

CHAPTER 4

Coordination and Response to Comments

1 CDOT published the EA and Draft Section 4(f)
2 Evaluation on July 13, 2009, and initiated the 45-day
3 formal review period, which concluded on August 26,
4 2009. During this time, comments were accepted from
5 agencies and the public.

6 4.1 PUBLIC COORDINATION

7 CDOT conducted extensive public involvement and
8 outreach during the course of the EA, as summarized
9 in Chapter 5 of the EA. Publication of the EA was
10 announced through a mass mailing to surrounding
11 residents and property owners, mass e-mails to
12 Lakewood residents and businesses, website
13 announcements, coordination with neighborhood and
14 business groups, and advertisements in local
15 newspapers and on public access television (Channel
16 8).

17 A public hearing was held at the Lakewood City
18 Council Chambers on Wednesday, July 22, 2009, to
19 collect comments on the EA. The hearing was
20 advertised through the same channels as the EA, as
21 well as through flyers posted at local community
22 centers, businesses, churches, schools, and libraries.
23 The hearing was held in open house format and
24 included a 30-minute informational presentation
25 provided by CDOT and consultant staff in the Council
26 Chambers. Following the presentation, members of the
27 public were given an opportunity to make oral
28 comments about the EA. The meeting was attended by
29 members of the public, City of Lakewood staff, CDOT
30 staff, FHWA staff, local business owners, and property
31 owners. Approximately 96 people attended the
32 meeting, not including CDOT, FHWA, consultant, or
33 Lakewood staff. Two court reporters were present to
34 record oral comments on the EA, one in the open
35 house area and one in the Council Chambers after the
36 presentation.

37 4.2 AGENCY COORDINATION

38 The EA was sent to local, state, and federal agencies
39 for review on July 8, 2009 (Exhibit 4-1). As
40 summarized in Chapter 5 of the EA, these agencies
41 were consulted throughout the NEPA process and
42 received progress updates at major milestones:
43 scoping, purpose and need, alternatives, identification
44 of the Build Alternative, and publication of the EA.

EXHIBIT 4-1: 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 Public Health and Environment (CDPHE),
Air Pollution Control Division (APCD)

CDPHE, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division
CDPHE, Water Quality Control 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

4.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Thirty comment documents were received during the review period. No impacts to the environment were identified in the comments received that were not addressed fully in the EA. Nine comments required minor revisions and clarifications to the EA; these revisions are noted in the comment responses and identified as a group in Section 4.3. Exhibit 4-2 summarizes the comments received.

EXHIBIT 4-2: US 6/WADSWORTH – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

ID	Format	Subject Matter
1	E-mail	Noise levels on Wadsworth
2	Project Website	Pedestrian access across interchange
3	Comment Form	Signage for business access during construction
4	Comment Form	Noise wall and property impacts
5	Comment Form	Traffic operations on Wadsworth
6	Comment Form	Neighborhood circulator buses
7	Verbal ¹	Noise impacts and mitigation
8	Verbal ¹	Drainage improvements
9	Verbal ¹	Drainage improvements
10	Verbal ¹	Noise wall locations
11	Verbal ¹	Construction noise impacts
12	Verbal ¹	Pedestrian access across interchange
13	Verbal ¹	Noise impacts and mitigation
14	Verbal ¹	Noise levels in northwest quadrant
15	Comment Form	Support for proposed improvements
16	Comment Form	Support for proposed improvements, and pedestrian and bicycle safety
17	E-mail	Noise and construction impacts
18	E-mail	Noise and construction impacts
19	E-mail	Noise and construction impacts, and public outreach
20	Letter	Water quality pond placement and property impacts

EXHIBIT 4-2: US 6/WADSWORTH – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

ID	Format	Subject Matter
21	Comment Form	Support for No Build Alternative
22	Letter	Construction impacts, long-term noise impacts, and public outreach
23	Letter	Noise study methodology and results
24	Letter	Lakewood response to proposed project, and support for improvements
25	Project Website	Noise walls
26	Letter	Property acquisition and cost
27	Project Website	Support for proposed improvements and noise walls
28	Letter	RTD station parking and property acquisition
29	Letter	Section 4(f) and wildlife
30	E-mail	Property acquisition, water quality basin placement and impacts, and redevelopment opportunities

¹ Verbal comments were made to the transcriber at the public hearing.

After the comment period ended, each comment document was assigned a unique ID number and was delineated by topic to address multiple comments provided by each commenter, resulting in 156 discrete comments.

