer to our responses to Comment #4-2 and to Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps in the FONSI in regard to your comments related to these hook ramps and traffic increases along 27th Avenue and the associated impacts to the residential neighborhood.

Response to Comment #197-8:
FHWA and CDOT would like to stress that there has been an ongoing and thorough public involvement effort conducted for this EA. We have gone to great effort to make project information and staff accessible, and have encouraged open communication throughout the process. We do not generally feel it is appropriate to debate the content of specific conversations. However, as indicated in our response to your wife's letter Mr. Maddoux has indicated that his recollection of his conversation with you is different than you have stated. He has indicated that his intention was to encourage your wife to make specific written comments to voice her concerns, not discourage comments or indicate that they would not be considered.
| Robert Ebisch | Comment #198 | From: Robert Ebisch [mailto:rebisch@comcast.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2006 11:33 AM  
To: Pamela.Hutton@dot.state.co.us  
Cc: Pavlik, Monica | 
Subject: 

Dear FHWA and CDOT:

As a resident of Applewood, I’m very concerned about the potential for negative impact on this community of a Cabela’s development done without the interests of the local residents in mind.

We can’t be confident that the interests of Cabela’s and Wheat Ridge are in our best interests. Wheat Ridge, after Cabela’s is built on its annexation, will get the tax revenues and we will pay the price if this is not done with concern for our interests.

One concern is getting transportation improvements completed as a condition of – AND BEFORE – the opening of Cabela’s. I was at one meeting where a Wheat Ridge representative assured the crowd that the traffic would be mitigated. One old-time resident stood up and pointed to the hellish nightmare of daily traffic jam at the intersection of the I-70 offramp and 32nd street’s intersection with that offramp and Youngfield and said that nightmare had been going on for years without CDOT or anyone else lifting a finger to solve it, so why should he believe that thousands more vehicles daily would not pose an awful problem? Good point.

Who wouldn’t like to have a Cabela’s nearby? What a great store! But who doesn’t know a bicyclist who has been hit by a car? Bicycle traffic on 32nd is already a ridiculous freak show of autos having to slow, wait for a gap in approaching traffic and then gun it around the bicyclists. We should supposedly promote bicycling as a commuting alternative as well, as healthy for people to get exercise and a good way of cutting down traffic and air pollution. But not at the risk of our bones and cartilage, and the lives of | Response to Comment #198: 
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning. | Response to Comment #198-1: 
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing. | Response to Comment #198-2: 
Please refer to our response to Comment #39 and #61 in regard to bicycle mobility. |
our bicycling children. Many people in this area bicycle for fun, and many commute by bike -- a doctor neighbor bicycles from here each day to his clinic at the Lutheran Medical Center.

In Europe and more progressive American communities, people commonly bicycle to work and back, to go shopping, to get around, on designated bike lanes and paths, even in the midst of large cities. Here, all too often, we’re left to find our way along the gutter and curb with mechanized death roaring by inches from our elbows. Access from my neighborhood to the Clear Creek bike path going west into Golden, for example, requires me to get on 32nd to McIntyre, a death-defying journey which I’m amazed that so many bike enthusiasts do daily.

Going to the Clear Creek bike path east, or if one wants to take it west and is willing to ride an extra mile to avoid riding on 32nd, one can take the Youngfield Service road to the Clear Creek bike path, which is now relatively benign because it carries little traffic. When that service road becomes a channel for Cabela’s traffic, however, it will be as bad as or worse than 32nd, and the last safe access to the Clear Creek path will have been eliminated, and everyone in this community will be unable to reach the Clear Creek path without risking their lives – especially children, who lack the experience and skills needed to avoid being hit from behind, and who often wobble away from the straight line of progress necessary to stay on the very edge of the pavement and minimize the chance of being hit. UNLESS that road is sufficiently widened and equipped with a walk-way and sufficiently set-aside on-road bike lane.

Best wishes,
Bob Ebisch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barbara Barry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment #199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment submitted as an email to CDOT Region 6 Traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to know if the following configuration along Cabela's drive was analyzed and the results of this analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Cabela drive: Two through lanes north of 32nd with one terminating at the hook ramps to go westbound I-70 only. Past this, Cabela drive will have two lanes through the development. Southbound Cabela drive: Two through lanes through the development with one terminating at the hook ramp intersection. One through lane past the hook ramp intersection that will become three lanes at the intersection of 32nd ave - one right lane, one through/left turn lane and one left turn lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Comment #199:
Barbara Barry also provided additional written comments. Please refer to Comments #142 and #228.

Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.
Response to Comment #200:

An interchange signing plan has been developed to help motorists find their way within the interchange complex and to make it clear that the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange is the route for accessing the proposed development. Section 2.3.10 Interstate Guide Signage in the FONSI discusses the supplemental guide signing.

Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
Response to Comment #201:
FHWA and CDOT would like to thank Jefferson County for their involvement.
Response to Comment #201A:
This comment was also received as an email to the project website.

Response to Comment #201A-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development.

Response to Comments #201A-2:
FHWA and CDOT appreciate your observations regarding groundwater-surface water interactions in the area. FHWA and CDOT believe that the groundwater and surface water analysis presented in the EA is adequate for the characterization of project impacts and identification of mitigation requirements. Further detailed evaluation will be conducted during final design to ensure that the transportation facilities are appropriate from both and engineering and resource protection standpoint.

As was described in the EA, relatively shallow groundwater conditions exist over portions of the study area. As was concluded in the EA, the Proposed Action is unlikely to have an adverse impact on groundwater based on the following:
• During final design detailed evaluation and engineering design will be conducted to ensure that the transportation facilities are compatible with the surface and subsurface conditions present at the site.
• During construction, stormwater management practices and dewatering permit conditions will be applied to protect surface water and groundwater resources from adverse affects of construction activities.
• Permanent drainage and water quality facilities will be designed, constructed, and maintained to mitigate adverse impacts of roadway runoff.
• Regardless of the area used for comparison (watershed or study area), the additional impervious area that will result from the Proposed Action is relatively small in comparison with the total area. Additionally, these impervious areas (roadways) are not concentrated in one location, but traverse the area. Therefore, these facilities would not be expected to have any substantial effect on the existing groundwater conditions.

Section 4.20.4.7 Water Resources/Water Quality in the EA discusses cumulative impacts to water resources in the cumulative impacts study area.
a daily basis that groundwater and surface water interactions within the area where the Proposed Action are more complex than this report portrays. In fact, in the time since the cut-and-fill actions related to the Cabela’s site “reclamation” has been done, I have personally observed new groundwater seeps that have appeared on the north-facing slope just a few tens of feet west of I-70 in the area where the Proposed Action will place the new I-70 on-off ramps and their associated acceleration lanes and connecting streets. I have observed that these new seeps were a direct result of the construction done during the infilling process by Coors and Cabela’s and I have made regular observations of those new groundwater-surface water interaction features during regular bicycle rides up and down the current Youngfield Service Road while accessing the Clear Creek trail. I question that these have not been adequately characterized at this point. Consequently, the full negative impacts that the construction of the Proposed Action will have upon the groundwater and surface water in the vicinity of the proposed new on/off ramps cannot be assessed nor any appropriate mitigative measures identified or taken. For example, the effects of excavation, compaction, loading, and creation of large impervious surfaces as well as channelization and control of storm-water discharge from these proposed features are likely to be great upon that area of the aquifer where groundwater and surface water interaction is already apparent.

The scale of the impact analysis for the water resources is flawed in Section 4.10.2. The EA continually refers to the entire watershed as the impact area. That level of analysis improperly directs the reader to believe there will be only a de minimis impact, when in fact the large increase in impervious surfaces will have substantial direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts upon the resources within the Study Area, which is the relevant control area in which the impacts of the Proposed Action should be compared. For example, the analysis states that the 20.54 acres of new impervious surfaces would only be 0.60% of the 446 sq. mile watershed, but the analysis scale should correctly be that the 20.54 acres of new impervious surfaces will represent a much larger proportion of the actual Study Area itself which appears to be about 5-6 sq. miles as represented in Figure ES-2. Therefore, the 20.54 acres represents approximately 0.05% of the 5.5 sq. mile study area (or proportionally 1000 times larger in percentage). The Proposed Action will have a far greater local impact on water resources than is currently represented in the EA. The analysis should include evaluations of effects on the scale of the Study Area itself, as well as at the watershed scale. The flawed scaling results in inadequate mitigation of groundwater impacts. Because the current analysis is on a scale of the entire watershed, the mitigation measures that are offered for the impacts are inadequate for the true impacts at the scale of the Study Area. Additional mitigation needs to be identified for surface water and groundwater impacts at the scale of the Study Area, not at the Watershed scale.

3. Timing of Completion of the Proposed Action is Flawed – The timing of the completion the EB I-70 to WB SH55 movement/layover until after the opening of the development is unacceptable. In all previous communications between the developer, the county, CDOT and FHWA, it has been promised that all movements
Comment #201A-4:

Response to Comment #201A-4:

Naming of local streets is typically falls under the jurisdiction of the local entity, in this case the City of Wheat Ridge. The proposed concept has apparent merit, and was considered by the City. The City considers the proposed Cabela Drive to be a continuous street from 32nd to 44th Avenue; and that the name should remain the same for clarity with respect to emergency access and life safety issues.

To minimize the development traffic use of the westbound I-70 exit, and hence 32nd, it is proposed that the interstate signage for the westbound I-70 off ramp remain the same as today, "Exit 264, Youngfield Street/32nd Avenue".

Response to Comment #201A-5:

Please refer to our response to Comments #39 and #61 in regard to your comments on bicycle lanes.

Comment #201A-5:

Response to Comment #201A-5:

Please refer to our response to Comments #39 and #61 in regard to your comments on bicycle lanes.

December 2006
Response to Comment #201A-6: The travel demand forecasting for both the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Action includes Phase I of the Gold Line, which is an 11.2 mile light rail transit project that extends from downtown Denver to Ward Road north of I-70. The Ward Road park-n-Ride facility could serve as the end of the line, although the final station locations will be identified as part of NEPA process for the Gold Line. Feeder bus routes are anticipated to serve the light rail station. Section 3.5 Transit Access discusses the current RTD bus routes serving the study area.

It is our understanding that RTD is considering adjusting their bus routes to accommodate the proposed development area west of I-70. In addition, the developers, in conjunction with RTD, are also investigating the possibility of relocating the current bus transfer operations at 38th / Youngfield to the proposed development site.

Response to Comment #201A-7: Please refer to our response to comment #2-1 in regard to an EIS.

Mark Griswold
14605 Foothill Circle
Golden, CO 80401

cc: Jefferson County Commissioners
Applewood Property Owners Association

December 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claudia Browne</th>
<th>Response to Comment #201B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #201B</strong></td>
<td>This comment was also received as an email to the project website. Claudia Browne also submitted comments during the November 8, 2007 public hearing (Comment #126 and Comment #140). For our response to comments, please refer to Comment #126.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Ed Martinez  
CDOT North Engineering Region 6  
4670 North Holly Street  
Denver, CO 80216  

December 5, 2006  

RE: Comments on Cabela’s project Environmental Assessment  

Dear Mr. Martinez:  

The current environmental assessment process is an important opportunity to accurately assess the environmental impacts of the proposed Cabela’s project so that meaningful mitigation measures and design adjustments can be made to ensure the sustainability of the Applewood neighborhood. As I have said on numerous occasions, this review process is not just about Cabela’s rather it concerns the associated development and the commercialization of the Clear Creek valley which is a valued natural resource in our area. Because of the long-term significance of the decisions that CDOT will make, I urge you to require revisions to the EA and/or a more detailed EIS to better determine the true impacts.  

