

CHAPTER 5

Consultation and Coordination

1 This chapter describes the communications and
2 coordination that have occurred with stakeholders
3 during the EA process. Coordination with stakeholders
4 has focused on early identification of issues,
5 cooperative resolution of issues, and open and honest
6 communication. The *Stakeholder Involvement Plan*
7 (CH2M HILL, 2007g) is available in Appendix C.

8 5.1 AGENCY CHARTER

9 The team established a charter agreement on June
10 15, 2007 with the five primary project participants:
11 FHWA, CDOT, RTD, Lakewood, and CH2M HILL. At
12 its foundation, the charter established the purpose of
13 the study: to deliver a NEPA decision document that is
14 endorsed and supported by the public and
15 stakeholders. The charter also identified goals and
16 values for the project and team interactions, formally
17 articulated the roles and responsibilities of participants
18 for the study, and provided a structured decision
19 process where team members would provide
20 concurrence at key milestones in the NEPA process.
21 The team also agreed to implement streamlining
22 techniques into this EA that could be tested and
23 potentially applied to future projects.

24 5.2 AGENCY COORDINATION

25 Resource and regulatory agencies outside of the
26 charter team and other departments within CDOT and
27 FHWA have been consulted as part of the agency
28 coordination process. As described in the *Scoping*
29 *Summary Report* (CH2M HILL, 2007f), 23 agencies,
30 listed in Exhibit 5-1, were invited to a formal scoping
31 meeting on August 16, 2007, to identify issues of
32 concern. Other CDOT and FHWA departments were
33 also invited to this meeting. Each participant was
34 provided a copy of two reports in advance of the
35 scoping meetings. The *Existing Conditions Report of*
36 *Engineering Design Elements* (CH2M HILL, 2007d)

37 provided background information on the transportation
38 problems and “geometric health” of the existing
39 transportation system, which informed the purpose
40 and need for the US 6/Wadsworth project.

EXHIBIT 5-1: AGENCIES CONSULTED ON US 6/WADSWORTH STUDY

Local Agencies

City of Lakewood

Denver Regional Council of Governments

Jefferson County Administration

Jefferson County Department of Health and Environment

Jefferson County Division of Highways and Transportation

Jefferson Economic Council

Regional Air Quality Council

Regional Transportation District

Urban Drainage and Flood Control District

State Agencies

Colorado Department of Local Affairs

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Air
Pollution Control Division

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment,
Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division

Colorado Division of Local Government

Colorado Division of Wildlife

Colorado State Parks

State Historic Preservation Office

Federal Agencies

Department of Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and
Compliance

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Federal Transit Administration

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1 The *Summary of Existing Conditions Report*
 2 (CH2M HILL, 2007a) outlined the important
 3 environmental resources that would need to be fully
 4 evaluated in the EA, identified resources of less
 5 importance in this project context that would not be
 6 analyzed in detail, and provided recommendations
 7 about methodologies to be used for impact analysis.

8 Scoping input received from resource agencies
 9 indicated agreement with the identified purpose and
 10 need and recommended level of environmental
 11 analysis. Letters were sent to the same agencies in
 12 February 2008 and June 2008 to inform them of study
 13 progress at key milestones. The agencies have
 14 received a copy of this EA and will have the
 15 opportunity to comment on its findings during the
 16 45-day review period.

17 Formal consultation with the Colorado SHPO has
 18 been conducted to fulfill the requirements of Section
 19 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In
 20 addition to the scoping meeting and letters sent to all
 21 agencies, described above, consultation has included
 22 the following additional steps: consultation on the
 23 boundaries of the area of potential effect (APE), which
 24 resulted in no objections from the SHPO; submittal of
 25 the determination of eligibility of historic resources,
 26 which resulted in concurrence from the SHPO; and
 27 submittal of the determination of effects to historic
 28 resources, which also resulted in concurrence from
 29 the SHPO. Negotiations regarding mitigation for
 30 adverse effects to historic properties is under way and
 31 will be completed before CDOT and FHWA sign a
 32 decision document. Records of meetings and
 33 communications with each agency can be found in
 34 Appendix C.