Responses to all comments received are presented in Exhibit 4-3. The table is organized by comment ID, as noted in Exhibit 4-2, with the comment reproduced from original comment documents presented next to the corresponding response. Copies of the responses also were provided to each commenter in a separate mailing. The original comment documents are presented in Appendix C in the form in which they were received, with the exception that delineation of each comment is handwritten on the documents to correspond to the comment numbers presented in Exhibit 4-3.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Coffman, Jill	Private citizen	1-1	I would like to complain that noise levels at Wadsworth is very loud, so additional lanes do not help my cause.	The noise analysis conducted for the EA indicates that traffic noise at residences near Wadsworth would not increase perceptibly with the additional travel lanes proposed under the Build Alternative. With the exception of the single residential property located along Wadsworth (1215 Wadsworth), all other residences within the study area are located one or more lots back from the roadway. The existing noise levels for these residences are not high enough to warrant mitigation under CDOT and FHWA's noise mitigation policies. Consideration of noise mitigation is warranted when noise levels reach or exceed 66 A-weighted (dBA) or increase more than 10 dBA. If these criteria are met, mitigation is included if it is feasible and reasonable according to the FHWA and CDOT guidelines. Please refer to the <i>Noise Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA for additional details on the predicted noise levels and mitigation considered.
Banker, Pat	Private citizen	2-1	I took a look at the proposed design and my only concern is that it doesn't appear to improve the pedestrian situation. With light rail going in just a few blocks north this is an opportunity to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access and should be looked at carefully. We live near this intersection and would like to see a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over 6th Avenue. There is no safe walking or bicycling access across 6th Avenue from Perry Street to Simms. Please consider this request in your plans.	The addition of sidewalks and reconfiguration of the US 6 interchange ramps will significantly improve pedestrian and bicycle travel north to south through the interchange area. Please refer to Sections 1.2.1.2, 1.2.3.1, and 3.2 of the EA for a discussion of pedestrian and bicycle facilities and impacts. See also response to Comment 12-1 for a discussion of the overpass and underpass options considered.
Moritzky, Bonnie	Private citizen	3-1	Given that Lakewood has very strict signage/advertising regulations for businesses, how will business access be affected during construction? Will business in the area be allowed signage (directional) during construction that they would not normally be allowed?	CDOT will provide for all-weather access and detours to minimize disruptions for businesses during construction. CDOT uses signs to mark detours and general business access appropriately. (Signs are provided for businesses in general but not for individual businesses.) Additionally, CDOT will develop a traffic control plan and make that plan available to Lakewood and the CDOT public relations office prior to construction, which will relay additional notifications for lane closures. A construction newsletter will be prepared and distributed as needed to keep businesses, residences, and travelers up to date. These commitments have been included in Section 4.4 of the FONSI. Lakewood is committed to maintaining a vibrant community for businesses and is willing to discuss additional signage or other measures to help businesses during construction of the US 6/Wadsworth project.
Moritzky, Bonnie	Private citizen	3-2	Will sections of Wadsworth be blocked off that will adversely affect business access? How will this issue be addressed?	Lane closures during construction will comply with CDOT's Region 6 Lane Closure Strategy (CDOT, 2005). In the project area, the lane closure strategy generally allows one lane of Wadsworth to be closed in the evening (after 7 or 8 p.m.) and for 1 or more hours during daytime non-peak travel times. In addition to maintaining through-lanes, CDOT policy also requires access to adjacent properties be provided during construction, as noted in response to Comment 3-1. The locations and times of closures are determined based on traffic patterns and are planned to minimize traffic disruptions. Information regarding lane closures and business access during construction has been added to Section 4.4 of the FONSI. See also response to Comment 3-1.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Leiby, Marianne	Private citizen	4-1	Sound walls are a blessing to the property next to them; however, they create a wind tunnel affect [sic] which brings trash in large quantities to the adjacent properties. Any possibility the engineers can prevent this trash problem? Perhaps being on the north edge of the frontage road? Or find the trash source and enforce existing fine structure.	The walls will be located next to the highway to allow properties along the frontage road to maintain their access. In cases where access is not a concern, the noise walls will be located next to the property boundary, which may reduce trash problems. CDOT is responsible for maintaining the frontage road and would be open to discussing opportunities for Adopt-a-Highway partnerships with the community for trash collection.
Leiby, Marianne	Private citizen	4-2	7373 W 6th Ave. Could the driveway be reconfigured to allow for a solid south edge sound wall on the property? Perhaps a joint driveway to the west for this and the property to the east? Then the sound wall could be totally on the north side of the two-way frontage road all the way to Crescent Lane.	Both 7373 W. 6th Ave. and 7393 W. 6th Ave. would remain under the Build Alternative. The primary access to these houses is from the frontage road, and there is no alternative access that could be provided to these properties. (Specifically, a wall in front of 7373 W. 6th Ave. would block access to 7393 W. 6th Ave, and the locations of garages for these properties do not lend themselves to shared access.) The four residences west of 7393 W. 6th Ave. would be acquired to reconstruct the ramp and frontage road in the northeast quadrant. As a result of these acquisitions, the noise wall can and does switch to the north side of the frontage road in this location.
Turner, Michael	Private citizen	5-1	I am very concerned with the possible U-turn for people turning north from 6th Ave to Wadsworth. I am concerned about traffic backing up and causing the possibility of rear end collisions. Need to be very observant about traffic flow in the 9th Ave area.	Left-turn lanes have been designed to accommodate the expected future 2035 traffic, including U-turn movements where permitted. According to the traffic analysis and modeling conducted for the EA, vehicle queues are not expected to exceed the storage length provided in the left-turn lanes.
Brown, Coraline	Private citizen	6-1	Seniors over 80 would be more willing to give up driving if circulator buses will circulate around neighborhoods and to [...]points as to light rail points, Red Rocks, Lakewood's Belmar, etc. Others would find this helpful.	In the Denver metro area, the Regional Transportation District (RTD) is responsible for planning and operating bus service. RTD operates two express bus services from the US 6/Wadsworth project area to downtown during the peak hours. Route 87X, South Wadsworth Express, provides express bus service from US 6 and Wadsworth to Civic Center Station downtown (16th and Broadway). Route 93X, Green Mountain Express, provides express service from Wadsworth and 1st Avenue directly to Civic Center Station. RTD also plans to increase the frequency of area bus service to serve the new West Corridor Light Rail (anticipated to be operational in 2013), which will provide rail service from the project area to downtown Denver. RTD also operates a service for seniors called seniorRide (303-299-6503).
Brown, Coraline	Private citizen	6-2	I would favor a ballot to push up date for 6th Avenue to Downtown, especially express service to Downtown.	Thank you for your comment. At this time, the project has been included in the Denver region's long-range transportation plan and is expected to be funded through CDOT's standard budgeting process. No ballot initiative is proposed. (The US 6/Wadsworth project is not expected to improve service to downtown Denver, although travel times for cars and buses on US 6 may improve somewhat based on better operational efficiency of the interchange. The new RTD light rail, which includes a station at 13th Avenue and Wadsworth, would provide new rail service to downtown. Additional information on the West Corridor light rail line and stations is available from RTD [http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/wc_1j].) Please also refer to response to Comment 6-1.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Seal, Michael	Private citizen	7-1	I live at 8230 West Eight Avenue. This is two blocks from Sixth Avenue and it's a slightly higher elevation. I am concerned about the construction of the new sound wall as I think it might make the noise pollution at my house worse. The current proposal calls for building two walls out of concrete on either side of Sixth Avenue. If they do this, I will receive both direct sound and the reflected sound from the far wall at my house.	In its publication, Keeping the Noise Down: Highway Traffic Noise Barriers (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/keepdown.htm), FHWA addresses this issue. "Residents adjacent to a highway sometimes feel that their noise levels have increased substantially, because of the construction of a noise barrier on the opposite side of the highway. However, field studies have shown that this is not true. If all the noise striking a noise barrier were reflected back to the other side of a highway, the increase would be theoretically limited to 3 dB. In practice, not all of the acoustical energy is reflected back to the other side. Some of the energy goes over the barrier, some is reflected to points other than the homes on the opposite side, some is scattered by ground coverings (for example, grass and shrubs), and some is blocked by the vehicles on the highway. Additionally, some of the reflected energy is lost due to the longer path that it must travel. Measurements made to quantify this reflective increase have never shown an increase of greater than 1-2 dB an increase that is not perceptible to the average human ear." CDOT policy does recommend, however, that in cases where the width-to-height ratio of a roadway section to parallel barriers is less than 10:1 (as is the case under the Build Alternative), sound absorptive materials be considered to reduce reflective noise, and use of sound absorptive materials or equivalent will be considered in final design.
Seal, Michael	Private citizen	7-2	I am suggesting that CDOT spend approximately 3 percent more money to build sound-absorbent sound walls so that it will actually reduce the sound at my house and other peoples' houses at this [higher] elevation. There would only be a 3 percent cost difference, and I think it is worth it for the long-term benefit of these residents.	The use of absorptive materials or other techniques to reduce noise reflection will be considered during final design of the project. The City of Lakewood will also have the opportunity to provide input on design elements related to noise mitigation, including the grading, landscaping, color, and material of any noise walls. The consideration of sound-absorptive materials for noise walls has been included in Section 4.4 of the FONSI.
Green, David	Private citizen	8-1	Lakewood City was going to improve [McIntyre] gulch – stabilize the gulch, the banks of the gulch and this was to be done between Carr and Wadsworth where all the property owners are losing 2 to 3 feet of property every year into the gulch. The gulch is going deeper, wider. What impact is working on Sixth Avenue going to have on this project?	As part of the US 6/Wadsworth project, McIntyre Gulch would be widened to improve conveyance of 100-year flows through the project corridor. The existing culvert for McIntyre Gulch under US 6 would be replaced with a larger structure to convey the 100-year flows under the roadway and prevent US 6 from flooding during 100-year flood events. The proposed design would significantly improve drainage, reduce erosion, and reduce flooding within the improved area. The City of Lakewood, which was a partner agency in preparation of the EA and development of the Build Alternative, is in the process of adding McIntyre Gulch to its 5-year capital improvement plan and is working to secure funding to address flooding concerns elsewhere along the gulch. The earliest Lakewood's construction on McIntyre Gulch would begin is 2012, and the timing of the CDOT US 6/Wadsworth project is uncertain but likely after 2012. CDOT and Lakewood will continue to work together to ensure that the project designs do not conflict. Your comment also has been passed along to Lakewood.
Green, David	Private citizen	8-2	All other problems [on McIntyre Gulch] have been fixed over the past year. Now it is time for this section to be fixed, according to Lakewood. The funding should come from the Colorado water people and Lakewood. This section is probably the last section of the gulch that is eroding.	See response to Comment 8-1. Your comment also has been passed along to Lakewood. Please contact Lakewood's Stormwater Management Utility with any additional questions regarding the City of Lakewood's drainage or floodplain improvement projects.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Sherman, George	Private citizen	9-1	They are going to increase the size of the culvert where it goes under Wadsworth and it goes into that new Two Creeks Park north of Tenth Avenue. Where the water goes through that park, it then goes back underground into another culvert for approximately 1 to 1 ½ blocks along Tenth Avenue. Since they are increasing the culvert leading into Two Creeks Park, are they going to increase the size of the culvert that leads out? Because that is a real flood problem. Every time we have a moderate rain, the water goes over the top of that culvert along Tenth Avenue, especially where it crosses Teller.	<p>The new culvert under Wadsworth is designed to carry 100-year flows and prevent flows from overtopping the roadway. The project is not intended to address downstream flooding, except to ensure that the flooding does not worsen. That is, the amount of water entering the culvert under 10th Avenue will not change. If there is a flooding problem in this location, the US 6/Wadsworth project will not affect it, neither making it better nor worse.</p> <p>Lakewood has developed some upstream flood detention at Ritchie Park, which has reduced flows considerably through Dry Gulch. Lakewood would also be responsible for addressing flooding described at 10th Avenue if that flooding persists. Your comment also has been passed along to Lakewood. Please contact Lakewood’s Stormwater Management Utility, which is responsible for programming drainage projects for the city, to report and/or discuss this problem.</p>
Lamke, Brian	Business owner	10-1	I own a building that is on Sixth Avenue at 7727 West Sixth Avenue. On the proposed site you have a noise wall that starts at the beginning of the building. It’s going to block all of the signage; it’s a commercial building. What I would like them to do is move that wall to the back of the building – at least behind the building. It’s supposed to be 15 feet, and it’s too tall. It will block all the signage – moving the beginning of the wall westward to the building or to the back of the property. This would allow the signage to be unobstructed.	<p>Your concern is understood. To provide significant noise reduction for the homes along Allison Street, the noise wall was proposed to extend east of Allison Street and in front of your commercial building. A design option may be possible to change the alignment of the noise wall to accommodate both the commercial needs for visibility and residential needs for noise reduction. Specifically, it may be possible to change the alignment of the noise wall between Allison and Ammons Streets to the north side of the frontage road and wrap the wall around the west side of your property. The noise wall could extend along the highway just east of Ammons Street and continue as described in the EA. This design modification will be investigated in final design and included if feasible. The commitment to consider the alternative alignment is reflected in Section 4.4 of the FONSI.</p>
Frazer, Kim	Private citizen	11-1	My concern is the noise during construction. I live on Fifth Avenue, so not far at all from where the construction will be taking place. And I imagine it will be a long construction period; one to two years, something like that. So I’m just curious if they have taken that into consideration at all. Do they have any plans to at least contain the hours or the noise levels, anything that would improve the whole situation during that timeframe?	<p>Construction noise is generally a function of the nearest one or two pieces of equipment. At any one residence, equipment use will vary from day to day. For example, near bridge abutments there may be pile driving for a few days, then earthwork, then concrete forming, with many days of no active work. For a typical roadway construction project, there are often weeks of little to no construction activity near any one residence, then perhaps a few weeks with activity. Some activity is relatively quiet, such as some utility work, while other activities are relatively loud, such as jack hammering. As stated in Appendix B to the EA, mitigation for construction noise includes limiting work to daytime hours when possible and requiring contractors to use well-maintained equipment, including muffler systems. Noise during construction must comply with state and local requirements. CDOT may, if feasible, construct proposed permanent noise walls early in the overall construction schedule to provide noise mitigation for the temporary construction noise as well as the long-term operational noise from US 6 traffic. The commitment to construct permanent noise walls early in the overall construction schedule, if feasible, is reflected in Section 4.4 of the FONSI.</p>