Overall, I believe the current EA document is seriously flawed for the several reasons listed below:  

1. The no action alternative is a false construct with erroneous assumptions about traffic volumes. The traffic volumes in the “no Action” alternative are by no means a “given”, because while another commercial development may occupy the site, it would not necessarily be a development that draws 3 million cars per year. Therefore, the No Action alternative is an inappropriate basis for comparison. There needs to be sensitivity analyses comparing the proposed improvements to the other realistic alternatives such as “no improvements AND significantly lower traffic flows” e.g., assuming a smaller local development that does not depend on regional traffic inflows and/or assuming only Cabela’s’ without the traffic from the other 300,000 sq ft Wheat Ridge anticipating developing in the same area.  

2. The air and noise analyses do not adequately take into account the cumulative impacts of the project.  

3. Because of the inappropriate use of the No Action alternative and the absence of cumulative impact analysis, impacts from key issues such as air and noise are downplayed, and as a result, no meaningful mitigation measures are proposed such as providing alternative transportation to reduce the inflow of traffic.
4. The EA does not provide a full explanation of its assumptions or a systematic fact-based analysis (e.g. about traffic volumes and vehicle mix, delivery vehicles, road usage), and therefore it is not possible to determine if the EA is complete, accurate, or reasonable.

For the reasons listed above, I believe the EA needs to be revised to address these and other concerns and/or that the process needs to move to a full EIS evaluation. However, we are losing confidence in the process and are at a critical crossroads. For 2 years we have tried to comment on inadequacies in the alternative screening process and assumptions made by PHU about traffic. Now that we have seen the lack of detailed consideration of our serious concerns and avoidance of mitigation measures, we are no longer comfortable with the developer and Wheat Ridge handling the scope of the EA. We believe it is essential that at a minimum CLIOF step in and provide more oversight and scrutiny of assumptions, analytical methods, and presentation of the environmental assessment process and results.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Claudia Browne
Chair, Sustainable Applewood
Cc: Monica Pavlik
Response to Comment #201C:

Response to Comment #201C-1:
Section 4.20 Cumulative Impacts of the EA discusses cumulative impacts for the study area.

Response to Comment #201C-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #102 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning.

Linda Chumbley
Comment #201C

Date: December 6, 2006
From: Linda Chumbley, Applewood Resident
To: FHWA and CDOT representatives
Subject: Draft I70-32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental Assessment Comments

I am very concerned about the EA’s inadequate assessment of the cumulative impacts to our neighborhood. I feel the project is pushing forward without regard to the many and varied inputs of the community.

The following was copied from Cabela’s website:

“Cabela’s is dedicated to preserving your way of life not because it is our business, but it is our way of life as well.”

Really? Several of my neighbor’s homes and businesses will be consumed and demolished because of this project. Where’s the dedication to preserving their lives and livelihoods? All information that I’ve seen and heard over the last couple of years of this project’s existence is seemingly contrary to that statement.

Applewood residents have chosen to live in this area for very specific reasons. It’s the quiet, semi-rural feel, the lack of crime, etc. etc. that makes Applewood, Applewood. I’m not a long-time resident of Applewood, but I have lived in the neighborhood for 7 years and have first-hand experience with what I call, “commercial creep”. I define “commercial creep” as the slow, but never-ending consumption of vacant land by business or housing.

I empathize with Cabela’s desire to build their facility in the shadow of North Table Mountain. It’s a beautiful location. However, building a Cabela’s on the border of the Applewood neighborhood would not be “commercial creep”; it would be “commercial gluttony”. If Cabela’s was truly dedicated to preserving Applewood’s way of life, it would not propose building Colorado’s next biggest tourist attraction in Applewood’s backyard.

My suggestion – RE-USE and RECYCLE!

The former Stinson Chevrolet dealership at Colfax and Indiana has been sitting empty, surrounded by chain link fences for over a year. The facility has taken on an “urban blight” appearance. It would be the perfect location for Cabela’s.

I’ve heard the argument about that location and non-compete agreements with stores at Colorado Mills, but certainly there must be a creative solution to that issue. The traffic


C-231
improvements are already in place, there’s plenty of parking and Cabela’s would provide a much needed “shot-in-the-arm” to the Mills.

Granted, Cabela’s would not have the picturesque backdrop of the Clear Creek Valley at the Stevinson Chevrolet location and the city of Wheat Ridge would lose the tax revenue, but the qualities that make Applewood the desirable neighborhood that it is, would be preserved.

As for the proposed Cabela’s site along Clear Creek, leave it as open-space. Open-space is not a bad thing. Every piece of land should not be required to generate revenue. And, YES, the traffic issues at 32nd Ave./Youngfield/I-70/SH 58 still need to be addressed. But if you aren’t building to funnel 1 million “motor home driving”, “trailer pulling” visitors each year through these interchanges, the solution will be much simpler and more economical.

Linda Chumbley
14365 W. 30th Place
Golden, CO 80401
CHUMBLEYL@yahoo.com

December 2006
Response to Comment #201D:

Response to Comment #201D-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning.

Response to Comment #201D-2:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #201D-3:
Traffic volumes generated by the Cabela’s shopping center were estimated from trip rates and equations published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Trip Generation and from other Cabela’s store facilities. Please refer to Chapter 3 Transportation Analysis of the EA and the October 2006 Traffic Analysis Technical Report for further explanation.

The traffic analysis did account for a truck presence in the LOS analyses. The plan includes accommodating delivery trucks via the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange, and all roadway design was laid out to accommodate large vehicles like delivery trucks.

Response to Comment #201D-4:
FHWA and CDOT appreciate your concern related to traffic noise and air quality and also believe these effects require evaluation. Section 4.5 Traffic Noise and Vibration in the EA is a summary of the analysis that was performed as part of the EA to assess potential impacts from traffic noise to properties neighboring the proposed improvements. The October 2006 Noise Impact Assessment Report details the noise analysis conducted. Section 4.4 Air Quality of the EA, Section 3.2 Additional Information and Clarifications to Air Quality in the FONSI, and the October 2006 Air Quality Assessment Report detail the air quality analysis conducted. The EA does not address the lighting of the proposed development and Cabela’s store because the proposed development and Cabela’s store are outside the jurisdiction of FHWA and CDOT. Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s storage and local land use planning. As per CDOT standards, high-mast or mid-mast fixtures will be used to light the highway and ramps. The lighting selection process will consider shields, reflectors, and/or other measures to minimize light spill. Visual impacts are further discussed in Section 4.16 Visual Character of the EA. Table 4-1 Summary of Proposed Action Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the FONSI summarized the mitigation measures for the traffic noise, air quality, and visual impacts from the Proposed Action.

Response to Comment #201D-5:
The Proposed Action does not include improvements to McIntyre Street. The Proposed Action does include improvements to the Holman Street/44th Avenue intersection that will connect with Cabela Drive and the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange. Please refer to our responses to Comments #16 in regard to your comment on 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street intersection and #25 in regard to your comment on the mitigation of the effect of the new signalized intersection at 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street.
Response to Comment #201D-6:
These properties are zoned for commercial development, so FHWA and CDOT would expect commercial expansion to occur in these areas.

Response to Comment #201D-7:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning.

Response to Comment #201D-8:
Please refer to our response to Comment #201D-3, in regard to traffic volumes estimated for Cabela’s. Section 2.5 Funding and Phasing in the EA provides estimates of the probable construction costs for the various transportation improvements and the funding source. Section 2.4 Funding Status in the FONSI discusses the preliminary assumption of costs for the Proposed Action.

Response to Comment #201D-8:
Table 4-1 Summary of Proposed Action Impacts and Mitigation Measures identifies the impacts of the Proposed Action and the mitigation measures for those impacts. In addition, impacts, such as full right-of-way acquisition, were used to eliminate alternatives and minimize impacts to residents. The alternative screening analysis is summarized in Chapter 2 Alternatives in the EA.
Response to Comment #202:
FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.
Response to Comment #203:
The property located at 12751 W. 32nd Avenue will be a full acquisition. At this time, no right-of-way will be acquired from the property at 3450 Youngfield Street.

CDOT sincerely regrets that private property sometimes needs to be acquired for transportation projects. This is an unfortunate reality of our work. We are well aware of the unique circumstances of your property and your situation and that makes this difficult decision even harder. We are aware of the emotional toll that property acquisition takes on affected property owners, especially in circumstances where occupants are displaced and relocated to replacement properties. Rest assured that, at the future time when the decision is made to proceed with the acquisition of your property, our right of way professionals will strive to provide you with the courtesy and dignity you deserve in the process.

All right-of-way acquisition will follow the procedures outlined under the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987 (as amended) and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended). Unfortunately, the relocation benefits offered by this program are not enough to make businesses whole for all losses arising from relocation. The program only provides nominal benefits to assist with some of the costs associated with relocation. Regrettfully, displaced businesses commonly incur financial damages, sometimes significant, for which there is no reimbursement in the federal-aid relocation program.

The three major areas of financial relocation benefits for displaced benefits are: (i) costs incurred searching for a replacement site, limited to $2,500, (ii) moving expenses (no limit), and (iii) reestablishment, limited to $10,000. Additionally businesses can also elect to accept a single payment “in-lieu” of all other relocation benefits; however, the “in-lieu” payment is limited to $20,000. All of the payment limits imposed on these benefits were established in 1970 when Congress enacted the Uniform Act. These limits have not been modified since and are obviously incongruent with present economic realities. FHWA is considering asking Congress to modify these limits.

These policies have measures intended to treat business owners, property owners, residents, and tenants fairly during the right-of-way acquisition process. CDOT Right-of-way specialists will work with the landowner and all displaced persons and businesses during the acquisition process to address their individual needs and desires as best possible as allowable under law.

Please refer to our response to Comments #4 and #99 for other affected properties.
comparable access and convenience. We feel our business may suffer irreparable harm due to the displacement and disruption of service.

We strongly encourage FHWA and CDOT to carefully evaluate the significant impacts the I-70/32\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue Interchange Project will have on businesses like Starbucks.

Again, we applaud your agency for having the vision to consider the long-term future of Wheat Ridge. We also ask that you carefully evaluate the near-term fiscal and physical impacts that affect the livelihoods and lifestyles of those who live, work, and conduct business in Wheat Ridge.

Sincerely,

Carl Hansch
Regional Vice President
Starbucks Coffee Company

cc: Ms. Monica Pavlik, FHWA, Colorado Division
Response to Comment #204:

Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development.

Response to Comment #204-1:

Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development.
Response to Comment #204-2:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #204-3:
Please refer to our response to Comment #5-1 in regard to your comment on noise along 32nd Avenue west of I-70.