35 Formal consultation with the USACE has been
 36 conducted to fulfill the requirements of Section 404 of
 37 the Clean Water Act. In addition to the agency
 38 scoping meeting and letters sent to all agencies,
 39 described above, consultation with the USACE has
 40 included the following additional steps: submittal of
 41 the *Wetland Delineation Report* and jurisdictional
 42 determinations and informal coordination regarding
 43 potential impacts and permitting requirements. The
 44 consultation with the USACE resulted in preliminary

45 jurisdictional determinations for waters and wetlands
 46 within the construction area under USACE regulatory
 47 jurisdiction and initial recommendations for Section
 48 404 permitting. Coordination with the USACE will
 49 continue through final design and permitting.

50 5.2.1 AGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

51 Exhibit 5-2 lists the agency coordination activities that
 52 have occurred with local, state, and federal agencies.
 53 In addition to the activities listed in Exhibit 5-2, nine
 54 Technical Leadership Team meetings have been held
 55 to date with Lakewood and RTD to discuss study
 56 progress, come to consensus on key decisions, and
 57 fulfill the goals of the charter agreement.

EXHIBIT 5-2: AGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

| Activity | Date |
|--|------------|
| Lakewood project kickoff meeting | 5/14/2007 |
| NEPA training for Lakewood staff | 6/6/2007 |
| Lakewood planning meeting | 6/14/2007 |
| Agency chartering meeting | 6/15/2007 |
| DRCOG travel demand modeling meeting | 8/8/2007 |
| Agency scoping meetings | 8/16/2007 |
| Section 106 Consultation letters mailed to Native American tribes | 9/14/2007 |
| Lakewood City Council briefing | 9/17/2007 |
| UDFCD drainage coordination meeting | 9/25/2007 |
| SHPO area of potential effects meeting | 11/15/2007 |
| Area of potential effects consultation letter and memorandum mailed to SHPO and consulting parties | 12/12/2007 |
| SHPO letter documenting no objections to area of potential effects | 12/26/2007 |
| Progress letter mailed to agencies | 2/18/2008 |
| DRCOG traffic operations meeting | 3/28/2008 |
| Lakewood traffic review meeting | 4/1/2008 |
| Lakewood ROW impacts meeting | 4/4/2008 |
| Lakewood traffic review meeting | 5/13/2008 |
| Lakewood noise wall coordination meeting | 6/30/2008 |
| Progress letter mailed to agencies | 6/18/2008 |
| Lakewood City Council briefing | 6/21/2008 |
| Determination of Eligibility consultation letter and report mailed to SHPO and consulting parties | 7/2/2008 |
| Lakewood/UDFCD drainage coordination meeting | 7/9/2008 |
| Lakewood ROW impacts meeting | 7/9/2008 |

EXHIBIT 5-2: AGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES (CONT.)

| Activity | Date |
|---|------------|
| Lakewood Development Assistance Team presentation | 7/10/2008 |
| Request from SHPO for additional information on historic resource eligibility | 8/7/2008 |
| Lakewood funding approaches meeting | 8/15/2008 |
| Lakewood ROW impacts meeting | 9/5/2008 |
| Submittal of <i>Wetland Delineation Report</i> and jurisdictional determinations to USACE | 9/18/2008 |
| Response to request for additional information and <i>Final Historic Resources Survey Report</i> sent to SHPO | 10/10/2008 |
| SHPO concurrence with determination of eligibility of historic resources | 10/21/2008 |
| USACE e-mail correspondence regarding wetland impacts and permitting | 11/20/2008 |
| Historic resource effects determination submitted to SHPO and consulting parties | 12/9/2008 |
| SHPO effects determination review meeting | 12/9/2008 |
| SHPO concurrence with determination of effects to historic resources | 12/19/2008 |

5.2.2 KEY ISSUES RAISED

This section summarizes the key issues raised by agencies and the actions taken to address them.

Scoping Issues

Issue: The City of Lakewood should consider the impacts of zoning compliance on ROW acquisition. If zoning compliance is required of all affected properties, ROW acquisition could become an even more significant project cost and impact.

Action: Subsequent meetings were held with Lakewood to discuss this issue and determine if some nonconformance may be allowed.