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Nichols, Randy	Private citizen	12-1	...my primary concern is I would like to see some method for pedestrians and bicyclists to go over – or under – 6th Avenue without having to deal with traffic. There are a couple of examples where this has been done. One is on Kipling where the Clear Creek does under Kipling – I think it's about 39th or so. And there's another one on I-70 – again, about 38th or so – that's an overpass. And I don't know how effective that is. But anyway, that may be nice to have	CDOT recognizes that US 6 is a barrier to north-south pedestrian and bicycle travel through Lakewood, and providing for better pedestrian and bicycle mobility through the Wadsworth interchange area was a primary need identified for the US 6/Wadsworth project. The addition of sidewalks and reconfiguration of the US 6 interchange ramps will significantly improve pedestrian and bicycle travel north to south through the interchange area. A complete grade-separated crossing of US 6 was considered but not included in the Build Alternative due to site constraints, property acquisition needs, limited effectiveness because of out-of-direction travel, maintenance considerations, steep grades and/or long tunnels, and cost. An underpass of the loop ramp in the northwest quadrant is under consideration. As described in Section 3.2.3 (page 3-8) of the EA, an underpass option for the loop ramp crossing will be evaluated in final design and included in the Build Alternative if a suitable solution to groundwater conflicts can be designed. An overpass of the loop ramp also was considered but not included because elevations required to get over the loop ramp (and maintain a vertical separation with traffic below) would be steep, the bridge could be difficult to maintain due to icing of the bridge, and it would cost an estimated \$1 million to construct (in comparison to the underpass, which would be approximately \$200,000 to construct). In all other quadrants of the interchange, crossings would remain at grade. Additional measures to improve safety of at-grade crossings, such as pavement markings, warning lights, signing, or other measures, will be included in the final design of the Build Alternative, as stated in Appendix B, Mitigation Commitments, to the EA.
Nichols, Randy	Private citizen	12-2	There is one minor problem with underpasses. And if anybody here was here on Monday, sometimes when you get pretty dramatic weather —and two years ago, I worked down in the vicinity of 11th and Decatur. And the Lakewood Gulch used to have a bike path through there. About two years ago, a lady was pushing her baby through there. And we had a humongous storm, and this big surge of water came through and she lost her child. So that's the downside of underpasses.	The potential underpass of the US 6 loop ramp would not be within the Lakewood Gulch channel, and therefore, would not be subject to flooding during storm events as in the example provided. The bottom of the underpass would be located near groundwater levels, however, which could pose some problems to maintaining the underpass, such as potentially requiring pumping of groundwater. The underpass of Wadsworth at Lakewood Gulch (at approximately 8th Avenue) would be located within the channel and could be subject to flooding during storm events. If a path is constructed along Lakewood Gulch (by Lakewood or others) to take advantage of this undercrossing of Wadsworth, appropriate signage, stormflow indicators, gates, or similar measures would need to be installed along the path to warn or protect against flooding dangers.
Nichols, Randy	Private citizen	12-3	It would be nice not to have to deal with the traffic to get from south – from north of 6th Avenue south. I have a lot of friends that ride bikes. And I can tell you for sure, we don't ever use Sheridan because there's always the chance a big chunk of concrete is going to fall down on your head. And Wadsworth is a little safer, but not as convenient. That's my wish.	Pedestrian and bicycle underpass crossing of US 6 would be improved on both sides of Wadsworth. See response to Comment 12-1. (Although unrelated to the US 6/Wadsworth project, CDOT is aware of the problems with the US 6/Sheridan interchange. Funding has recently been identified to reconstruct the US 6/Sheridan bridge. CDOT's tentative schedule is to begin construction in 2011. Interim maintenance repairs should happen sometime in the near future.)