Response to Comment #204-2:

all the numerous proceedings that have occurred over the last two years, this EA is the ONLY government assessment of the environmental impacts flowing from the tens of thousands of additional cars per day expected to travel these roads solely as a result of this development. The inclusion of this traffic in the "No Action" alternative makes a finding of "No Significant Impact" a foregone conclusion. Consequently, no analysis under an "environmental assessment" becomes a sham. We must CAA and FHWA's production of a decision document will ensure that a true evaluation of the environmental impacts of traffic from this project will be undertaken and presented to the public in accordance with the letter and spirit of applicable laws and regulations. Please see Exhibit A to this letter regarding certain issues in the EA related to the assumptions used in the construct of the "No Action" and "Proposed Action" alternatives.

Comment #204-3

2. Cabela's store opening must be delayed until completion of all essential road improvements, including the completion of the I-70/CO-8 interchange at numerous public meetings, and as acknowledged in the EA, the developer and the City of Wheat Ridge have repeatedly represented that necessary transportation improvements will be in place before Cabela's opening day (see, e.g., EA Executive Summary, ES-27; see also, letter to Mayor DiTulio attached as Exhibit B). Among these improvements, completion of the missing I-70/CO-8 interchange is especially essential for traffic to access the "front door" of the project from CO-8. The missing interchange ramps are assumed under the "No Action" alternative and are integral to the functioning of other improvements included in the "Proposed Action." Yet, the EA states that completion of the interchange is not expected until six to twelve months after store opening. This timetable is unacceptable to APOA.

We strongly believe that the integrity of the Proposed Action and the EA hinges on completion of this interchange. We note that the development requires legal access from the planned Cabela Drive to the public road system in order to function. Such access should be withheld until construction of the missing I-70/CO-8 interchange ramps is complete. Alternatively, additional environmental impact analysis must be undertaken to reflect the true impacts within the study area of project traffic (as discussed in Item 1 above) until such time as the missing interchange ramps are open for use.

Further, we question whether the proposed laneage of Cabela Drive just north of 32nd Avenue, as compared with the laneage at the "front door" where Cabela Drive will intersect with CO-8, is primarily designed to accommodate increased traffic at 32nd Avenue because of the anticipated delay in access to the front door from eastbound I-70. Consistent with the oft-stated position that access to the development site via 32nd Avenue will be minimized, we note that this design be reassessed in light of a schedule that postpones store opening until the interchange is completed.

3. The EA, as written, contains numerous inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and flaws in its analysis. Of particular concern is the inadequate mitigation of noise impacts to
Response to Comment #204-4:
Pleas refer to our response to Comment #25 in regard to your comment on the mitigation of the effect of the new signalized intersection at 44th Avenue/Cabela Drive/Holman Street.
Response to Comment #204-5:
Please refer to Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps in regard to your comment on traffic impacts.

Response to Comment #204-6:
Meeting the objectives of local and regional plans (community design) and maintenance of community character and aesthetics (quality of life) were used as screening criteria during the fourth-level screening. Please refer to Section 4.2 Alternatives Considered and Appendix C Screening Matrix of the EA.

Response to Comment #204-7:
As stated in Section 2.3 No-Action Alternative of the EA, the transportation projects currently planned in the vicinity of the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange that are included in the No-Action Alternative have committed or identified funds for construction and will be made regardless of whether or not any improvements are made to the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange. Projects included in the unconstrained part of the Transportation Improvement Plan are unfunded and consequently were not included in the No-Action Alternative.

However, the Northwest Corridor Combined Alternative, which includes a freeway facility along SH 93 and US 6 through Golden and McIntyre Street as a four-lane arterial, was included in the travel demand forecasts for the No-Action Alternative because CDOT did not want to make this size of an investment in an improvement without accounting for the potential traffic from this project.

Response to Comment #204-8:
Cumulative impacts are those that may result from the incremental impacts of a particular action when added to other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. The cumulative impacts study area was chosen based on the resources to be analyzed for cumulative impacts because it encompasses nearby areas of current and planned development. A neighborhood scale cumulative impacts study area would be too narrow in focus and would not account for local or regional projects.

Response to Comment #204-9:
Please refer to our response to Comment #5-1 in regard to your comment on noise along 32nd Avenue west of I-70.
Response to Comment #204-10.
Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development. In addition, clarification has been added to Section 3.2 Additional Information and Clarifications to Air Quality in the FONSI.

4. Air Quality Analysis

The “Proposed Action” alternative shows an improvement in air quality when compared to the “No Action” alternative which includes proposed development traffic. As previously stated, since development of this magnitude could not proceed without improvements like those planned under the “Proposed Action,” this is essentially a false construct. The air quality analysis should compare the “Proposed Action” with a “No Action” alternative that contemplates more typical local growth – the only growth that can realistically occur without the proposed improvements. This is particularly evident at page 4-17. Although sensitive receptors are referenced here, the EA does not address the specific impact of increased traffic on the air quality at homes and schools in this area.
Response to Comment 204-11:
Please refer to our responses to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela's and local land use planning.

Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.
Response to Comment #204-12:
South of 32nd Avenue, Eldridge and Alkire Streets have limited continuity. The vast majority of traffic that would make use of these roadways would likely be destined-to or originating-from the immediate residential area that it serves. During construction, measures will be explored to minimize the amount of traffic that might utilize local streets.

Response to Comment #204-13:
At the westbound I-70 hooks ramps, which access Cabela Drive, the majority of the traffic will not be destined for the proposed development but for other adjacent commercial and residential areas. Approximately 75 percent of the traffic on Cabela Drive, south of the proposed development, is destined or originates from a local commercial or residential area. The 19,000 vehicles per day projection is comprised of only 4,800 vehicles per day associated with the proposed development and Cabela’s. Please refer to Chapter 3 Transportation Analysis of the EA and the October 2006 Traffic Analysis Technical Report for further explanation. The analysis assumes completion of the current CDOT I-70/SH 58 interchange improvements.

Response to Comment #204-14:
Please refer to our responses to Comments #39 and #61 in regard to your comment on bicycle lanes.

Response to Comment #204-15:
The travel demand forecasting for both the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Action includes Phase I of the Gold Line, which is an 11.2 mile light rail transit project that extends from downtown Denver to Ward Road north of I-70. The Ward Road park-n-Ride facility could serve as the end of the line, although the final station locations will be identified as part of NEPA process for the Gold Line. Feeder bus routes are anticipated to serve the light rail station. Section 3.5 Transit Access discusses the current RTD bus routes serving the study area.

It is our understanding that RTD is considering adjusting their bus routes to accommodate the proposed development area west of I-70. In addition, the developers, in conjunction with RTD, are also investigating the possibility of relocating the current bus transfer operations at 38th / Youngfield to the proposed development site.

Response to Comment #204-16:
Given that air pollutants are not predicted to exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the future as a result of implementing the Proposed Action, mitigation measures for air quality are not necessary for the project. Future emissions from on-road mobile sources will be minimized globally through several federal regulations. The Denver area maintenance plans for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter will serve to avoid and minimize pollutant emissions from project area roads. In addition, clarification has been added to Section 3.2 Additional Information and Clarifications to Air Quality in the FONSI.

Comment #204-12

Response to Comment #204-12:
South of 32nd Avenue, Eldridge and Alkire Streets have limited continuity. The vast majority of traffic that would make use of these roadways would likely be destined-to or originating-from the immediate residential area that it serves. During construction, measures will be explored to minimize the amount of traffic that might utilize local streets.

Comment #204-13

Response to Comment #204-13:
At the westbound I-70 hooks ramps, which access Cabela Drive, the majority of the traffic will not be destined for the proposed development but for other adjacent commercial and residential areas. Approximately 75 percent of the traffic on Cabela Drive, south of the proposed development, is destined or originates from a local commercial or residential area. The 19,000 vehicles per day projection is comprised of only 4,800 vehicles per day associated with the proposed development and Cabela’s. Please refer to Chapter 3 Transportation Analysis of the EA and the October 2006 Traffic Analysis Technical Report for further explanation. The analysis assumes completion of the current CDOT I-70/SH 58 interchange improvements.

Comment #204-14

Response to Comment #204-14:
Please refer to our responses to Comments #39 and #61 in regard to your comment on bicycle lanes.

Comment #204-15

Response to Comment #204-15:
The travel demand forecasting for both the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Action includes Phase I of the Gold Line, which is an 11.2 mile light rail transit project that extends from downtown Denver to Ward Road north of I-70. The Ward Road park-n-Ride facility could serve as the end of the line, although the final station locations will be identified as part of NEPA process for the Gold Line. Feeder bus routes are anticipated to serve the light rail station. Section 3.5 Transit Access discusses the current RTD bus routes serving the study area.

It is our understanding that RTD is considering adjusting their bus routes to accommodate the proposed development area west of I-70. In addition, the developers, in conjunction with RTD, are also investigating the possibility of relocating the current bus transfer operations at 38th / Youngfield to the proposed development site.

Comment #204-16

Response to Comment #204-16:
Given that air pollutants are not predicted to exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the future as a result of implementing the Proposed Action, mitigation measures for air quality are not necessary for the project. Future emissions from on-road mobile sources will be minimized globally through several federal regulations. The Denver area maintenance plans for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter will serve to avoid and minimize pollutant emissions from project area roads. In addition, clarification has been added to Section 3.2 Additional Information and Clarifications to Air Quality in the FONSI.
Response to Comment #204-17:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning.

Response to Comment #204-18:
The businesses along Youngfield Street, south of 27th Avenue, will not be directly impacted by right-of-way acquisitions or loss of access and are expected to benefit from improved accessibility from eastbound I-70 provided by the transportation improvements.

Response to Comment #204-19:
Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations was issued in 1994 to address social equity in the sharing of benefits and burdens of specific projects or programs. The project newsletter was translated into Spanish to provide special outreach to low-income and minority populations located in the study area. The project newsletter was also provided in English. No other minority groups with specific language needs were identified. Please refer to the October 2006 Environmental Justice Evaluation Technical Report for detailed information on how the presence of low-income and minority groups were identified.

Response to Comment #204-20:
FHWA and CDOT are committed to on-going public involvement during final design. The specific public involvement activities and methods for future involvement will be determined during final design.

Response to Comment #204-21:
The meeting you reference was not sponsored by FHWA and CDOT.
Response to Comment #204-22:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela's and local land use planning.

Response to Comment #204-23:
The funding for pedestrian and bicycle facilities are included in the cost estimate for each component of the Proposed Action. Section 2.4 Funding Status of the FONSI identifies the various funding sources for each component of the Proposed Action.
Response to Comment #205:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.

Response to Comment #205-1:
As an existing land use, Wal-Mart is included in the DRCOG forecasts for the study area.

Response to Comment #205-2:
The travel demand forecasting for both the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Action includes Phase I of the Gold Line, which is an 11.2 mile light rail transit project that extends from downtown Denver to Ward Road north of I-70. The Ward Road park-n-Ride facility could serve as the end of the line, although the final station locations will be identified as part of NEPA process for the Gold Line. Feeder bus routes are anticipated to serve the light rail station.