Issue: Current Nationwide permit regulations for impacts to wetlands and waters of the United States may not provide coverage for project impacts, and an individual 404(b)(1) permit may be required.

Action: Subsequent coordination with USACE determined that Nationwide Permit # 14 (Linear Projects) would be appropriate for project impacts.

Issue: Coordination needs to occur with the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD) regarding flood improvements upstream of the project area.

Action: Subsequent meetings identified improvements by others that were incorporated into the modeling for project drainage improvements.

Post-Scoping Issues

Issue: CDOT should pay close attention to the height and aesthetic treatment of the noise wall proposed along the frontage road northeast of the interchange.

Action: CDOT will consult with Lakewood on the design of noise walls during final design.

Issue: CDOT should carefully consider how to manage excess ROW from parcels fully acquired.

Action: CDOT has explained to Lakewood and interested property owners the ROW policy that addresses disposal of excess property and parties entitled to first right of refusal. CDOT ROW policies also allow owners the ability to maintain ownership of uneconomic remnants if they desire.

5.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement activities were crafted to identify community concerns, provide opportunities for input, and achieve public endorsement and support for the project. Public involvement activities have focused on building a high degree of public trust in the study and decision process. To build and maintain this trust, the project team established the following goals: develop a project that is compatible with community and municipal visions for the corridor; maintain open and honest communications; and thoroughly identify important community issues early in the planning process.

Numerous and timely communications with stakeholders have been essential to achieving these goals. A variety of outreach methods has been used to reach, engage, and inform stakeholders. The sections below describe the outreach efforts and involvement activities that have been conducted, and the important community issues that have been identified through these activities.

1 The public involvement activities conducted to date
 2 have helped build public trust in project decision
 3 makers and create widespread public support for the
 4 planning process and Build Alternative.

5 **5.3.1 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

6 Exhibit 5-3 lists the meetings that have occurred with
 7 public stakeholders. Meetings with individual groups
 8 were advertised by those groups to their members.
 9 Project open houses were advertised by: a) direct
 10 mailings to the project mailing list; b) flyers mailed and
 11 hand delivered to businesses and community centers;
 12 c) advertisements in the *Denver Post* and *Lakewood*
 13 *Sentinel*; and d) informational postings on Lakewood's
 14 Channel 8 and website, and the project and local
 15 organization websites. Attendance at public meetings
 16 increased throughout the project; 70 people attended
 17 the first open house (public scoping meeting), 92 were
 18 in attendance at the second open house, and 127
 19 attended the third open house.

EXHIBIT 5-3: PUBLIC MEETINGS

| Activity | Date |
|---|------------------------|
| Eiber Neighborhood Organization meeting | 7/19/2007 |
| Two Creeks Neighborhood Organization meeting | 7/21/2007 |
| West Colfax Community Association meeting | 8/15/2007 |
| Public Scoping Meeting | 8/21/2007 |
| Lakewood on Parade booth | 8/25/2007 |
| O'Kane Park Neighborhood Association meeting | 8/28/2007 |
| Alameda Gateway Community Association meeting | 9/5/2007 |
| Mid Lakewood Civic Association annual meeting | 9/25/2007 |
| Morse Park Neighborhood Organization meeting | 10/11/2007 |
| Informational meetings with schools | 9/11/2007 – 10/4/2007 |
| Business owner interviews | 10/30/2008 – 12/5/2008 |
| Public Open House #2 – present range of design concepts | 2/12/2008 |
| Eiber Neighborhood Organization meeting | 3/13/2008 |
| West Alameda Kiwanis meeting | 4/2/2008 |
| Two Creeks Neighborhood Organization meeting | 4/19/2008 |

EXHIBIT 5-3: PUBLIC MEETINGS (CONT.)

| Activity | Date |
|--|----------------------|
| Eiber Neighborhood Organization meeting | 4/22/2008 |
| Public Open House #3 – present preferred alternative | 4/29/2008 |
| O'Kane Park Neighborhood Association meeting | 4/29/2008 |
| Public Open House #3, makeup date | 5/21/2008 |
| Noise Assessment and Mitigation meeting | 6/4/2008 |
| Property owner meetings | 6/23/2008 – 7/8/2008 |
| Two Creeks Neighborhood Organization meeting | 6/21/2008 |
| Alameda Gateway Community Association meeting | 7/2/2008 |
| West Colfax Community Association meeting | 7/16/2008 |
| Mid Lakewood Civic Association meeting | 10/2/2008 |

20 **5.3.2 PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS**

21 In addition to meeting with stakeholders, CDOT used
 22 other methods to distribute project information. Some
 23 of those activities are described below. A complete
 24 listing of outreach activities is available in the
 25 *Stakeholder Involvement Plan* (CH2M HILL, 2007g) in
 26 Appendix C.