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	13-1	When you were speaking of noise impacts, you said that there had been other options considered beside the noise walls. Could you tell me what those were?	The <i>Noise Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA (pages 29-30) describes other noise abatement measures considered but deemed infeasible. These included: restricting access to heavy trucks, acquisition of property to form a buffer zone, alteration of the horizontal or vertical alignments of the Build Alternative design, reducing speed limits, noise insulation of buildings, earth berms, and using a low-noise pavement. (Using a low-noise pavement is not infeasible but is not proven to be effective over the long term. CDOT continues to study pavement types and their noise effects.) Given the geographical constraints of this project, noise barriers were the most reasonable and feasible mitigation option to construct. As noted in Appendix B, however, the final height and configuration of noise barriers or equivalent will be confirmed during final design.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	13-2	My concern is that we live behind – we live north of the 6th Avenue area, and we’re in a – topographically, we’re a little bit higher. So we get quite a lot of the noise from 6th Avenue right there. With the noise walls, as they’re proposed, we’re thinking that if – that that will just channel more noise up into that area. So my question would be – I guess that’s more a question than a comment – would be to consider having some material that is more noise absorbent than just concerned, because that is just a noise reflector, particularly with – when you would have the – the two walls on either side of 6th Avenue reflecting all that noise. So it could get quite loud.	The use of absorptive materials for noise walls will be considered during final design of the project. See also responses to Comments 7-1 and 7-2.
Fleming, Glennis	Private citizen	14-1	I live at 7865 West 8th Avenue. And as we were looking to see about all the noise barriers, we were told that there would be no noise barriers on the northwest side of the exchange, because all the homes are too far back. I would like to know what myself and my neighbors could do to have somebody come and check the noise decibels in our backyards. Because the overpass is quite high on – on 6th’ and it throws the noise over – even in the summer, the trees don’t cut the noise. And it comes into our yards. And I’d like to know what we could do to have somebody come and check it.	As discussed with you and your neighbors at our August 2009 meeting, existing and predicted noise levels at residences in this area are not high enough to warrant mitigation under CDOT and FHWA noise mitigation policies. Consideration of noise mitigation is warranted when noise levels reach or exceed 66 dBA or increase more than 10 dBA as a result of the project. The model, which included the proposed elevation of the highway, indicated that the project would not produce sound levels meeting either of these conditions at residences in this area; neither existing nor future noise levels (which include the Build Alternative and traffic volumes projected for year 2035) would exceed the 66 dBA Noise Abatement Criteria threshold.
Choi, Richard	Private citizen	15-1	The proposed improvements at 6th and Wadsworth represent the best solution to our existing traffic problems. Especially for the residential zone at the N.E. quadrant. The encroachment of commercial and through traffic should be greatly diminished.	Thank you for your support.
Choi, Richard	Private citizen	15-2	The new sound wall should not only reduce the noise but will also visually define the boundaries of the separation.	Thank you for your support.
Choi, Richard	Private citizen	15-3	Once the service [frontage] road [in the NE quadrant] is re-configured and the sound wall installed, prominent new signage will be needed to aid in the establishment of new patterns of use	Signage and striping will be included in the final design package for the Build Alternative. Proper design should encourage new patterns of use, but should problems develop, CDOT or Lakewood would evaluate additional signage.
Koop, Scott	Private citizen	16-1	I agree the 6th Ave. and Wadsworth Blvd. interchange needs to be updated to safely handle the ever increasing amount of automobile traffic.	Thank you for your support.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Koop, Scott	Private citizen	16-2	I hope there will be an elevated sense of importance given to the design for maximum pedestrian and bicycle safety. Alternate modes of transportation will increase on Wadsworth Blvd. with the completion of the RTD Wadsworth light rail station, and as our society and economy changes.	Pedestrian and bicycle mobility was one of the most important issues raised by the community, and the Build Alternative was developed to improve safety, access, and comfort of multi-modal transportation. See response to Comment 12-1 for a discussion of additional options that will be refined in final design.
Koop, Scott	Private citizen	16-3	These two very large public transportation projects being developed within close proximity to each other offers and extraordinary opportunity to set an example of how alternate modes of transportation can be supported in conjunction with more traditional automobile traffic. Please give pedestrians and bicyclists your full attention in the building of this public project.	CDOT has worked with RTD and Lakewood throughout the project to coordinate the design of the Build Alternative with the design of the West Corridor project, and is committed to continuing this coordination throughout final design and project implementation. As noted in response to Comment 12-1, pedestrian and bicycle improvements were primary needs identified by the project, and the Build Alternative has been developed to meet these needs.
Hurst, Susan	Private citizen	17-1	I reviewed your EIS and did not see a photo of our townhomes. We are right off 6th and VANCE; and we will be greatly impacted by this project. Noise, added dust of everyday traffic - before, during and after the project - the Webster street apartments provide some buffer and the homes directly south of the frontage road as well. With these gone the sound on the second floor where our bedrooms are will be unbearably loud. It's loud now, I just CAN'T imagine how LOUD it will be with backed up traffic, demolition, constant noise of heavy trucks, earth moving.	As indicated in Section 3.4 of the EA, four single-family residences adjacent to the frontage road southeast of the interchange have been identified as total acquisitions. The apartment complex along Webster Street would remain and does not need to be acquired for the Build Alternative. The residence directly north of your townhome (between your property and the frontage road and highway) also would remain. The traffic noise model created for this project indicated that existing noise levels at your townhome are 65 dBA (which includes the buffer effect of the surrounding residences and the existing noise wall). Under the Build Alternative (with the proposed reconstructed wall in place and the acquired residences not in place), the predicted noise level is 62 dBA, which represents a 3 dBA reduction in noise. Noise levels at your townhome were also modeled with a receptor height of 15 feet, which represents a point 5 feet above the elevation of the second-floor balcony. The model indicated that existing noise levels at this height are 67.4 dBA. Under the Build Alternative, the predicted noise level is 65 dBA, which represents a 2.4 dBA reduction in noise. See response to Comment 11-1 for a discussion of noise mitigation during construction and response to Comment 18-1 regarding construction-related dust emissions
Hurst, Susan	Private citizen	17-2	How is this going to affect the 'settling' of our home? The addition of the sound wall made a bit of settling, but this will be another matter entirely.	Noise walls will be constructed according to FHWA's <i>Highway Noise Barrier Design Handbook</i> . This handbook recommends that construction of noise walls follow the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D1557-07 (2007), "Test Method for Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil Using Modified Effort," to ensure that soils are properly compacted and any potential for settling near adjacent properties is reduced. This commitment has been reflected in Section 4.4 of the FONSI.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Hurst, Susan	Private citizen	17-3	I would think that this section of our townhome's [sic] would be considered for relocation - it will be next to impossible to get in or out of our driveways!!	As noted in Section 3.4.2 (page 3-12) of the EA, properties are identified for acquisition when the proposed construction limits would directly impact the principal building on the property, or the existing use or operation would be altered so greatly (such as through permanent loss of access) that the property would become economically unviable. The townhomes at 6th Avenue and Vance Street are not affected in these ways and would not need to be acquired for the construction of the Build Alternative. Access to the townhome complex will not change because the access from Vance Street to the frontage road would remain in the same location and configuration as the existing condition. None of the townhome driveways is affected by the Build Alternative. Reconfiguration of the frontage road would result in some construction activity at the intersection of Vance Street and the frontage road, but access to the townhomes would be maintained at all times during construction and would be unchanged in the permanent configuration.
Hurst, Susan	Private citizen	18-1	I have concerns regarding additional indoor dust/pollution health issues; additional buildup on appliances/electronics/furnace/air conditioning units; and possible power surges/spikes. * Will C-DoT regularly clean the exterior of our building? * Provide Uninterrupted Power Backup System's for all of our major appliances and electronics; * 1 (one) Ion Air Cleaner per floor (3 floors) of our home to prevent additional wear from the above (dust/dirt and power surges or outages from this project)?	The potential impact of particulate matter and fugitive dust emissions during construction was evaluated as part of this study (see Section 3.14.4 and the <i>Air Quality Technical Memorandum</i> in Appendix C to the EA). As noted in Appendix B to the EA, CDOT has committed its contractors to reducing emissions through the implementation of best management practices (BMPs), such as watering exposed soils, covering trucks when transporting materials, minimizing mud tracking by vehicles, and stabilizing construction entrances. Contractors will also be required to reduce emissions by limiting the idling time of construction equipment and vehicles, and using newer construction equipment or equipment with add-on emission controls. These measures have been found to be effective at reducing impacts to ambient air and surrounding properties. In addition, contractors are required to follow CDOT's <i>Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction</i> , which governs construction practices near private properties.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Hurst, Susan	Private citizen	18-2	I'm at 544 Vance, in our building, 10 families would be affected and possibly 2 from the building directly East of us that's closest to the frontage road. I think you should make a personal visit to check this out yourself. Seriously, I am inviting everyone in this email to call and come out to stand in my second floor bedroom that faces 6th Avenue. Then go out and stand in my bedroom's balcony. Don't bother trying to make phone calls from the patio (even though we have a garage to 'buffer' noise), you can't hear the conversation from the blaring traffic. I will begin taking appointments at 9:00 a.m. 3 days a week starting this week. You will need to make prior arrangements as we have had to 'burglar proof' the exterior of our townhome, so access is limited. After the existing sound wall was built we discovered that the traffic noise drowns out sounds of people trying to break into your home from the back side (North side faces 6th Avenue). I was home during one of these break-in attempts.....I want to make sure you get the 'true affect' of the noise and dirt/dust issues that will be a health issue for MY family. I look forward to hearing from you ~ I really do!	As noted in response to Comment 17-1, noise at your residence, even at the height of the second-floor balcony, is predicted to decrease with the implementation of the Build Alternative. Please see response to Comment 18-1 for a discussion of dust issues during construction.
Hurst, Susan	Private citizen	18-3	The sound wall on the frontage road was NOT in place when we purchased our home here; 6th Avenue noise got louder when and after the wall was built. I was told by C-DoT crew (yes, I have this on film) that the EIS only addressed ground floor living space noise; not second floor space.	See response to Comment 7-1 regarding the potential for noise to increase after noise wall installation. CDOT policy, and that of FHWA and other state departments of transportation, is directed toward achieving significant noise reduction for sensitive receivers, such as residential properties. In general, the primary considerations are the exterior areas of frequent human use. Guidance specific to second floor living can be found in CDOT's <i>Noise Analysis and Abatement Guidelines, Section 4.1</i> . Achieving significant noise reduction at second and higher stories would often be technically infeasible because noise walls would need to be 25 to 35 feet tall. Walls of this height present challenges including shadowing (icing), structural support (need to withstand wind loads), cost, and aesthetics. As discussed in the response to Comment 17-1, with the proposed wall in place, the noise model predicts a reduction in noise at this residence, even at the height of the second-floor balcony.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-1	May I ask WHY you have not sent direct mailings to the maximally exposed population in the Stonebridge Townhomes complex?	The project team developed the initial direct mailing list from the Jefferson County Assessor's database. The mailing list was expanded several times during the course of the study. The notice of availability of the EA, which is the primary vehicle for official public comment into the proposal, was mailed to approximately 3,700 households and businesses, including 544 Vance Street. In addition to direct mailings, significant public outreach was conducted to inform and gather input on the proposed action and EA. These efforts are summarized in Chapter 5 of the EA and included activities such as meeting advertisements in the <i>Lakewood Sentinel</i> , <i>Denver Post</i> , and Lakewood public access television (Channel 8); flyers posted throughout the community (at churches, schools, and grocery stores); information distributed through neighborhood group and association newsletters, websites, and meetings; updates provided to business association websites and meetings; updates to Lakewood City Council, which were open to the public and broadcast on Lakewood's public access Channel 8; meetings with area school principals and distribution of information in school registration packets; frequent updates on the study progress on the City of Lakewood and project websites; and numerous meetings with individual property and business owners. Although this level of effort is well above the requirements of NEPA, CDOT and FHWA chose to conduct this extensive public outreach to gather public comment and input to help shape the scope of study and improve the alternatives.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-2	The issue is more than the noise, its deadly PM _{2.5} , VOCs & aldehydes from demolition and earth moving! The large trees have helped buffer noise, filtered some of the air pollution and highway grit. Removing houses and trees will change the character of this neighborhood significantly and in a very negative way. Additional noise and fugitive dust emissions from this project, on top of what we already have had to put up with since the wall was put in, will make this neighborhood undesirable as a residential neighborhood.	As described in the <i>Air Quality Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA, the Build Alternative would not result in long-term or permanent adverse effects to air quality. See responses to Comments 17-1 and 18-1. With the exception of one residence planned for acquisition at the intersection of Vance Street and the existing frontage road (7390 W. 6th Avenue Frontage Road), the trees and buildings near the Stonebridge Townhomes would remain in place, and any buffering benefit those structures and vegetation provide would also remain.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-3	This was a nice, quiet neighborhood when we purchased our townhome here, until the sound wall was put in, which pushed the highway noise up and over to our property. This created significant noise to the 2nd floor bedrooms in our building, as that highway noise bounced directly to that level.	As noted in the responses to Comments 7-1 and 7-2, noise does reflect off walls but measured increases in noise levels due to parallel noise walls have been less than can be perceived by normal human hearing, that is, less than 3 dB. As noted in response to Comment 18-3, achieving significant noise reduction at second and higher stories is often technically infeasible, primarily due to the excessive noise wall heights that would likely be required for the mitigation.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-4	It [the existing sound wall] also caused settling in the area, evidenced by cracks appearing in our driveway, carports, garages, patios, etc. Will CDOT compensate us and/or relocate us for that impact?	Cracks in concrete happen for a variety of reasons and are widespread throughout the metro area. Some of the causes include changes in temperature or ground moisture that create expansion and contraction, tree roots growing under surfaces, undetected subsurface drainage that washes the soil below the concrete, and so on. These conditions are particularly common in older neighborhoods such as the US 6 and Wadsworth area. Damages that may occur during construction are addressed in CDOT's <i>Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction</i> . See also response to Comment 17-2.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-5	Additional noise adds stress, which impacts quality of life and health. There are plenty of scientific studies that validate this point.	Comment noted. FHWA and CDOT recognize the potentially adverse human and environmental effects of noise, specifically highway and roadway noise, and their policies are informed by evaluation and ongoing research on the topic.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-6	Will they be working on this project during night time hours? What about the most sensitive populations, that being the elderly, pregnant women and children? Has your EIS/EA taken that into consideration?	See response to Comment 11-1 for a discussion of noise mitigation during construction. FHWA and CDOT noise guidelines are designed to protect all populations from the adverse effects of noise during construction.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-7	Sue has Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome with fibromyalgia, which are severely affected by this kind of noise, pollution, and heavy vibration activity, which will be ongoing for several years. Paula has asthma (pollution reactive), and prior exposure that created hypersensitivity to asphalt/petroleum fumes. Both of us would be greatly negatively impacted by the disruption, vibration, noise and pollution from this project, and in our cases, it could be life threatening. We feel this makes us candidates for relocation, with CDOT purchasing our property and paying to move us to another location.	Comment noted. See responses to Comments 11-1, 18-1, and 22-10 regarding noise, air emissions, and vibration during construction. See response to Comment 17-3 regarding purchase and/or relocation requirements.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-8	Does this EIS address noise for second floor living? I couldn't find a reference for it.	CDOT did consider second-floor living and evaluated noise at your balcony level. See responses to Comment 18-3 regarding challenges to second-floor noise mitigation and 17-1 regarding the second-floor noise reduction at your residence.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-9	Considering the drastic change of topography will our building of townhomes be considered for relocation? One of the homes directly North of us that faces the frontage road (south side of Sixth Avenue and Vance) looks like it will be removed. That is one of the homes that has been a buffer for noise from traffic for our building.	See responses to Comments 17-1 and 17-3. Note that the building directly north of your townhome is not proposed for acquisition and will remain in place.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	19-10	I agree that this much needed interchange would be a wonderful improvement for commuters. Unfortunately, residents in our building will have their quality of life negatively impacted by this project. I hope we can have meaningful exchange in trying to figure out answers to our concerns.	Thank you for your comment. A primary goal of the project team was to develop a project that is compatible with community and municipal visions for the corridor. CDOT has gone to great efforts to maintain open and frequent communications with residents and business owners in the project area. These efforts are detailed in Chapter 5 of the EA. Public communication will continue as the project moves into final design and construction (after funding is secured).
Mauz, Weston	Business owner	20-1	Within the CDOT construction envelope, 34% of existing parking spaces at the 1395 Wadsworth (Mauz) commercial property will be immediately lost to the Wadsworth widening project (Map 2). The total area of the combined Mauz parcel will be reduced by 12% (5100 sq ft), permanently reducing its commercial value. The likely immediate impact to the Mauz commercial property is loss of income to the tenant, resulting in inability to meet rent, and ultimate loss of the tenant. Reduced parking facility will negatively impact lease potential for the property, resulting in long-term economic loss to Mauz.	The permanent impact to the Mauz property is less than the construction envelope shown in the EA (which includes both permanent impacts and temporary impacts during construction) and in attached mapping provided by the commenter. Although final design for the project has not been completed, the estimated permanent acquisition of property (including a permanent easement) under conceptual design is an approximately 25-foot-wide strip of property adjacent to the 150-foot frontage on Wadsworth, accounting for approximately 3,750 square feet, of which 1,500 square feet is related to roadway widening. The additional property impact shown in the EA and attached mapping provided by the commenter accounts for temporary impacts during construction and is not a permanent right-of-way (ROW) need. (Note that property owners are compensated for temporary construction easements that are required