Section 3.5 Transit Access discusses the current RTD bus routes serving the study area.
Response to Comment #206:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70 Ward Road interchange.

Comment #206

Regarding I-70/Ward Rd. Interchange:

Considering a light rail station will be built off Ward north of I-70, and considering there is a Invent counting on the westbound Ward exit for north flow to Ward, I strongly recommend adding/adding a west bound exit to accommodate another lane to go north on Ward. In addition, extending the acceleration lane to the Frontage Rd would be a wise move. Every night there is a huge back-up extending back onto I-70 very far north.
Response to Comment #207:
FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.

Francis
Langdon
Comment
#207

3570 Miller Street
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033
November 29, 2006

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT TO I-70 / 32nd Avenue INTERCHANGE

I would like to voice my opinion in favor of the proposed changes to correct the problems on I-70 at 32nd Avenue, Ward Road, Youngfield Street and SH 58.
With the increased traffic in this area, these changes are long overdue.
I am in favor of the proposed changes because the completed project will correct traffic problems as people make short daily trips in this area of Jefferson County and as they travel to and from the area, resulting in using both overpass and underpass with ease.
I am also in favor of the project as it includes "preplanning" for bike lanes, wider sidewalks for pedestrians, improved school safety, and access to the Clear Creek Trail System.
I hope the completed project will make the Cabella's development a model for other developments in the area.

Thank you for listening to my opinion.

Francis L. Langdon
66 year Wheat Ridge Resident

303-425-5303
fax 303-425-0374

fax # 303-398-6781

1 page - no cover
Response to Comment #208:

FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.
Response to Comment #209:
Gene and Connie Mauldin also provided additional written and verbal comments. Please refer to Comments #104 and #129.

Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on Cabela’s and local land use planning.

Please refer to our response to Comment #5-1 in regard to your comment on noise.
November 30, 2006

To Colorado Department of Transportation,

The Applewood Business Association would like to thank all the entities involved in the I-70/32nd Ave. Interchange Environmental Assessment for their continued work with the community in making this project the best for all involved.

The timeline for the road construction is a vital part to the community. We feel the majority of the work should be completed before store opening,

- SH 58 / I-70 West bound ramp
- The new interchange at SH 58 & Cabela Drive with the connection to 44th Ave.
- with proper mitigation design for the residential at 44th & Holman
- The 40th Ave underpass, with the widening of Youngfield from 38th Ave north to 44th Ave.
- The west bound I-70 Hook ramps at 32nd Ave.
- The 32nd Street to Youngfield widening

We realize that the I-70 east bound ramp to SH 58 are an integral part to create the correct traffic pattern for the development traffic, we also recognize that it will not be possible to construct the ramp prior to store opening.

With regard to the existing I-70 west bound ramp for local traffic, we would like to see some design mitigation (small median, single lane right turn only, etc.) to keep this from becoming a default for the development traffic entering west bound I-70.

We feel that some mitigation (continued masonry wall with signage) is needed at 32nd Ave west to recognize the residential area. The design and widening of 32nd Ave under the I-70 bridge be aesthetically pleasing to create a gateway to Wheat Ridge and the businesses on the east side of Youngfield in.

The 27th Ave hook ramps, we understand the need for complete interchanges are necessary for the safety and traffic patterns of drivers. We would hope that when the time comes for this interchange that it is deemed necessary. The Applewood Business Association does not believe that this interchange should be eliminated (as some residents believe), as it would give access to the businesses both north and south on Youngfield.

P.O. Box 5177 • Wheat Ridge, CO 80034-5177

Response to Comment #210:
Response to Comment #210-1:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #210-2:
Please refer to Section 2.3.1.2 Westbound I-70 Hook Ramps and Section 2.3.2 32nd Avenue Improvements in the FONSI in regard to your comments on the 32nd Avenue improvements.
Response to Comment #210-3:
Masonry walls along 32nd Avenue are not recommended due to serious safety concerns. The masonry walls would cause serious sightline problems for drivers exiting the neighborhoods onto 32nd Avenue from seven unsignalized streets or driveways within approximately 1,500 feet. In addition, the masonry walls would have to be very close to some of the homes because there is little space between some homes and 32nd Avenue.

During final design, CDOT will identify aesthetic design elements and enhancements for the improvements along 32nd Avenue to ensure compatibility with the surrounding areas and provide a positive visual experience. Public input will be solicited on aesthetic issues.

Response to Comment #210-4:
No response necessary.
Response to Comment #211:
FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.
An interchange signing plan has been developed to help motorists find their way within the interchange complex and to make it clear that the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange is the route for accessing the proposed development. Section 2.3.10 Interstate Guide Signage in the FONSI discusses the supplemental guide signing.

Response to Comment #212-1:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #212-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.
Response to Comment #212-3:
The traffic analysis prepared for the June 2002 I-70/SH 58 Interchange Environmental Assessment was based on regional population and employment growth projections for the Year 2020. The traffic analysis prepared for the I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange EA is based on regional population and employment growth projections for the Year 2030. In addition to the proposed development, DRCOG forecasts that the study area is expected to experience a 22 percent increase in population and the number of households and a 40 percent increase in employment over existing land uses without the proposed development. With the proposed development, employment is predicted to increase 52 percent over the existing land uses. It is important to note that even without Cabela’s and the proposed development, the eastbound off-ramp of I-70 at Youngfield Street is already operating at a LOS E in the afternoon peak hour, which represents over capacity and gridlock (see Figure 1-3 Operational Deficiencies in the FONSI). Increased traffic volumes and accidents will eventually require some governmental entity, be it CDOT, Jefferson County, Wheat Ridge, Lakewood, or some combination thereof to address these concerns.

Response to Comment #212-4:
It is a requirement that all studies have a No-Action Alternative. The No-Action Alternative was included in the screening process and has been carried through this EA as a benchmark against which the other alternatives are compared. The No-Action Alternative will not address the purpose and need for the project but is being carried through the analysis for comparison in accordance with CEQ requirements and to preserve the option not to adopt the Proposed Action if the studies warrant such a decision. Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development.
Response to Comment #213:
Bob Vermillion also provided additional verbal comments. Please refer to Comment #106.

Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.

Response to Comment #213-1:
The needs of the I-70/Ward Road interchange were included in the I-70/SH 58 interchange project and are not included in the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange project. Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
<p>| Douglas Harness |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #214</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment received via the project website. Date : 12/09/06 18:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for accepting my comments and for your efforts to make this project as community-friendly as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have just one comment - a project of this size requires an Environmental Impact Statement and not just an Environmental Assessment. It will clearly have significant impacts on area wildlife, air and water quality, noise levels, and other environmental factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Response to Comment #214: |
| Please refer to our response to Comment #2-1 in regard to an EIS. |
Response to Comment #215:

FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.

Comments on I-70/32nd Ave Interchange Environmental Assessment

I have been going through this intersection since it was built. It worked pretty well originally, since then many, many houses have been built west of Youngfield. Of course they all use the I-70/32nd Ave Interchange. That interchange as well as Youngfield/32nd Ave. intersection are a traffic nighttime during the busy times. There is land for even more houses to be built. They too will use 32nd Ave. The interchange will do nothing but get worse if nothing is done. The new proposal will really help the traffic flow more smoothly and safely.

I believe that the new proposal will be safer for the children walking to school. I frequently walk 32nd Ave from Alkire St. to my home on Moore St. I am confident that the new proposal will make that walk safer as well as protecting the many bicyclists who ride on 32nd Ave.

Personally I think the improvements to the east bound hook ramp at 32nd and Youngfield St. will be adequate if you make double left turn lanes. Four or five years ago, when CDOT was working on the EA for I-70/Hwy 58, I was told that completion of the I-70/Hwy 58 interchange would take much of the pressure off of I-70/32nd Ave. interchange. The 32nd Ave interchange was originally in the study area for I-70/Hwy 58 Environmental Assessment.

A full urban interchange might work better if it had been put in when I-70 was initially constructed, but, as I think your study shows, it would be devastating to many more homes and businesses than the present proposal.

I also served as Wheat Ridge mayor for eighteen years. Thank you for all your work.
Response to Comment #216:

Response to Comment #216-1:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #216-2:
South of 32nd Avenue, Eldridge Street has limited continuity. The vast majority of traffic that would make use of this roadway would likely be destined-to or originating-from the immediate area that it serves. The routing option identified in the comment would create out-of-direction travel and is likely to be used by only a few. During construction, measures will be implemented to minimize the amount of traffic that might utilize local streets.
Response to Comment #217:

Response to Comment #217-1:
Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

Response to Comment #217-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comments related to 32nd Avenue.

FAX: 720-963-3001 - Monica Pavlik, FHWA

December 5, 2006

COMMENTS ON
I-70 / 32nd AVENUE INTERCHANGE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Page ES-28, Figure ES-9 - Transportation Improvements Construction Timeline:

1. The construction of a new I-70 to westbound SH 58 flyover must be completed prior to development opening at all costs. Either the construction schedule or the opening date of the improvements, or both, must be altered to accomplish this. Eastbound I-70 will be a significant source of traffic for the new development. Since there is no other reasonable access for this traffic most of it will use the interim on ramp onto Youngfield Street compounding an already overloaded street. A significant portion of this traffic will attempt to navigate the series of turns to access Cabella Drive from 32nd Avenue. This combined with those who try to use the underpass north of SH 58 will almost certainly result in an unsatisfactory situation if not total gridlock.

2. Delay of the southbound I-70 / 32nd Avenue on-ramp for 20 plus years only increases the cost, disrupts the area again and impedes traffic flow for 20 additional years.

Paragraph 2.4.1.3 and Figure 2-6 - Project I-70 to westbound SH 32nd Avenue / Westbound I-70 Construction:

Some portion of the southbound Cabella Drive traffic will be trying to access the westbound I-70 on-ramp resulting in an unmitigated disaster. This disaster will be further compounded by the periodic U-turn from westbound 32nd Avenue (even if it’s illegal) unless some other solution can be found I recommend removing the existing ramp.

Note: I live in the area adversely affected by elimination of this ramp.

Paragraph 2.4.7 and Figures 2-7 and 2-8 - Proposed 32nd Avenue / Youngfield Street Intersection:

The westbound 32nd Avenue / I-70 underpass should be modified in the same manner as the eastbound side. The existing traffic problems through this underpass will be ameliorated by closing westbound 32nd Avenue access to the westbound I-70 on-ramp but not enough to compensate for the dramatic increase resultant from the proposed development. There will be significant development traffic feeding from the east on 32nd Avenue as well as from the both directions on Youngfield. Additionally, there will be the cross traffic with the shopping center on the northwest corner of 32nd and Youngfield. This cross traffic will be especially strong during ski season as the ski buses which fill up at Ariele Lodge and move both to and from the ski areas now wanting to make the almost certain required stop at the “WORLD’S FOREMOST OUTFITTER”. The “proposed construction timeline” (see comments above) only make it worse.