27 Direct mailings were sent to the entire mailing list,
 28 including: a) a letter introducing the study and inviting
 29 recipients to the public scoping meeting; b) the
 30 January 2008 newsletter; c) the April 2008 newsletter;
 31 and d) the fall 2008 postcard update on study
 32 progress. As the study progressed, the mailing list
 33 expanded from an initial list of 550 addresses within
 34 three blocks of the project area to 3,700 addresses
 35 surrounding the project area between Garrison and
 36 Otis Streets.

37 Mailings and solicitations for interviews were sent to
 38 specific groups, including businesses and commercial
 39 property owners, area schools, and owners of
 40 potentially affected properties. Interviews with
 41 businesses along the corridor provided an opportunity
 42 to understand commercial operations within the study
 43 area; establish a line of communication if potential
 44 property or business impacts were identified; clarify

1 the scope of the NEPA study; and dispel rumors about
2 the project, particularly related to the decision-making
3 process and potential use of eminent domain. The
4 business survey process also led to more than
5 100 new businesses being added to the mailing list.
6 Meetings and discussions with owners of potentially
7 affected properties provided similar benefits and
8 established strong lines of communication with many
9 of the property owners.

10 Regular updates were posted to the project website,
11 www.US6Wadsworth.com.

12 Study updates were provided to neighborhood and
13 business groups for publication in their quarterly
14 newsletters.

15 5.3.3 SPECIALIZED OUTREACH TO MINORITY 16 AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS

17 Demographic data from the U.S. Census and area
18 schools indicate minority and low-income populations
19 are present in higher-than-average percentages in the
20 neighborhoods surrounding the project area.
21 Specialized outreach efforts, therefore, were
22 employed to identify and engage minority and low-
23 income stakeholders in the decision-making process.

24 Newsletters and the public scoping meeting invitation
25 were mailed in both English- and Spanish-language
26 versions to all addresses on the project mailing list.
27 Spanish speakers, as opposed to other language
28 speakers, were targeted because of the high
29 percentage of Hispanic children identified in the local
30 school demographics.

31 English- and Spanish-language project fact sheets
32 were placed in the registration packets of six area
33 schools in August 2007 to introduce the study to the
34 public.

35 An informational insert, printed in English and
36 Spanish, was included in the Jefferson High School
37 October 2007 newspaper, which was distributed to
38 3,000 families located in a geographic area containing
39 identified minority and low-income populations. The
40 insert provided basic project information and gave
41 instructions for joining the mailing list.

42 Interviews were conducted with business owners
43 throughout the project area to gather more information
44 about possible minority or low-income employee
45 populations.

46 Spanish translation has been offered at all public
47 meetings. Newspaper advertisements and press
48 releases have included telephone numbers for
49 Spanish translation and information. No requests for
50 Spanish-language translation were received through
51 any of these avenues during the study.

52 5.3.4 KEY ISSUES RAISED

53 Primary topics of public interest have been noise,
54 safety, pedestrian and bicycle access, traffic
55 operations, accommodation of future transit, property
56 acquisition, and construction staging.

57 Many other issues, from traffic signal timing to
58 roadway maintenance concerns, have been prevalent
59 in public discussions as well. CDOT has addressed
60 many of these in the planning process and proposed
61 design. Summaries of public discussion at the initial
62 scoping meeting and subsequent open houses can be
63 found in the meeting summary reports contained in
64 Appendix C. Meeting notes from other meetings are
65 available upon request. This section summarizes
66 predominant issues raised consistently throughout the
67 study and the actions taken to address them.

68 **Issue:** Provide noise mitigation on US 6 west of
69 Wadsworth. Consider quiet pavement and absorptive
70 wall materials for further noise reduction.