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
				<p>during construction. Temporary easements remain the property of the property owner after construction is complete.)</p> <p>Appraisers valuing partial acquisitions are required to determine the fair market value of the portion acquired and damages to the remaining unacquired portion, if such damages are supported by credible market evidence. Both the value of the portion acquired and damage to the remaining unacquired portion, if any, are included in the just compensation offer made to the landowner.</p> <p>For the purposes of estimating and considering impacts in the EA, the impacts to this property were determined from review of existing uses; based on that review, CDOT determined the remaining portion of the Mauz parcel could continue to operate in its current use as a restaurant within existing zoning requirements. Lakewood agreed with this determination based on the conceptual design, with the understanding that all final determinations about conforming zoning and land use decisions will be made based on the final design. (The number of parking spaces on this parcel currently totals 29. Construction of the Build Alternative would result in the approximate loss of 9 parking spaces, with 20 remaining. Lakewood zoning specifications indicate parking requirements are 12.5 per 1,000 gross square feet. The existing building is approximately 1940 square feet, which results in a need of about 24 spaces. The parking situation at this location, therefore, appears to meet Lakewood’s allowable nonconforming use, as described in its new ordinance outlined in response to Comment 24-23.)</p> <p>It is important to note that the majority of the permanent acquisition/easement on the Mauz property is for sidewalks. Any redevelopment of this property (or any within the TMU zoning area) would require the property owner/developer to construct a 17-foot sidewalk in front of the property, which is consistent with CDOT’s proposal.</p>
Mauz, Weston	Business owner	20-2	<p>There are currently no alternative locations that can provide compensatory parking in the proximity of the Mauz commercial property. The configuration of the future parking structure on the east side of Wadsworth is unknown. An allotment of parking spaces in that facility for the businesses on the west side of Wadsworth that will permanently and/or temporarily lose parking area and/or all vehicle access as a result of the reconstruction process should become part of the RTD/City of Lakewood/CDOT planning process.</p>	<p>Parking at the RTD LRT station is being funded by RTD to provide parking for LRT customers. No parking for commercial businesses on either side of Wadsworth is being proposed or will be permitted at this facility. See also response to Comment 20-1 regarding impacts to parking at the Mauz property.</p>

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Mauz, Weston	Business owner	20-3	The current location of the proposed CDOT detention pond on the 1355 Wadsworth (Crockett) property, immediately south of the Mauz property, displaces a currently productive business and fragments the southwest quarter of the Station Core (Map 1, Map 2).	<p>CDOT is required by federal law to treat stormwater runoff from any project that increases impervious surfaces.</p> <p>The property at 1355 Wadsworth was identified as a total acquisition due to roadway widening and sidewalks; all parking (and access to parking) would be lost for the property, and it would no longer be viable as a commercial property. Because acquisition of the property and relocation of the business was necessary anyway, the location was considered for water quality treatment. In general, CDOT used the following process to determine appropriate locations for water quality basins. First, the water quality capture volume was determined; that is, how much runoff is CDOT responsible for treating? This determined the capacity of water quality treatment systems, such as the size of basins. Second, the boundaries of existing water basins were considered so that water would be treated and discharged in the same basin; that is, water from one basin would not be discharged to another basin, which would potentially affect water rights. Third, the topography and utilities were considered to determine additional constraints that would make a basin location infeasible. Basins generally need to be close to existing creeks so that the piping connections to collect and discharge water are close to the affected water. Finally, designers looked at properties that would be available based on acquisition needs for other project features. As noted, 1355 Wadsworth was identified as an acquisition because of loss of parking (due to roadway widening and sidewalk needs) and was, therefore, considered available to meet water quality needs. See also responses to Comments 24-20 and 24-21, because these are pertinent to your property as well.</p> <p>The final determination and sizing of the water quality basin will be developed during final design. In addition, CDOT will coordinate this design with the City of Lakewood.</p>
Mauz, Weston	Business owner	20-4	The pond at its current proposed location would permanently inhibit redevelopment options for the west side of Wadsworth, including Mauz property, that is across from the Station parking facility and within one block of the Light Rail Station.	<p>As noted in response to Comment 24-20, the sizes and locations of basins have been determined based on existing conditions and preliminary engineering. All redevelopment, including commercial redevelopment, must comply with water quality treatment requirements. The RTD station area also will require permanent water quality treatment; however, plans are still under development, so the type, size, and location for that treatment are uncertain. As noted in response to Comment 24-21, CDOT is willing to consider partnering with a public entity such as Lakewood and/or RTD for joint water quality treatment if such a joint venture would be feasible and practical. CDOT would also consider options for water quality treatment that might complement private development. For instance, if properties were aggregated and a specific development plan was proposed, CDOT would consider an alternative location for a water quality basin as long as another similarly-sized basin could be implemented within the larger development to meet CDOT's water quality treatment requirements. CDOT will work with Lakewood during final design to review any land use changes or development plans that may arise between now and the time the US 6/Wadsworth project is funded and implemented. Should the project be funded and implemented prior to private redevelopment in this area, the basin location would influence the redevelopment scenarios but would not inhibit all redevelopment options</p>

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Mauz, Weston	Business owner	20-5	The suggested alternative location indicated at the south end of the 7590 W Colfax property (FirstBank of Colorado) places the pond in a currently open greenspace in the northeast quarter of the Station Core. The alternative location is at the corner of a block where business access and land use potential are not immediately or permanently compromised.	for the parcel. The alternative location is outside the project limits for this project and represents similar redevelopment potential as the parcels on the west side of Wadsworth. See also response to Comment 20-4.
Gurley, J	Private citizen	21-1	Having used the 6th and Wadsworth interchange for several decades without incident my question is: Why change what isn't broken? Every stoplight added increases the likelihood of serious accidents, clogged traffic, and extra pollution from idling vehicles. The cloverleaf design has proven itself over 70 or more years. Adding another signalized intersection within a block of the existing one spells "gridlock." Replacing a cloverleaf with a left turn across heavy traffic invites accidents - accidents cloverleafs [sic] eliminate.	The cloverleaf interchange no longer operates efficiently or meets safety needs, as described in Chapter 1 of the EA. The cloverleaf interchange design did operate well originally with the lower traffic volumes and rural setting of the 1950s. Over the past 50 years, the area around the US 6 and Wadsworth interchange has changed considerably and, consequently, traffic volumes have increased, making this interchange design no longer able to operate effectively. As indicated by the traffic analysis, the Build Alternative (tight diamond with loop) will eliminate the existing critical weaving sections between the loop ramps, which are a source of US 6 congestion and traffic crashes. The signalized intersections introduced are expected to operate without congestion (at level of service C or better during peak hours) and can be integrated into the existing system to maintain progression between adjacent traffic signals. With the elimination of the weaving sections, the high number of side-swipe and rear-end crashes will likely be reduced, and left turns that are introduced at the traffic signals will be operated with red arrow traffic signals, reducing accident potential at these intersections. Air quality analysis conducted for the EA suggests air quality will improve, rather than decline, as a result of the Build Alternative.
Gurley, J	Private citizen	21-2	Is this a "stimulated make-work project?"	No. If the commenter is referring to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds, also known as the stimulus package, this project did not meet the requirements to receive money because it was not "shovel ready" at the time that funding was allocated.
Gurley, J	Private citizen	21-3	Leave the existing design alone. Adjust the lane striping and speed limits for on/off traffic but let the proven engineering design do its job. Perhaps you could crack down on the texting, phoning, eating, and drinking drivers instead. (*The "weaving" of traffic is a basic driving skill. People who cannot manage the task can't heed stop signals and turn arrows either.)	The on- and off-ramp acceleration and deceleration lengths are shorter than required for design speeds and traffic volumes, and adjusting striping will not alleviate the problems with merging or weaving in these short distances. Reconstructing the interchange with a new cloverleaf and adding auxiliary lanes to eliminate weaving was considered but rejected because this design would have substantially higher effects on private property, streams and gulches, and other environmental resources around the interchange and along US 6. A partial cloverleaf interchange with two loops in opposing quadrants (northwest and southeast) was also considered but the environmental and social impacts of this alternative outweighed the traffic benefits. The tight diamond with loop, the Build Alternative, represents the best balance of impacts and operational efficiency. (CDOT is not responsible for enforcing driving behaviors, only for providing and maintaining state highways.)
Gurley, J	Private citizen	21-4	This appears to be an unneeded, unwise, air quality killing, public boondoggle and waste of public funds.	As described in Chapter 1 of the EA, the US 6/Wadsworth project is needed to improve safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists; improve operational efficiency of the interchange and along Wadsworth; meet current and future traffic demands; and support multi-modal connections. Many stakeholders consider fixing the problems with the