I know it’s a waste of time but I can’t help but repeating my earlier comments that this is all just patch work similar to the years of jury rigged efforts at the “Moosetrip”. A proper solution would close the 32nd and Youngfield / I-70 access completely and build an all inclusive interchange encompassing Ward Road, Youngfield, 44th Avenue, SH 58 and the proposed development.

Sincerely,

Donald W. Hodder
13910 Wad 30th Place
Golden, Colorado 80401
dohodder@comcast.net
Response to Comment #218:

Response to Comment #218-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the
eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue and #10-5 in regard to your comment
on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #218-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on
the public involvement process.

Response to Comment #218-3:
FHWA and CDOT were involved in each of the decisions made regarding the EA
and provided oversight to the project team throughout the NEPA process.
FHWA and CDOT believe that the distribution of hard copies of the EA for public
review was adequate. In addition to the hard copies available at three local
libraries and the FHWA, CDOT, Jefferson County, Wheat Ridge, and Lakewood
offices (for a total of nine locations), the EA report was made available on the
project website at www.CabWheatRidge.com and members of the public could
request an electronic copy of the EA on a compact disc through the project
website. For the months of October, November, and December 2006, the project
website was accessed over 91,000 times. Approximately 40 compact discs were
distributed to the public during the public comment period.

---

John F. Gillespie  
1965 Alleaie St.  
Golden, Colorado 80401  

December 7, 2006

Federal Highway Administration  
Colorado Division 12300 W. Dakota Ave.  
Lakewood, Colorado, 80228  
Attn: Ms. Monica Pavlik

Please accept and respond to my comments on the EA for the 170/32nd Ave
Interchange.

THE BOTTOM LINE: There can be little doubt that the optimum result of this
EA (for Cabela) would be direct access from I70 Westbound (WB) into the Cabela
parking lot. Obviously CDOT and (hopefully) FHWA would not buy that! What will
they buy? The “Preferred Alternate” comes very close, a direct access ramp to
"Cabela Dr." at the south edge of the Cabela property!! As Jackie Gleason was
told to say, “How sweet it is!” Although unwritten I’m sure that the main charge
from the client (Cabela) to the consultant (FHU) is to optimize access into their site.
The “Preferred Alternate” does that brilliantly! The rest of the document is
incidental, to that overriding goal, but is needed to satisfy "the EA process" and
the other players objectives. Since the hook ramps to and from I70 WB terminate at
"Cabela Dr," I can envision the City of Wheat Ridge petitioning CDOT in the
future, after the heat is off, to sign that WB off-ramp for Cabela Dr. DON’T DO
IT, CDOT!!!

THE PROCESS: It’s been said that a good District Attorney can convince a
Grand Jury to indict a ham sandwich. Similarly, a good consultant can persuade,
(manipulate), study groups, working groups, citizen advisory groups, the “public
involvement” process, to endorse a desired outcome during “working sessions”.
FHU is a very good consultant! In my opinion Cabela, Wheat Ridge and HFU have
hijacked a State/Federal process to lead legitimacy to their plans. None of the above
are signatory to the document. It appears that CDOT involvement has been very
passive. Since the improvements will largely be paid for by others they've let WB
and HFU drive the process. FHWA, in my opinion, is only concerned with "THE
PROCESS", with the crossed T’s and dotted I’s. FHWA doesn't appear to have the
engineering expertise they once had to critically analyse traffic, capacity,
geometries, interchange design and driver’s expectancy, all necessary to an honest
engineering review. On the other hand, if the process looks good why sweat those
details.
Specifically, I feel the "process" has been manipulated by holding a series of
open houses in the Applewood neighborhood at which up to 300 of the public

---

C-263
Response to Comment #218-4:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue and #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #218-5:
At the westbound I-70 hooks ramps, which access Cabela Drive, the majority of the traffic will not be destined for the proposed development but for other adjacent commercial and residential areas. Approximately 75 percent of the traffic on Cabela Drive, south of the proposed development, is destined or originates from a local commercial or residential area. The 19,000 vehicles per day projection is comprised of only 4,800 vehicles per day associated with the proposed development and Cabela’s. Please refer to Chapter 3 Transportation Analysis of the EA and the October 2006 Traffic Analysis Technical Report for further explanation.

Although the gravel service road closer to Eldridge Street that you recommend upgrading would provide access to the proposed development, the gravel service road would not provide a connection to I-70 from 32nd Avenue. The majority of the traffic from the westbound I-70 hook ramps to 32nd Avenue neither originates nor is destined for the proposed development, and the connection from the I-70 westbound hook ramps to 32nd Avenue is necessary to provide access for local residents and motorists destined for other commercial areas, such as along Youngfield Street. Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #218-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #218-6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public involvement is a component of the NEPA process. FHWA and CDOT must weigh public comment with the technical analysis that is conducted as part of the EA in accordance with NEPA and its related regulations. FHWA and CDOT sincerely regret that we have the difficult decision of weighing public comment against this technical analysis and the needs of the transportation system. This is an unfortunate reality of our work. We are well aware of the unique circumstances of your neighborhood and your situation and that makes this difficult decision even harder. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #218-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #218-7:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to our response to Comment #218-5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #218-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #218-8:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The projected traffic volumes are based on forecasted 2030 land use. DRCOG provides information on the forecasted 2030 land uses for the entire metropolitan area. DRCOG’s land use forecasts include population, household and employment estimates by TAZ. The metropolitan area includes a total of 2,664 TAZs. The TAZs within the study area are shown in Figure 2-1 traffic analysis zones in the FONSI. DRCOG has added a new TAZ (TAZ 2665) to specifically account for the proposed development. The land use forecasts in TAZ 2665 are based on the current development proposal. All other TAZs in the study area represent DRCOG’s land use forecasts. The study area is expected to experience a 22 percent increase in population and the number of households and a 40 percent increase in employment over existing land uses without the proposed development. With the proposed development, employment is expected to increase 52 percent over the existing land uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #218-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #218-9:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue and #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection. An urban interchange at I-70/32nd Avenue was included in Alternative Package 1 but was eliminated due to the right-of-way impacts and displacement of businesses at the Applewood Shopping Center. Please refer to Section 2.2 Alternatives Considered of the EA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #218-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #218-10:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT guidance typically requires comments on an EA be accepted for a total of at least 30 days. To facilitate public comment on the Section 4(f) de minimis documentation, the 30-day comment period was extended to 45 days. FHWA and CDOT believe that the distribution of copies of the EA for public review was adequate, and an extension of the comment period is not required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #218-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Comment #218-11:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to our response to Comment #218-5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joseph and Sharon Whelan
Mark and Lydia Creager
Kathleen Estes
Steve Lehman

Comment #219

Response to Comment #219:

Response to Comment #219-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #219-2:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-2 in regard to the location of the eastbound I-70 hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

Ms. Monica Pavlik
Federal Highway Administration
Colorado Division
12300 West Dakota Ave., Suite 180
Lakewood, CO 80228

December 6, 2006

Dear Ms. Pavlik,

This letter is in regards to the proposed commercial development at S.H. 58 and I-70. That development will include a Cabela's retail store as well as other satellite retail businesses. We are concerned about the impact that this development, as outlined by The City of Wheat Ridge in the recently released I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental Assessment, will have on local traffic and the effect on surrounding residential areas.

These concerns include:
- The volume of traffic into the Cabela's development from the intersection of Cabela Drive and 32nd Avenue
- The increase in traffic congestion and volume on Youngfield Street south of 27th Avenue, and on 34th Avenue.
- The taking of historic property, homes, and businesses for the 27th Avenue hook-ramps instead of locating the ramps north or not constructing them at all.

During the past two years, residents in the neighborhoods affected by the Cabela's development have repeatedly expressed concern about the increase in traffic on 32nd Avenue and Youngfield Street caused by the Cabela Drive access to the development at 32nd Avenue. The reply to these questions was that the southern access from 33rd Avenue was for local and emergency access only. The "front door" to Cabela's was to be from the north at the interchange at S.H. 58 and Cabela Drive. The recently released Environmental Assessment, however, clearly indicates that the Cabela Drive and 32nd Avenue intersection is the intended main access for the development, with most customer traffic located here than the S.H. 58 interchange and the 40th Avenue underpass entrances combined. The five-lane design width of Cabela Drive at 32nd Avenue shown in the Environmental Assessment clearly supports this conclusion, with forecasts of 19,000 vehicles per weekday but no estimate of weekend traffic, which would presumably be much greater. The south access at Cabela Drive is evidently intended to handle most, if not all, of the anticipated increase in traffic to the development from eastbound I-70, which includes traffic from northbound C-470 that feeds into I-70.

In order to handle the traffic flow to Cabela's arriving from eastbound I-70, the EA proposes construction of hook-ramps at 27th Avenue and Youngfield Street. The additional traffic volume of 19,000 vehicles per day, and two large intersections at Youngfield Street and 27th Avenue and at Youngfield Street and 32nd Avenue will virtually guarantee congestion on Youngfield Street and 32nd Avenue and result in traffic backups in all directions from that intersection.

In addition, construction of the proposed hook ramps at 27th Avenue will necessitate taking of a number of residences and local businesses, including the historic Novacek property, by eminent domain. This historic property not only has a personal residence but has a business that has been
Response to Comment #219-3:

A single point urban interchange, such as the new interchange at I-25 and University Boulevard, was evaluated as part of Alternative Package 1. This alternative was eliminated because of the new to relocated Youngfield Street to the east and the number of right-of-way impacts and displacements. Please refer to Section 4.2 Alternatives Considered in the EA. Please refer to our response to Comment #179 in regard to moving an urban interchange north on I-70.

Response to Comment #219-4:

Figure 2-1 Study Area Traffic Analysis Zones in the FONSI identifies the limits of the study area for the traffic analysis. The study area extends east to Kipling Street and south to Colfax Avenue. Traffic impacts to Youngfield Street are included in the traffic analysis.

Response to Comment #219-5:

Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.

---

Comment #219-3

Response to Comment #219-3:

A single point urban interchange, such as the new interchange at I-25 and University Boulevard, was evaluated as part of Alternative Package 1. This alternative was eliminated because of the new to relocated Youngfield Street to the east and the number of right-of-way impacts and displacements. Please refer to Section 4.2 Alternatives Considered in the EA. Please refer to our response to Comment #179 in regard to moving an urban interchange north on I-70.

Comment #219-4

Response to Comment #219-4:

Figure 2-1 Study Area Traffic Analysis Zones in the FONSI identifies the limits of the study area for the traffic analysis. The study area extends east to Kipling Street and south to Colfax Avenue. Traffic impacts to Youngfield Street are included in the traffic analysis.

Comment #219-5

Response to Comment #219-5:

Please refer to Section 2.5 Implementation Schedule in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the construction timing.
Response to Comment #220:
FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.
Response to Comment #221:

Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
Response to Comment #222:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
Response to Comment #223:
FHWA and CDOT agree that the current situation is problematic. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.

As a citizen of Wheat Ridge for the past 58 years, I have seen projects come and go—some on time and some not. I think our highway system is pretty efficient, mainly because it is constantly being remodeled and improved to handle the ever-increasing amount of traffic. However, in my estimation, this project is overdue for this area. In the past, the system was doing its job pretty well but as situations change, so should we.