71 **Action:** Noise walls are proposed along both sides of
72 US 6 between Wadsworth and Garrison Street. CDOT
73 will consider various wall materials during final design.

74 **Issue:** The design of the interchange and the
75 unlimited access on Wadsworth lead to many
76 accidents in the area.

77 **Action:** The proposed changes address the
78 operational issues with the interchange and provide
79 access control on Wadsworth, creating safer
80 conditions for vehicles and other travel modes.

1 **Issue:** Provide dedicated pedestrian and bicycle
2 facilities that meet Americans with Disability Act
3 requirements along Wadsworth. Provide safe
4 pedestrian and bicycle crossings of US 6 on
5 Wadsworth.

6 **Action:** The proposed action includes sidewalk
7 facilities throughout the project area and improves
8 pedestrian and bicycle movements. In most locations,
9 additional buffers between the sidewalk and travel
10 lanes also are included.

11 **Issue:** Cut-through traffic in neighborhoods is a
12 concern. Consider land use and traffic impacts that
13 will result from light rail and redevelopment.

14 **Action:** Changes to the design of frontage roads
15 north of US 6 have been made in response to
16 concerns about cut-through traffic. The traffic
17 projections used to model future conditions (and
18 design the capacity of the proposed action) take into
19 account the light rail line and associated land use
20 changes that are likely to occur.

21 **Issue:** Accommodate future transit on Wadsworth.

22 **Action:** The ability to accommodate future transit on
23 Wadsworth was one of the criteria used to evaluate
24 the project alternatives. The Build Alternative would
25 provide a bridge on US 6 over Wadsworth that is long
26 enough to accommodate a future transit lane next to
27 the proposed travel lanes. Bus operations would be
28 improved by improved capacity and turning
29 movements on Wadsworth.

30 **Issue:** Desire to know how much ROW would be
31 required and how many properties would be affected.

32 **Action:** CDOT mailed letters to owners of potentially
33 affected properties providing information on potential
34 impacts and the ROW acquisition process, and
35 inviting property owners to contact CDOT to discuss
36 potential impacts.

37 **Issue:** Coordinate construction with RTD West
38 Corridor light rail and other planned project
39 construction so that traffic impacts are manageable.
40 Start construction as soon as possible.

41 **Action:** CDOT has taken note of these comments and
42 will plan construction phasing in coordination with
43 other projects, if a construction project is approved
44 and funded.

45 **Issue:** Flooding on Wadsworth at Lakewood Gulch is
46 a problem.

47 **Action:** Drainage improvements are proposed at all
48 four gulches that cross the project area. The
49 improvements would be substantial and would
50 decrease surface water elevations so that the
51 floodplain would no longer encroach upon the
52 roadways.

5.4 REMAINING PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

53
54
55 FHWA and CDOT are providing this EA for agency
56 and public comment. A public hearing will be
57 scheduled in Lakewood at the Lakewood Council
58 Chambers (480 S. Allison Parkway, Lakewood, CO
59 80226). Newsletters announcing the public hearing
60 will be sent to all individuals on the mailing list. The
61 public hearing also will be advertised in newspapers,
62 websites, neighborhood newsletters, and flyers
63 distributed throughout the study area. Interested
64 individuals can attend the public hearing to provide
65 comments or learn more about the EA study and its
66 recommendations. Comments can be provided in
67 person at the public hearing, on the project website
68 (<http://us6wadsworth.com/>) or via mail, fax, or email:

69 Seyed Kalantar, P.E.
70 Project Manager
71 CDOT Region 6, Central Engineering
72 425 B Corporate Circle
73 Golden, CO 80401
74 (720) 497-6955 (phone)
75 (720) 497-6951 (fax)
76 seyed.kalantar@dot.state.co.us

77 Reviewing agencies will be provided a copy of the
78 document, and individual meetings with agency
79 representatives will be held if requested.

80 After the review period ends, all comments will be
81 addressed in a formal response, which will be issued
82 with the final decision on the project. A newsletter will
83 be mailed to the entire mailing list at the end of the
84 study to inform agency and public stakeholders of the
85 study's conclusions and next steps.