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
				US 6/Wadsworth interchange and the Wadsworth corridor between 4th and 14th Avenues to be among the highest priorities of the transportation needs in the western metropolitan area. In addition to addressing transportation needs, the project would improve air quality (please refer to the <i>Air Quality Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA).
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-1	This is a project that is very much needed for the city, but it will negatively affect the residents. After reviewing the EA, we feel there are many areas that are too conservative (underestimated) regarding impacts, or does not have proper definition, references, and real time measurements for comparison.	Comment noted. The EA has been evaluated by FHWA, CDOT, other public agencies, and the public, and has been determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, impacts of the proposed project, and appropriate mitigation measures. Based on consideration of the EA analysis, and public and agency comments, FHWA has made a decision to issue a FONSI and proceed with implementation of the Build Alternative.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-2	This project would be better served by having a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) done. We would urge the US EPA to review this EA pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) due to fugitive dust emissions and no apparent plans for effective dust control. At a minimum, appropriate monitoring should be utilized, including PM-10 monitors. The EPA should also evaluate the short and long term effects of the demolition and construction for excess noise and environmental release of pollutants to local environs and residents.	An EA is conducted to determine whether there will be a significant environmental impact. Because this study resulted in a finding of no significant impact, further analysis in the form of an EIS is not required. The EPA, while not required by law or regulation to review EAs but rather only EISs, was invited to participate in scoping and was provided a review copy of the EA. EPA did not identify any environmental or other concerns associated with the US 6/Wadsworth project or the NEPA process followed by CDOT, and did not provide any official comments to the EA. See responses to Comments 11-1 and 18-1 for responses regarding construction-related noise and air pollution, respectively. Appendix B provides mitigation measures to control dust emissions.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-3	The CDOT Noise Analysis Procedure Sound Pressure Levels graphic from public meetings appears to equate expected construction noise at 50 feet to being between 70 to 90 decibels (<i>this will damage hearing</i>). We took our calibrated digital noise meter, and found just sitting at the intersection at 5th and Wadsworth during a light traffic time (no construction), captured readings of 65 to 70 decibels. CDOT's document compares their expected 70-90 decibel range noise from construction to a motorcycle or semi truck driving by.	As explained in response to Comment 11-1, construction noise would be intermittent and would occasionally but not consistently reach levels of 70 to 90 dBA during the construction period. As noted in Appendix B to the FONSI, CDOT will comply with all local and state noise requirements for limiting construction noise. Regarding damage to hearing, the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) recommends hearing protection for workers who will be exposed to noise levels in excess of 85 dBA for 8 hours. OSHA's regulation states that a worker's exposure to noise should not be more than 90 dBA for an 8 hour day. The exposure can be increased by 5 dBA for each halving of time exposed. For example, a worker could be exposed to 95 dBA for 4 hours, 100 dBA for 2 hours, etc. Therefore, construction noise levels of 90 dBA are not expected to cause hearing damage to residents because a) they will not be exposed for 8 hours a day, and b) the levels will not always be this high; in fact, there will often be no significant construction noise (see response to Comment 11-1). As for the readings of 65 to 70 dBA at 5th and Wadsworth, these are consistent with the EA analysis that measured 71 dBA along Wadsworth. All local and state construction noise ordinances will be followed.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-4	The State of Colorado allowable noise levels are cited as 55 decibels during the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and 50 dBA between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our ambient background noise at our home location outdoor patio is already at 55 dBA from local/US 6 traffic. The World Health Organization defines noise annoyance levels to be between 50 to 55 decibels, and hearing impairment levels start at 70 decibels.	The State of Colorado's noise statute (Article 12, Noise Abatement), section 25-12-103, paragraph 5 states that, "Construction projects shall be subject to the maximum permissible noise levels specified for industrial zones for the period within which construction is to be completed pursuant to any applicable construction permit issued by proper authority or, if no time limitation is imposed, for a reasonable period of time for completion of project." The limit for industrial zones is 80 dBA during the daytime. FHWA and CDOT, however, recognize the potentially adverse human and environmental effects of noise, specifically highway and roadway noise, and their policies are informed by evaluation and research on the topic. FHWA has extensive information on its website about highway noise, methodologies for measuring noise and its effects, and procedures for noise abatement or mitigation. Please refer to http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/probresp.htm . See also responses to Comment 22-3 regarding hearing impairment and Comment 22-15 regarding intermittent exposure.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-5	We are particularly interested in the anticipated hours of operation for this project. Will CDOT be doing construction work overnight to lessen the impact on commuter traffic? What about significant impacts to local residents located around this construction activity? We feel CDOT's analysis has made wrong assumptions based on flawed data or information. This requires further analysis and remedies.	As stated in Appendix B to the EA, CDOT has committed to limiting work to daytime hours when possible. While there may be times when nighttime construction is necessary, noise during construction must comply with state and local requirements. Please consider that disturbances during construction (mostly related to the realignment of frontage road at this location), will vary from day to day, often with weeks of little to no construction activity near any one residence. As noted in response to Comment 22-1, the EA has been evaluated by FHWA, CDOT, other public agencies, and the public, and has been determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, impacts of the proposed project, and appropriate mitigation measures. It is not clear what data or assumptions are being questioned.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-6	The previous CDOT project that was adjacent to our property at Stonebridge Townhomes B Building (most NW building) was the construction of the US 6 Noise Wall, about 5 years or so ago. The workers on this wall construction told us that the noise impact study did not take into consideration 2nd floor living, which applies to our building. Because the wall is not tall enough to be effective, it merely pushes the sound up and over to our building. This is a major flaw with highway projects. The noise and vibration estimates are too conservative, as our topography causes the noise and vibration to be funneled, or to flow in our direction through "city canyons" created by the buildings and fences.	See responses to Comments 7-1, 17-1, 18-2, 18-3, and 19-8 for responses about noise walls increasing noise levels, reflection from noise walls, and procedures related to second-floor noise. Response to Comment 22-10 addresses vibration from traffic operations.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-7	The heavy equipment traffic 50 feet north of us was definitely felt in the vibrations conducted to our home, including the “back up” safety alarms, which are extremely loud and disruptive, as they are designed to be. Example: A Pile Driver at 50 feet is listed in other environmental documents as a noise source generating 110 decibels, and that does not include the impact vibrations being conducted. No amount of white noise, ear plugs, or other mitigation can help alleviate impacts like this. Even trying to sleep, the construction vibrations were felt in our building. The US 6/Wadsworth project will be 50-100 feet west of us, certainly close enough to “feel” the vibrations of the heavy equipment, construction activity, and backed up traffic.	Construction noise will be audible and some vibration may be felt, but these conditions will not be persistent in any one location (as explained in responses to Comment 11-1 and 22-16). Noise levels will be required to meet State and local regulations, and vibration levels will be required to remain below building damage thresholds. (Note that although a construction schedule and plan of activities has not been developed at this point, construction activities are not anticipated within 100 feet of your residence.)
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-8	This CDOT EA specifies under Noise Mitigation that the current plan is to extend the noise wall along US 6 west from Wadsworth, all the way to Garrison Street. This is completely unnecessary, and a waste of the taxpayers money, that could be put to better use in this project.	Typically, noise walls are considered only in the immediate vicinity of a project. Although on this project, construction is not anticipated west of the slip ramps near Brentwood. CDOT decided it would be prudent to continue noise walls west to the east side of the Garrison Street bridge to provide continuous noise abatement for residences along US 6 between Wadsworth and Garrison Street. This decision was based on the following factors: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The noise model indicated that noise levels were equal to or exceeded CDOT’s 66 dBA Noise Abatement Criterion at the majority of residences adjacent to US 6, and many experience severe noise impacts (defined as 75 dBA or greater). 2. CDOT has received numerous complaints and comments over the years regarding noise from residents in this area, and the public has requested that CDOT provide noise mitigation. 3. Per CDOT practice, noise mitigation generally extends to a logical end point so that barriers do not end in the middle of a neighborhood or block. In this case, CDOT determined that Garrison Street was a logical termination for the wall.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-9	The installation [of noise walls] itself is highly disruptive to residents and to local structures. If it is not high enough, it merely concentrates and pushes the noise up and out to 2nd floor and higher structures.	See responses to Comments 17-1, 18-3, and 19-8. Note that the proposed reconstructed noise wall is 3 feet higher than the existing wall.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-10	The construction [of noise walls] itself inserts support pylons that act like tuning forks to conduct more vibrations from the highway to local homes and businesses, which is more disruptive than leaving it alone. In this case, the current configuration allows the highway noise to naturally disperse without creating a noise bellows so to speak.	The proposed reconstructed walls would operate very similarly to the current configuration, with the exception that the new walls would be approximately 20 percent higher than the existing walls and would extend farther to the west. It is not clear why this reconfiguration would create the impacts suggested by the commenter. In general, ground vibration from roadways is not perceptible inside adjacent residences. Measurements of ground vibration from roadways typically do not approach those from normal household activities and mechanical systems. Research (Wiss, 1981) has found that vibrations from heavy trucks are not even perceptible at distances greater than 12 feet from the source. Instead of enhancing ground vibrations, it is more likely that noise walls would reduce them because the noise walls would block airborne sound that can itself cause vibrations.
Elofson-Hurst,	Private citizen	22-11	In our neighborhood, when the section of noise wall was installed	See responses to Comments 7-1 and 22-10.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine			on the south side of US 6, East of Wadsworth, we found that the noise and vibration situation was much less before the installation. So this has had a negative impact on our quality of life, not an improvement. It did not reduce noise or vibration, it increased it.	
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-12	The following sound levels table is an excerpt from the Mission Trails Environmental Impact Statement. It provides more realistic sound level comparisons. [citizen included table of typical noise sources and human perception of noise levels]	Thank you for the information. CDOT agrees with these typical noise sources and sound levels, which are similar to those shown at project open houses and available on the project website.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-13	We would like to refer you to the following article(s) regarding the physiological effects of excess noise found at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noise_pollution	Thank you for the information. See response to Comment 22-4.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-14	A second article excerpt of interest is regarding physiological effects of excess noise pollution: http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/sci/A0835810.html	Thank you for the information. See response to Comment 22-4.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-15	There are a few excerpts from the WHO Guidelines for Community Noise document that we feel are directly pertinent to our concerns about prolonged elevated construction noise so close to our residence.[citizen included 2 pages of excerpts from WHO Guidelines for Community Noise and provided the complete 66 page document as an attachment.]	As noted in response to Comment 22-4, FHWA is aware of research regarding negative effects of noise. The WHO report cited does not support the conclusion that intermittent exposure to construction noise over the 2-year construction period proposed by CDOT would result in the magnitude of adverse health or psychological impacts described by commenter. Short-term construction noise resulting from the Build Alternative is not the type of noise exposure that is described in the WHO (and OSHA) guidelines, which is generally related to long-term occupational noise exposure. CDOT has committed to appropriate mitigation measures for construction noise, as reflected in Appendix B to the FONSI.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-16	We would like to offer you some comparisons from a very helpful source regarding the impacts of vibration: http://www.consultnet.ie/environmental%20vibration.htm	Thank you for the information. Please see response to Comment 22-10. As noted in the information provided, vibration can be a concern during construction activities, such as pile driving, bridge demolition, blasting, etc. For construction of the US 6/Wadsworth project, these activities would not occur near enough to residential structures to cause damage from vibration. (Research [Wiss, 1981] finds the threshold for residential building damage from vibratory pile driving to be about 50 feet. (The previous construction used drilled caissons, which creates lower vibrations; research suggests this activity must be within 3 feet of buildings to cause damage.) The construction contractor will be required to comply with CDOT <i>Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction</i> and adhere to industry standard thresholds for building damage. This information has been added to Section 4.4 and Appendix B of the FONSI.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-17	Here are the noise limits according to the State of Colorado and the City of Lakewood: Colorado Noise Statute Source: http://www.nonoise.org/lawlib/states/colorado/colorado.htm	FHWA and CDOT are aware of these regulations and comply with their requirements during construction. See response to Comment 22-4.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and	Private citizen	22-18	Short and long term noise and vibration disturbances of this magnitude, and at this close proximity to residents creates	Vibration from construction activities would be short-term and intermittent during the construction period. Research suggests that vibration may be