We are at the entrance to our beautiful mountains where 99% must travel to enter the mountains for whatever the reason—snow sports, hunting in the winter months, fishing, hiking, boating, etc. During the gorgeous unseasoned summer months. We are fortunate to be able to enjoy these good things almost at will but... the Golden, Arvada, Wheat Ridge, Lakewood areas have grown in both commercial and residential. Truck traffic has also greatly increased. In the past, we have never been behind when the need has arisen to improve. This is the time and place for a large improvement.

I could ramble on about all the logical reasons for doing this now. Tomorrow may be too late and too costly. This is part of the dream and the future for this area.

Thanks for listening.

George J. Langdon
3570 Miller Street
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033
303-424-3303
November 29, 2006
Wheat Ridge, Colorado
Response to Comment #224:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
Response to Comment #225:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
Comment #226

John Villachica

Response to Comment #226:
No response necessary.
Response to Comment #227:
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on the I-70/SH 58 project improvements at the I-70/Ward Road interchange.
Response to Comment #228:
Barbara Barry also provided additional written comments. Please refer to Comments #142 and #199.

Response to Comment #228-1:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on public involvement and the oversight of FHWA and CDOT in the project.

Response to Comment #228-2:
FHWA and CDOT regret that the Applewood Valley Association believes its comments have been ignored. FHWA and CDOT remain committed to a broad range of outreach methods and opportunities to connect with the community. An extensive public involvement program has been conducted for the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange project. The public involvement program included the public hearing, four open houses, presentations to community groups, a community information telephone hotline, a project website, newsletters, news releases, and local newspaper advertisements.

The input of the public really is important and is included in the planning and implementation of transportation projects. We can assure you that your comments and the comments of others have been taken very seriously by FHWA and CDOT throughout this process. It is our responsibility to carefully weigh community concerns, transportation needs, and environmental consequences to arrive at a balanced and reasoned decision on this, and any, transportation project. Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on the public involvement process.

The project team met with the Applewood Valley Association on July 26, 2005 and met with the Clear Creek Valley Neighborhood Council, which the Applewood Valley Association was a member, on ten different occasions. Please refer to Table 6-3 Summary of Community Presentations of the EA for the specific dates of the meetings with the Clear Creek Valley Neighborhood Council. As president of the Applewood Valley Association and member of the Clear Creek Valley Neighborhood Council, FHWA and CDOT have appreciated your input and enthusiasm related to the project.

Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development.
Response to Comment #228-3:
Please refer to our response to Comment #2-1 in regard to an EIS.

Response to Comment #228-4:
As discussed in Section 2.3.4 New Cabela Drive of the FONSI and shown on Figure 2-9 Cabela Drive Typical Sections of the FONSI, Cabela Drive will consist of two southbound through lanes, one northbound through lane, and a center turn lane. Based on the traffic analysis, two southbound lanes were evaluated to be necessary because the interchange signing plan has been developed to help motorists find their way within the interchange complex and to make it clear that the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange is the route for accessing the proposed development from I-70. Motorists will be directed from both eastbound and westbound I-70 to Cabela Drive via the SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange, requiring two southbound lanes to access the proposed development. Only one northbound lane on Cabela Drive returning to the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange is necessary because of the location of the westbound I-70 ramps. Motorists accessing westbound I-70 will utilize the new westbound I-70 hook ramps instead of returning to the SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange and accessing westbound I-70 from SH 58. Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #228-5:
Please refer to our response to Comment #228-3 in regard to your comment on public input.

Response to Comment #228-6:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection and to Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps in the FONSI in regard to your comments related to these hook ramps and traffic increases along 27th Avenue and the associated impacts to the residential neighborhood.

Response to Comment #228-7:
FHWA and CDOT understand that the EA is a large document and can be difficult to review. In an attempt to limit the size of the EA, technical reports are relied upon for detailed information not included in the EA. FHWA and CDOT reviewed the figures presented in the EA and FONSI for clarity and were unable to identify the specific figures that you are referencing. Graphic representations of the twenty-one alternatives and various sub-alternatives were included in Table 2-1 Initial, Second-Level and Third-Level Screening Results and Table 2-2 Fourth-Level Screening Results of the EA. Small graphic presentations were utilized to limit the size of the EA because larger scale representations of the alternatives had been presented in the September 2005 System Level Feasibility Study and at the four open houses conducted as part of the project. The System Level Feasibility Study is available on the project website at www.cabwheatridge.com.

Citations for the technical reports and data, analysis, and technical assumptions were included in the text of the EA. Please refer to Chapter 7 References of the EA and Chapter 9 References of the FONSI for a list of the sources cited.
| Comment #228-12 | To evaluate "modifications" of I-70/32nd using only standard criteria produces improper results. We would also like to have careful interpretation of DRCOG regional growth factors for this setting. |
| Comment #228-13 | We foresaw severe traffic impacts from the original development proposal in 2004. We persistently asked for alternatives to be defined and evaluated to eliminate unnecessary impacts. The only response was inclusion of a new interchange on SH 58. But that became the "front door" in name only; the primary flow of traffic remains directed to the south connected with 32nd Avenue. |
| Comment #228-14 | The screening of alternatives did not involve any effort to redirect traffic. The analyses simply made use of various possible modifications to existing public roads. This led to the narrow choice of one Build Alternative which requires putting half of the 32nd Avenue interchange into our neighborhood at 27th Avenue. |
| Comment #228-15 | Many problems descend from this arbitrary development street configuration. The crucial one overloads the existing eastbound I-70 ramps and forces their relocation away from 32nd Avenue. Most of the remaining problems will be experienced by the residents who live outside of the city limits. Unless these problems could be mitigated by design elements (e.g., school zone signing) already planned by the developer and Wheat Ridge, neither the problem nor their potential solutions were given consideration in the EA. This is astonishingly apparent on pages 3-10 and 3-10 of the EA. Only seven paragraphs in this slick 500-page document mention impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. And at that, the text deals with only a few anecdotal concerns. No systematic, coordinated or comprehensive thought was applied to impacts on this community. |
| Comment #228-16 | Wheat Ridge and the Cabella's development team had agreed to certain features before they disclosed them to the public in 2004. With few exceptions those features are still the only ones defining this entire proposal. The most obvious feature is the Cabella Drive restricted capacity northward and major free capacity south to 32nd Avenue. |
| Comment #228-17 | For two years the developer and applicant (WR) have avoided defining and evaluating the true impacts of traffic spreading southward. The impacts will be significant. We can see this but the developer and the City cannot because they have ignored the majority of public objections comments submitted by the residents who live outside of the Wheat Ridge city limits. |
| Comment #228-18 | In response to our comments, the Wheat Ridge/Cabella's applicant has made only six adjustments to the original 2004 plan. These are: 1) nominal relocation of "front door" access to SH 58 new interchange, 2) signage and sidewalks for one school area, 3) four lanes instead of two in the 40th Avenue underpass, 4) construction of new westbound I-70 on and off-ramps and closure of one WB off-ramp at 32nd Avenue, 5) |

**Response to Comment #228-8:**
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

**Response to Comment #228-9:**
Please refer to our response to Comment #57 in regard to your comment on I-70/SH 58 project and the I-70/Ward road interchange improvements.

Traffic forecasts for the No-Action Alternative and Proposed Action were developed for 2030 from the DRCOG regional travel demand model (see Chapter 3 Transportation Analysis of the EA). These traffic forecasts and improvements were not based on the timing of when these facilities would be constructed.

**Response to Comment #228-10:**
The study area for the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange project falls partially within the cities of Wheat Ridge and Lakewood and partially within unincorporated Jefferson County. Based on Exhibit 1 presented in your letter, the Applewood Valley Association is located within both the City of Lakewood and unincorporated Jefferson County. A project committee consisting of affected entities and agencies was formed to provide a forum to address concerns in preparation of this EA. Representatives from FHWA, CDOT, the City of Wheat Ridge, Jefferson County, and the City of Lakewood were some of the agencies and entities that participated in the project committee. Both Jefferson County and the City of Lakewood represented the interests of their respective municipalities. In addition, an extensive public involvement effort was conducted resulting in changes to the Proposed Action, as described in our response to Comment #228-2. FHWA and CDOT are responsible for decisions made regarding the interstate and state highway system. The development of the Proposed Action has involved compromises by all parties, including the City of Wheat Ridge.

**Response to Comment #228-11:**
FHWA and CDOT are well aware of the unique circumstances of your neighborhood and your situation and that makes this difficult decision even harder. FHWA and CDOT are charged with satisfying not only the needs of the community but to assure the safety of the interstate system to which they have been charged with assuring.

Closure of the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange was not identified as an alternative because closure of the interchange is not justified based on safety concerns. Although there is some support to close the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange and reduce traffic on 32nd Avenue, this would do so largely by diverting the same traffic to the I-70/Ward Road and I-70/Denver West Boulevard interchanges. This is not desirable and is not supported by either FHWA or CDOT. The existing I-70/Ward Road interchange is currently at overcapacity, and while the I-70/Denver West Boulevard interchange has some reserve capacity, it is only peripherally serves the study area.
In addition, closure of the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange does not address the purpose and need of the project, as stated in Sections 1.1 Purpose of the Proposed Action and 1.2 Need for the Proposed Action in the FONSI. While closure of the interchange would alleviate traffic congestion at this interchange, this alternative does not address future transportation demands on the interchange and local street network due to regional growth and expanding local retail/commercial development. Existing commercial development on Youngfield Street in the vicinity of the interchange would be impacted by the closure of the interchange, which currently provides access to the existing adjacent residential and commercial areas. The Proposed Action represents a compromise between impacts to the community and traffic operations.

Vehicle storage along 32nd Avenue underneath I-70 is inadequate between signals in both eastbound and westbound directions due to the closely spaced signalized intersections of Youngfield Street/32nd Avenue, I-70 on and off-ramps/32nd Avenue, and Youngfield Service Road/32nd Avenue (see Figure 1-3 Operational Deficiencies in the FONSI). The closure of the existing I-70 off-ramp at 32nd Avenue will remove one of these signalized intersections to provide greater vehicle storage between signalized intersections and improve traffic operations (level of service) along 32nd Avenue at the Youngfield Street and Cabela Drive intersections.

Response to Comment #228-12:
The criteria that FHWA and CDOT used to evaluate the alternatives is discussed in Chapter 2 Alternatives in the EA. FHWA and CDOT do not advocate the reconstruction and redesign of interchanges with sub-standard design criteria. Relative to the assumptions on the proposed development, the EA did use a “fixed” set of land use assumptions in the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Action; they both included the proposed development. This is a common approach in evaluating the impacts and benefits of alternatives and defining differences over a do-no-improvements scenario. The EA is used to determine the best means of improvements to accommodate a given land use scenario and not necessarily to determine what the best land use scenario is.