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Paula Elofson-Gardine			conditions for greater stress and sleep loss. This impacts people's health and welfare by weakening immune systems and impacting chronic conditions such as: musculo-skeletal disorders such as arthritis, fibromyalgia; asthma, allergies, and post traumatic stress syndrome symptoms, etc.	perceptible but is unlikely to be disturbing to humans unless construction activities occur close (between 7 and 50 feet) of residences (Wiss, 1981). See responses to Comments 11-1, 22-4, 22-10, 22-15, and 22-16.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-19	The pylons placed for the US 6 sound wall conducts vibrations that were previously undetected. The highway noise was reasonable before the noise wall was constructed. After completion, the noise wall concentrated (increased) and bounced that noise to our 2nd floor bedrooms and patio areas in such a way that people have to raise their voices to be heard. The highway noise is now heard in the courtyard on the south side of our building, echoing to both bedrooms on front and back side of the building. Since the US 6 sound wall was installed, when heavy trucks, buses, or motorcycles pass by on US 6 that shift their load or use their air brakes, we feel the "clunk" in our building thanks to the vibration conduction by the noise wall supports. This has added stress cracks to our carport, garage, back patio, and north wall in our lower level basement that were not there previous to the installation of new windows in 2004.	See response to Comment 7-1 in regards to changes in noise levels due to installation of noise walls. As noted in response to Comment 22-10, the level of vibration needed to cause building damage is well above that produced by construction activities; airborne and ground-borne vibration from roadway traffic is an even lower threshold (less than 2 feet).
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-20	This US 6/Wadsworth Project EA does not sufficiently address seismic vibration conducted to our buildings from heavy trucks, equipment, concrete demolition, jackhammers, earthmoving, and other construction activities. This type of project also causes settling in our area, as demonstrated by the construction of the US 6 noise wall.	See responses to Comments 17-2 and 22-16.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-21	Building demolition and tree removal will necessitate the use of chainsaws across the street and behind us, so we will be surrounded by inordinate levels of nuisance noise and vibration that can irreversibly damage our hearing.	Chainsaws are indeed loud, and can produce over 100 dBA at the operator position and 75 dBA at 50 feet. Noise from the use of chainsaws during construction would be governed by local and state regulations. Beyond approximately 50 feet, chainsaws do not produce noise levels capable of hearing damage on a short-term exposure basis.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-22	Sound decibels of heavy trucks and equipment being started up and driven back and forth are too conservative in this EA. There will be multiple sources with loud or sharp retorts (air brakes, shifting gears, horns, start up idling, etc.), that have not been accounted for in the estimates. We are asking CDOT to address the multiplicative effect of the cumulative noise and vibration from all sources associated with the project, added to existing levels of noise and vibration.	The noise levels for construction vehicles provided in the EA are average levels. It is correct that there will be events that will create louder levels on a short-term basis. It is important to consider that construction noise will vary from day to day at any one residence, with many days of no active work. As noted in response to Comment 11-1, construction noise is related to the one or two loudest pieces of equipment operating at any given time. CDOT will comply with state and local standards for noise during construction. See also response to Comment 22-16.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-23	Instead of hearing and seeing local squirrels, birds, foxes, hawks, etc., we will be hearing the blaring heavy truck horns, back up alarms, and demolition activity for the duration of the project, which could be 2 years. After the project, we will no longer be able to enjoy the changing of the leaf colors on the trees because they will have been removed, and many of the local wildlife may have moved on by then to get away from the project irritants. These are significant impacts, not a FONSI. CDOT needs to do a more realistic comparison of the synergistic effect of these multiple sources of noise and vibration pollution impacts.	See response to Comment 11-1. As noted in Section 3.14 of the EA and supporting information in Appendix C, the project is located in a highly urbanized area with limited habitat and species that are adapted to urban activities. Vegetation that is removed during construction will be replaced with native vegetation and established as soon as feasible. The EA acknowledges that wildlife may be displaced during the construction period but would return once active construction is complete. While some trees will need to be removed, many will remain and/or be replaced. Neither the long-term or short-term impacts associated with vegetation loss or habitat disruption are significant impacts that will permanently affect the ecological conditions of the project area.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-24	It is highly likely that there will be NO public street parking in front of our townhome complex on Vance with the additional traffic flow coming through our neighborhood which will impact our already limited parking available to us inside the complex.	The Build Alternative does not change the street width of Vance Street and, therefore, would not affect public street parking. Traffic on Vance Street also would not change noticeably under the proposed reconstruction. Vance Street currently carries traffic destined for the frontage road and would continue to do so under the Build Alternative.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-25	Behind our Building, which is on the north end of the complex, the driveway to our carports and garages is an elevated dead end with steps at the end. Will CDOT open this up so we have options to drive all the way through to the east parking lot so we can reach the other two exits? Either way, ingress and egress will be made more difficult by the increase in local traffic.	CDOT does not propose any changes to access to your townhome complex. Existing accesses will be maintained. See response to Comment 22-24 regarding local traffic patterns.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-26	If a second exit is created behind our building to give us another through way, we will lose more parking spaces on the east end of our building. This will also increase noisy traffic attempting to get through our back area – making us more vulnerable to crime as well.	CDOT does not propose to open up additional access at the east end of your driveway. See also response to Comment 22-25.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-27	When the US 6 highway is cleaned, it sends clouds of dust covering our cars, balconies and patio, necessitating closure of all windows and doors. It leaves a fine layer of dust in our home on everything (furniture, T.V.'s, lamps, computers, appliances, cabinets, picture frames, plants, flooring...) that needs cleanup the next day. If weather permits, most people want to open their doors and windows to let fresh air and sunshine in. With additional particulate and fugitive dust, that will be a health concern. The particulate from the US 6/Wadsworth project, along with "unknown" hazards potentially to include lead based paint, asbestos, old transformers with PCB's from the older buildings being demolished, and other potential hazardous chemicals/materials expected to be encountered during construction will be greater than what is generated by highway cleaning, especially during demolition and grading activities.	See responses to Comments 18-1 and 22-41.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-28	Our neighborhood It [sic] is being changed from a quiet residential community to one with large volumes of cut-through traffic as we will now be situated alongside an on-ramp of a busy highway -- as you are moving it closer to us. There needs to be a relocation option for those local residents desiring relocation from a neighborhood that will have its character substantially and negatively affected and changed by the impacts of this project. We feel an EIS is in order because of the air pollution concerns, as well as local flora and fauna effects.	Comment noted. The Build Alternative would not markedly change the character of your surroundings. Your townhome complex would continue to be located near the eastbound US 6 on-ramp and frontage road but would not be located directly along either. The residence between your townhome and the frontage road would remain in place so your property would not be situated along the highway but would be buffered by a residence, frontage road, and noise wall. See responses to Comment 22-2 regarding the need for an EIS, Comment 22-24 regarding traffic on Vance Street, and Comment 22-23 regarding flora and fauna.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-29	You did lots of public outreach to many neighborhood communities, including school principals, businesses, Eiber, O’Kane, and Morse Park neighborhood associations, but failed to contact those closest to the US 6/Wadsworth interchange project. We have concerns about the lack of outreach or direct contact with our community, a maximally exposed/impacted population located on Vance Street next to the project. Our neighborhood should have been involved in the 2007 scoping period. Stonebridge Townhomes comprise the addresses from 420 to 582 Vance Street. How could you miss 84 homes adjacent to the project, yet do outreach to these neighborhood associations so much farther removed? The first notice we received was a card announcing the July 2009 public meeting, when we were out of town. After we inadvertently found out about the project from an insert in a free newspaper in Green Mountain, and called to find out why we weren’t informed, we received the Summer 2009 Newsletter.	See response to Comment 19-1.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-30	Stonebridge residents and the HOA Board appear to have not received any direct mailings until we requested it several months ago. We asked the Homestead Management Representative Michael Boards if Stonebridge Townhomes management or the board had any meetings with CDOT about this project and we were told no, there had been no meetings. There is no substitute for contacting each and every homeowner surrounding a project such as this.	See response to Comment 19-1.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-31	Our townhome complex with 84 homes and between 168 to 336 adults and/or children is on Vance Street, between 5th Avenue, and the US 6 Frontage Road. There are seven (7) buildings designated A through G in our complex. Three (3) of these buildings, A, B (ours), and G, will be maximally impacted by the sound, vibration, fugitive dust, and other irritants or pollutants from this project. B Building is the most NW building that is closest to Vance and the 6th Avenue Frontage Road. This building will bear the greatest impact from this project.	Your townhome complex was within the area of impact studied for the EA, and impacts related to noise, vibration, fugitive dust, and hazardous materials are assessed in the EA. Mitigation measures have been included in the project and are reflected in Appendix B to the EA and Section 4.4 of the FONSI. See also responses to Comments 11-1, 18-1, and 22-16.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-32	“Without noise mitigation, projected noise for residences along US 6 would increase 2 to 7 decibels.” We have reasonable cause to believe that this is an understatement. The simple addition of the noise wall along US 6 actually increased the noise to our building by 10 to 15 decibels (dBA). We have a calibrated Digital Sound Level Meter that we have used periodically that has validated this concern.	As noted, the Build Alternative does include noise walls as mitigation, and an increase in noise is not expected. The anticipated reduction in noise can be gauged in the project area by comparing existing noise for properties east and west of Wadsworth where noise walls are present or not. Those properties west of Wadsworth where no noise walls exist experience noise levels 10 dBA or more higher than those properties, like yours, located east of Wadsworth, indicating that noise walls are effective at reducing traffic noise, particularly for properties closest to the traffic source.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-33	“Construction equipment and activities would intermittently generate loud noise.” This is another understatement that needs to be defined more completely. Our references indicate that the intermittent loud noise can spike from 70 (moderately loud, defined by WHO has already damaging to hearing) to 110 decibels (equivalent to a Pile Driver at 50 feet away, or a Commercial jet taking off at 200 feet). This is not MINOR disruptive noise, but would be considered to be very loud nuisance noise that can be damaging to resident’s health and hearing. This does not include impact vibration and multiple sources. For night time construction activity, the City of New Jersey adds 10 dBA to noise estimates to account for what should be “quiet” residential sleep times, and how much more disruptive construction activity would be.	See responses to Comments 22-3, 22-5, 22-16, 22-21, 22-22, and 22-23.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-34	“Approximately 31.1 acres of property would be required from 96 ownerships; acquisitions would range from small slivers of property to entire parcels.” Is this an underestimate of property acquisition?	No. Estimates of ROW acquisition were carefully analyzed and discussed with property owners based on preliminary design. Impacts were determined based on the methods described in response to Comment 17-3. All efforts will be made during final design to reduce the estimated amount of ROW required for the Build Alternative.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-35	“14 residences and 28 businesses would be displaced.” We feel this is a misrepresentation. Consider the 84 residences at Stonebridge, containing 168-336 individuals, and the two large apartment buildings that sit between Webster and Vance Streets. These two neighborhood complexes are sitting adjacent to the construction zone. Those residents that express an interest to be relocated that live in these extremely close residences should be given the option to be relocated with property acquired from owners, and relocation expenses provided.	Section 3.4.2 of the EA describes the estimated residential and business displacements. Efforts will be made during final design to reduce the number of displacements from those identified in the EA. The Stonebridge townhomes are not identified in this list because they do not meet the requirements for relocation under CDOT’s ROW acquisition policies and procedures. The only persons that are eligible to receive ROW acquisition and relocation benefits are those whose property is acquired for the project. Since no acquisition from this property is contemplated, none of the owners, tenants, or other interested parties is eligible to receive ROW acquisition and relocation benefits. See also response to Comment 17-3.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-36	“Construction could disrupt access and travel through the project area for residents, businesses, and emergency service providers.” This is a major issue that is unacceptable. CDOT needs to come up with solutions. How are residents supposed to have ingress and egress from their homes during this project, which could last between 1 to 2 years? How are people going to go out, get groceries, and get them back into their homes, especially in inclement weather? What about at-risk children, adults, and medical responders? How about the disabled, such as one of our family members? Like any other neighborhood, we too have emergencies.	Access to and from residences and businesses will be maintained at all times. As noted in Appendix B to the EA, Summary of Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments, CDOT is committed to maintaining access for local residents and coordinating with emergency service providers throughout construction. Although overall construction of the Build Alternative could take as long as 2 years, each access point will be affected only during the period that construction occurs at or near that location; even during active construction at a particular location, access would not be continually disrupted, an alternative access will be provided, and permanent access will be restored as soon as construction is complete. See also responses to Comments 3-1 and 3-2.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-37	<p>"No disproportionately high and adverse impacts would occur in areas of minority or low-income populations." Are you kidding? This is a wrong hypothesis/assertion. There is a mix of population from mid-level income to low-level income in this neighborhood. In particular, we would bring your attention to the "Near [sic] Belmar Apartments", previously known as the "Webster Street Apartments" located between Webster and Vance, just south of the buildings slated to be removed along the current US 6 Avenue Frontage Road. This particular set of two (2) buildings is known for their high numbers of LOW INCOME Section 8 Housing residents. They will be right there, within 20 feet of the construction. Our Stonebridge Townhomes Building B, is on Vance, adjacent to the buildings slated to be removed in your EA. It is about 50 to 100 feet from the construction zone. There is a mix of rentals and individually owned property at Stonebridge Townhomes. The homes that have low income people in them are marked by greater numbers of individuals living in those homes to contribute to the overhead.</p>	<p>Adverse effects are considered disproportionate if they are predominantly borne by a minority or low-income population or would be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude to minority or low-income populations compared to the effects on non-minority and non-low-income populations. As explained in the EA, this is not the case for either of the locations noted. The EA followed FHWA and CDOT approved methodology for assessing potential impacts to minority or low-income populations. The southeast quadrant of the interchange does not, according to census records and consultation with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other sources, contain higher-than-average numbers of low-income residents compared with Lakewood as a whole. (Environmental justice guidelines require assessment of low-income populations, not individual households that might be located within a mixed-income area.)</p> <p>The EA acknowledges that construction will have some temporary adverse impacts to surrounding residences and commits to implementing mitigation measures to minimize those impacts. Please refer to the <i>Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA for a more detailed discussion and explanation of the methodologies and analysis conducted to support environmental justice impact conclusions.</p>
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-38	<p>Environmental Justice guidelines should tell you that there is an inequity here, especially considering that CDOT has done active outreach to neighborhood associations farther removed from this construction site at US 6/Wadsworth than for residents at Stonebridge and the Near Belmar Apartments. You did outreach to those property owners that would be directly displaced, but failed to do direct outreach to residents RIGHT at and surrounding the construction zone that would be maximally impacted by the disruption and pollution of dismantling buildings, heavy truck traffic, earthmoving and the like.</p>	<p>See response to Comment 19-1 regarding outreach efforts for the EA. Specialized outreach to minority and low-income populations is described in Chapter 5 of the EA and the <i>Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA. See also response to Comment 22-37.</p>
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-39	<p>The EA also mentions: "Noise walls will be constructed to reduce noise noticeably at approximately 380 residences." In our case, the noise wall installation did not reduce noise, in fact it INCREASED it significantly by 10 to 15 dBA more than before. It did not address 2nd floor living, as the sound walls bounce the noise around even more so because they are not high enough to shield nearby residences. The conduction of highway vibrations was an additional unexpected "bonus" impact of the US 6 noise wall. You underestimated the number of residences affected, since you appeared to have overlooked the communities of people south and east of the US 6/Wadsworth project.</p>	<p>See responses to Comments 7-1, 17-1, and 22-10.</p>