DRCOG provides information on the forecasted 2030 land uses for the entire metropolitan area. DRCOG’s land use forecasts include population, household and employment estimates by TAZ. The metropolitan area includes a total of 2,664 TAZs. The TAZs within the study area are shown in Figure 2-1 Study Area Traffic Analysis Zones in the FONSI. DRCOG has added a new TAZ (TAZ 2665) to specifically account for the proposed development. The land use forecasts in TAZ 2665 are based on the current development proposal. All other TAZs in the study area represent DRCOG’s land use forecasts. The study area is expected to experience a 22 percent increase in population and the number of households and a 40 percent increase in employment over existing land uses without the proposed development. With the proposed development, employment is predicted to increase 52 percent over the existing land uses.
Comment #228-23
Half an Interstate interchange will be moved to our AVA neighborhood. Except for eleven blocks on Youngfield containing small local businesses, all the surrounding miles of streets are strictly residential.
Saying “the public scoping was completed 17 August 06” is tantamount to saying “that’s when we (the developer and Wheat Ridge) stopped accepting public comment.” Such comment should have affected assumptions, area of impact, evaluation factors and techniques, criteria, definition of alternatives for EA study, options for refinement of alternatives, and thus the ultimate conclusions.

The actual assumptions and analyses have never been revealed despite our many requests for them. Instead we receive expanded assertions and rhetoric.

Process; Defining Purpose and Need
it wasn’t until we could read the EA that we could see how faulty and narrow the Purpose and Need had become. The purpose stated is to relieve traffic congestion at the I-70/32nd interchange and to address future transportation demands on the interchange and local street network. This should have reflected our long-standing input that the major new traffic generator needed to connect directly to the freeway system and not employ (commandeer) the existing street network to serve the development. By placing such dependency on the 32nd Avenue interchange, all diligent thought for other solutions was abandoned.

Process; Withholding Information
The resistance to open exchange of ideas has other ramifications. It is also evident in the apparent refusal of the Wheat Ridge/Cabela’s development team to honor a specific request from CDOT on behalf of AVA. This request was made on August 8th, two months before the EA was completed and four months before the deadline for our final comments was imposed. We had requested traffic modeling of the missing Cabela Drive lane configuration (2 through lanes south of new I-70 ramps vs. 4 through lanes north to SH 58). CDOT had agreed and forwarded our concept shown here as Exhibit 2. On November 9th, CDOT repeated the request to the Wheat Ridge/Cabela’s development team to provide this analysis.

Omission of this analysis and its far-reaching consequences constitute critical failure of the EA to meet normal standards. This cannot be satisfactorily disposed by tacking a few more dismissive paragraphs into the next NEPA document on the proposed set of projects.

Process; Urgency for approvals
As decision-makers, both the CDOT and FHWA have experienced urgent requests to approve documents advancing these proposals. Simultaneously, our citizens wonder why the hurry for your actions while the Planned Commercial District Developer...
Response to Comment #228-21:
A Public Scoping Report was prepared following the August 17, 2005 public scoping meeting. This report was made available for public review at the November 30, 2005 public open house. CDOT has retained a copy on file.

FHWA and CDOT recognize that public involvement is a dynamic process. Public outreach efforts emphasized utilizing public meetings to disseminate project information and provide a mechanism to incorporate the public’s ideas, needs, and concerns into the process. Following the August 17, 2005 public scoping meeting, an open house was held on November 30, 2005, and a series of community presentation were conducted with the Clear Creek Valley Neighborhood Council in September 2005 and January and March 2006. In addition, numerous written and emailed comments were submitted to the project team. These were incorporated into the EA process. Please see our response to Comment #228-2 regarding incorporation of public input into the Proposed Action.

Response to Comment #228-22:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection and to Section 2.3.1.1 Eastbound I-70 Hook Ramps in the FONSI in regard to your comments related to these hook ramps and traffic increases along 27th Avenue and the associated impacts to the residential neighborhood.

Response to Comment #228-23:
The purpose and need was first presented to the public at the November 30, 2005 open house. Following the open house, the boards from the open house were posted to project website in December 2005. In addition, a CD with electronic copies and hard copies of the boards from the November 30, 2005 open house were provided to the members of the Clear Creek Valley Neighborhood Council on December 5, 2005, as they requested. The purpose and need has not changed from the beginning of the project. FHWA requires the purpose and need to be broad enough to allow the consideration of alternatives and is not so narrow to prescribe selection of an alternative.

Figure 1-3 Operational Deficiencies in the FONSI identifies the current operational deficiencies of the existing I-70/32nd Avenue interchange. The proposed development, combined with projected regional growth, will place additional traffic demands on the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange that will further degrade operations.
Response to Comment #228-24:
Due to the impending release of the EA on October 25, 2006, this comment was included in the comments on the EA. Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #228-25:
Currently, the Cabela’s store is not scheduled to open until June 2008. As part of the City of Wheat Ridge’s approval process for the development plan that includes the Cabela’s store, the City of Wheat Ridge City Council has stipulated that the I-70 westbound hook ramps, the 40th Avenue underpass of I-70, widening of 32nd Avenue, Cabela Drive, and the SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange improvements must be constructed prior to the City of Wheat Ridge issuing a Certificate of Occupancy for the development.

Response to Comment #228-26:
Differences in the traffic forecasts since the original January 2005 traffic impact study are due to the evolution of the planned improvements. The January 2005 traffic impact study No-Build traffic represented only background traffic without any traffic from the proposed development. This is a normal step in estimating traffic forecasts as part of a traffic study. Other graphics shown in that study did account for the impact of the development but did not account for a new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange or the off-set hook ramps at the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange because those alternatives had not been developed yet. These clearly have an affect on traffic forecasts. The January 2005 report is obsolete due to changes in the planned improvements and in part due to the planning horizon changing from 2025 to 2030.

The September 2005 System Level Feasibility Study showed traffic forecasts for several scenarios including Year 2030 traffic volumes with no improvements without any new development and Year 2030 traffic volumes with no improvements with the proposed development. The technical appendices to the September 2005 System Level Feasibility Study showed traffic forecasts for all of the alternatives considered. Clearly, these are going to be a little different as different improvement alternatives affect the various parts of the roadway system.

The May 2006 traffic impact study and October 2006 I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Traffic Analysis Technical Report are in-line with each other relative to total traffic projects. Both show traffic forecasts for a variety of scenarios including with and without improvements and with and without the proposed development. Mixing and matching these will result in differences; it is these differences that allow us to analyze and test the pros and cons of the various alternatives.

The traffic project differences do not represent inconsistencies, but rather they represent an evolution of the process. They show impacts to various roadways under various actions.
It is important to note that even without Cabela’s and the proposed development, the eastbound off-ramp of I-70 at Youngfield Street is already operating at a LOS E in the afternoon peak hour, which represents over capacity and gridlock (see Figure 1-3 Operational Deficiencies in the FONSI). Increased traffic volumes and accidents will eventually require some governmental entity, be it CDOT, Jefferson County, Wheat Ridge, Lakewood, or some combination thereto to address these concerns. Please refer to our response to Comment #228-12 in regard to the traffic analysis zones and inclusion of the proposed development in the DRCOG travel demand forecasting.

Response to Comment #228-27:
Please refer to our response to Comment #228-4.

Response to Comment #228-28:
Please refer to our response to Comment #126-1 in regard to your comment on the No-Action Alternative with traffic from the proposed development compared to a No-Action Alternative without traffic from the proposed development. Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comment on local land use decisions.

The 40th Avenue underpass of I-70 was proposed as a separate action transportation improvement by the City of Wheat Ridge on November 30, 2005, because it did not preclude any of the three short-listed alternative packages being studied in the EA. The 40th Avenue underpass of I-70 could be constructed independent of other improvements because it will provide relief/mobility benefit to the present I-70/32nd Avenue interchange and local street system; not preclude other reasonable improvements in the area; and not trigger an immediate need for any other physical improvements in the area. As a local agency project, the 40th Avenue underpass of I-70 was determined to be independent and could stand on its own merits should the other anticipated improvements studied in the EA not be approved or if any alternative being studied in the EA was approved. CDOT agreed with the City of Wheat Ridge’s request on December 20, 2005, and the FHWA concurred on December 21, 2006.

Response to Comment #228-29:
Please refer to our response to Comment #179 in regard to H.M. Van Fleet’s proposed alternatives.

Response to Comment #228-30:
FHWA and CDOT recognize that screening of alternatives on a single criteria is inadequate. For this reason, a four-level screening process was employed. The initial screening was a fatal flaw analysis and focused on eleven screening criteria. The second-level screening focused on project Year 2030 peak hour traffic operations using four screening criteria. The third-level screening evaluated alternatives related to 15 screening criteria, and the fourth-level screening utilized 31 screening criteria (see Chapter 2 Alternatives in the EA).
Response to Comment #228-31:
The alternatives screening summary is presented in Section 4.2 Alternatives Considered of the EA.

Response to Comment #228-32:
Please refer to our response to Comment #147 in regard to your comment on traffic management solutions.

Response to Comment #228-33:
Please refer to our response to Comment #4-1 in regard to the letter received by CDOT from Murray Wilkening P.C.

Response to Comment #228-34:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #228-35:
FHWA and CDOT appreciate your concern related to traffic noise and air quality. Section 4.4 Air Quality of the EA and the October 2006 Air Quality Assessment Report detail the air quality analysis conducted. Additional air quality information is presented in Section 3.2 Additional Information and Clarifications to Air Quality in the FONSI. The noise and air quality models were based on traffic, which includes eastbound I-70 hook ramps as part of the Proposed Action. Noise mitigation includes rebuilding the existing noise barrier along I-70 near 27th Avenue where the barrier must be removed for the proposed eastbound I-70 hook ramps. This rebuilding of the existing noise wall was calculated to provide a 12 dBA noise reduction for the residences on 26th Avenue adjacent to I-70.

Given that air pollutants are not predicted to exceed the NAAQS in the future as a result of implementing the Proposed Action, mitigation measures for air quality are not necessary for the project. Future emissions from on-road mobile sources will be minimized globally through several federal regulations. The Denver area maintenance plans for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter will serve to avoid and minimize pollutant emissions from project area roads. In regard to air quality, DRCOG is responsible for monitoring growth within the metropolitan area and regularly examines regional impacts by performing regional conformity evaluations. The cumulative impacts on air quality from current and future transportation sources are accounted for in the conformity analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan. Additional discussion is included in Section 3.2 Additional Information and Clarifications to Air Quality in the FONSI.
Response to Comment #228-36:
The fact that SH 58 and I-70 have few crossing roadways, which limits traffic flow across these major corridors, was identified as a constraint to alternative development (see Section 2.2 Alternatives Considered in the EA) and is also discussed in the community cohesion and connections subsection of Section 4.1.2 Social and Economic Conditions in the EA.

Response to Comment #228-37:
FHWA and CDOT appreciate your observations regarding traffic safety in the area. FHWA and CDOT believe that the safety analysis presented in Section 3.4 Street and Highway Safety of the EA is adequate for the characterization of project impacts and identification of mitigation requirements. Further detailed evaluation will be conducted during final design to ensure that the transportation facilities are appropriate from both an engineering and traffic safety standpoint. Substantial effort has been devoted to safety considerations for school zones, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Please see our response to Comment #13-2.

Response to Comment #228-38:
Please refer to Section 3.4 Novaceks’ Carnation Nursery, 2635 Youngfield Street in the FONSI in regard to your comment on the Novacek property.
LEGEND:
Each through line is a traffic lane.
Dashed line = turn pocket

THROUGH LANE TERMINATES AT WB I-70 RAMP

SINGLE THROUGH LANE SB ON CORKIN DRIVE

SINGLE THROUGH LANE NB TERMINATES AT WB I-70 ON-RAMP

32ND AVENUE
Mr. Dick Cabela  
c/o Tim Wolff  
1 Cabela Drive  
Sydney, Nebraska 69160  

Dear Mr. Cabela;

Our homeowner's association of 1700 families is greatly concerned about the content of your company's decisions regarding the Wheat Ridge site. While many of us appreciate the quality of your facilities elsewhere in the country, we are shocked by the mistakes about traffic capacity and safety in this proposal.

Please look at the attached map. Applewood is divided by I 70. There are very few streets for neighborhood circulation. One whole mile of Youngfield Street has been appropriated to serve as the spine of the Applewood interchange on I 70 (shown in red). Youngfield and 32nd Avenue are jammed with vehicles and school pedestrians many hours of the week.

Your development team has reported refusal by the Colorado Department of Transportation to the request to add an interchange. Of course! That was the wrong question. A request to replace the Applewood interchange with a full service design would receive an entirely different response. Further, we believe it would receive resounding support from the whole community.

Thank you for taking a new, sincere look at this situation.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM DING, PRESIDENT

Officers and Directors of the Applewood Valley Association
December 20, 2008

Thomas E. Norton
Executive Director
Colorado Department of Transportation
4201 East Arkansas Ave #162
Denver, CO 80222

Randy Young
City Manager
7500 W. 39th Ave.
Wheat Ridge, CO 80033-8001

Mike Callahan
Cabela's
1 Cabela's Drive
Sidney, NE 69160

Re: Cabela's Wheat Ridge, Colorado Project

Dear Mr. Norton, Mr. Young and Mr. Callahan:

This letter is sent on behalf of my client, NQN Realty, LLC. NQN Realty is the owner of the Applewood Tech Center building located at 3001 Youngfield, Wheat Ridge, Colorado (the “property”).

Just recently, NQN Realty became aware of adverse and negative information about the property being presented to the public regarding the proposed Cabela's development. Specifically, "hook ramp refinements/Options" are being published which show a proposed Interstate 70 ramp running right through the property. This information is set forth on the www.cablawetridge.com website, the City of Wheat Ridge web site, and apparently was presented at a November 30, 2005 public meeting.
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Daryl Propp, of HGN Realty, has been in business in Wheat Ridge for over 10 years, is in charge of managing the property, and is easily available to address any issues concerning the property. However, not one single person ever bothered to contact him before the publication of information identifying a taking of the property through the construction of a new highway ramp.

This information is obviously adverse in that it negatively impacts HGN Realty’s ability to lease the property. Not only must Mr. Propp, as an honest businessman, disclose the possibility of the taking of the property to prospective tenants, other brokers must disclose the information to prospective tenants. Brokers will steer clients away from a property facing an uncertain future.

While the prospect of taking the property for a highway ramp seems absurd based on other available options, the prospect alone is enough to cause continuing damage to the property. Therefore, HGN Realty requests the following immediate action. The persons or parties responsible for suggesting any alternative that involves any taking of any part of the property should immediately disclaim and withdraw such proposals from public consideration. In addition, there should be an affirmative statement to the public that such proposals have been withdrawn. We expect that this will include an entry on the website and in any future plans, studies or proposals that are presented for public review and comment.

Mr. Propp appreciates the significant time and effort going into the Cabella’s project, but does not agree with the presentation of irresponsible information to the public. Cabella’s claims that they intend to be a good neighbor, on their website and elsewhere. Here is an opportunity for all involved to prove that is truly the case.
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Please feel free to contact me or Mr. Propp directly at (303) 233-4000 if you have any questions or concerns.

Very truly yours,

MURRAY WILKENING, P.C.

Murray Wilkening
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  Jerry DiTullio
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  Alan White
  Steve Holt
  Bill Beams
  Mary Weinheuser
  Rehabe's Wheat Ridge, o/o MCA Communications
  Ed Martinez
  David Nicol
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Julieann Nespor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment #229</strong></th>
<th><strong>Response to Comment #229:</strong> Julieann Nespor also submitted additional written comments. Please refer to Comment #13.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #229-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response to Comment #229-1:</strong> Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #229-2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response to Comment #229-2:</strong> Please refer to our response to Comment #13-2 in regard to your comment on school safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #229-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response to Comment #229-3:</strong> Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comments on the proposed development and Cabela's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #229-4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response to Comment #229-4:</strong> Please refer to our response to Comment #13-2 in regard to your comment on school safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #229-5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response to Comment #229-5:</strong> Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment #229-6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response to Comment #229-6:</strong> The Proposed Action includes improvements along 32nd Avenue that will require partial acquisition of right-of-way from the properties along 32nd Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment received via the website. Date: 11/06/06 15:16

I am the parent of a student at Maple Grove Elementary School and it is our strong hope that our son be able to attend The Manning School in the future. Moreover, we reside at 3160 Zinnia Court in Golden, unincorporated Jefferson County. We will be terribly and adversely impacted by the traffic changes proposed in the the Cabela’s traffic plan.

I am writing to express my horror at your continued proposed entrance/exit of Cabela’s Drive from/to 32nd and Youngfield to a more appropriate site. I am extremely concerned about the safety of our children. The proposed sidewalk north of 32nd Avenue will do virually not good whatsoever. I would implore you to position one of your staff at the intersection of 32nd and Zinnia Court between 2:15 pm through 3:20 pm on a school day - you would (or should be) astounded at the traffic -car, foot or bicycle.

I am appalled that we, as residents of Golden and unincorporated Jefferson County, will be impacted in such a serious and devastating manner by the desire of the City of Wheat Ridge for more revenue, when we are not even residents of Wheat Ridge. The Wheat Ridge border extends barely past the edge of the Conoco store, yet you are forcing the surrounding residents (non- Wheat Ridge residents) to suffer more traffic, taking and condemnation of their property and a drastic reduction in quality of life.

Wheat Ridge is apparently not interested in reinvigorating its already blighted economic areas along 38th and 44th Avenues, yet the city is greedily jumping at the opportunity to annex land and generate tax revenue (mostly from tourists travelling through on I-70), all the while forcing those of us who actually live in the area to deal with a huge traffic increase, loss of property and a devastating and overall reduction in our quality of life in Applewood.

I am especially concerned about the safety of our school children walking and biking from Maple Grove Elementary and The Manning School. Our wonderful Applewood area will forever be damaged by the desire of Coors to sell its property, the ongoing desire to continue to develop retail locations by Cabela’s and most especially, the overreaching actions by the City of Wheat Ridge in seeking additional sources for tax revenues. I cannot overstate the tremendous inequity here - these traffic changes will most adversely affect homeowners who are NOT residents of Wheat Ridge. We do not benefit from any of their city services and yet we will suffer the most from that city's short-sightedness and greed.

Not only will the traffic be unbearable and far more dangerous for our children, the effects on our quality of life and property values for those of us living in the subject area will be devastating. As I said above, I live at 32nd and Zinnia Court. There is simply not room to make 32nd Avenue into a four-lane road without taking property (yards) from my neighbors. Such a proposal is utterly unacceptable. Many of those people have lived there for over 25 years. We have already been forced to deal with the horrible traffic situation at 32nd and Youngfield. I am appalled that any governmental official or body would support making the area even more congested than it already is for those of us residing there. As you know, we in Applewood Mesa are already virtually landlocked because of Clear Creek and Table Mountain.

All right-of-way acquisition will follow the procedures outlined under the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987 (as amended) and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended). These policies have measures intended to treat business owners, property owners, residents, and tenants fairly during the right-of-way acquisition process. CDOT Right-of-way specialists will work with the landowner and all displaced persons and businesses during the acquisition process to address their individual needs and desires as best possible as allowable under law.

Please refer to our response to Comment #10-4 for additional discussion on minimizing right-of-way and displacement impacts.
We must, in most instances, enter and exit our neighborhood from the 32nd and Youngfield intersection. To make that process even more difficult than it already is would be utterly arbitrary and unjust.

Simply put, the city (and county’s) greed and desire for possible tax revenue is clouding its judgment and concern for the quality of life of the county taxpayers and residents. Our property values in Applewood Mesa remain high, in part, because of the quality of Maple Grove and Manning - two of the highest ranked and most awarded schools in the district. We regularly vote for bond and mill levy increases to help fund Jefferson County Schools, thereby increasing our property taxes.

These increases benefit all Wheat Ridge area schools. We are willing to do so to make our schools the best they can be for our children. You know first-hand of the marked increase in valuations over the past several years - valuations which have made our property taxes rise. We have all borne that increase, knowing we are privileged to live in Applewood and have our children attend such quality schools. However, our true property values will decrease (which of course will not be reflected on our valuation by the county) and far, far worse - our quality of life will suffer drastically. We will be forced to deal with huge traffic increases and the safety of our children when walking or riding to school will be forever compromised.

Adequate access to Cabela’s Drive can be provided WITHOUT allowing it to connect to 32nd Street. It is dangerous, unnecessary and a situation which would continue to pose a threat to the actual residents of the area!

There is no reason that both ingress and egress to the Cabela’s property can’t be from McIntyre, just South of Hwy 58. The plan already shows for exit from Cabela’s at that location.

The proposed primary entrance to Cabela’s seriously compromises the safety of students at both The Manning School and Maple Grove Elementary. A safer and more viable entry/exit MUST be considered. I would very much appreciate your thoughts on this matter.

Frankly, this devastating proposal cannot become a reality. Simply put - there needs to be a reasonable and well-considered solution to this problem. The current proposal is utterly unfair and unworkable. We need a more effective solution - a solution that will not impact residential areas and worse yet, the safety of school children.

Please respond with your thoughts on mitigating the volume of traffic at this already dangerous and congested intersection. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Lastly, a friend of my sister’s...the recently president of Cabela’s Bank, told her " if we (Cabela’s) perceive we are not welcome in a neighborhood or area, then we won't go in there." Well, with all due respect, to the neighbors who will be most adversely affected, I AGAIN tell you: "YOU ARE NOT WELCOME HERE".

Response to Comment #229-7:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #229-8:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comments on the proposed development and Cabela’s.

Response to Comment #229-9:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.

Response to Comment #229-10:
FHWA and CDOT would like to address your misconception that the proposed development can be accessed McIntyre Street south of SH 58. Cabela Drive will not connect with the existing SH 58 frontage road, which currently intersects with McIntyre Street south of SH 58. The existing SH 58 frontage road will be cul-de-sacked immediately west of the new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange that is included in the Proposed Action.

Response to Comment #229-11:
Please refer to our response to Comment #13-2 in regard to your comment on school safety.

Response to Comment #229-12:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-2 in regard to your comments on the proposed development and Cabela’s.

Response to Comment #229-13:
Please refer to our response to Comment #10-5 in regard to your comment on the Cabela Drive/32nd Avenue intersection.