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-40	We are sisters that have lived at our current location for over ten years. In that time, we have remodeled our home extensively, including enclosing the patio, installing a back access door to the garage, replacing all of the windows (bay window, kitchen garden window, energy efficient front window, two energy efficient windows downstairs), security storm doors front and back, remodeled three (2 full & 1 ½ bath) bathrooms twice, including installing a whirlpool tub in one, and putting in French Doors downstairs in preparation for an additional bathroom and bedroom installation. We also have recently replaced the furnace and hot water heater. We were preparing to replace sliding glass balcony doors with French Doors to the two balconies; add another full bathroom and moving laundry facilities to the lower level (basement), replacing carpeting with bamboo flooring in preparation to remodel the kitchen and dining area. Now that we have become aware of the severe impacts of this project, we are NOT moving forward with improvements to our property, as we recognize it may be better to be relocated, due to excessive construction impacts of sound, vibration, vehicular traffic including heavy equipment backup alarms (ear piercing), air brakes, rumbling startups, fugitive dust, structural building issues (plumbing pipes, settling/roofing).	Comment noted. Your property does not qualify for acquisition or relocation, as noted in responses to Comments 17-3, 19-7, 19-9, 22-35, 22-44, 22-45, and 22-46. The EA analysis does not support your conclusion that impacts would be severe, either during or after construction.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-41	The “unknown” contamination is also of concern with the age of the properties slated for demolition. This poses serious negative impacts to our stress levels and health via noise, vibration, and air contamination.	See responses to Comments 11-1, 18-1, and 22-16. Contamination is a concern in locations where property acquisition and ground disturbance is anticipated. CDOT conducted a broad review of hazardous material handling and waste sites in the project area in accordance with professionally accepted standards for this type of analysis. The review revealed 17 sites of potential concern (as described in Section 3.9 of the EA), none of which is located near your residence. Ground disturbance will comply with all applicable requirements for the handling of hazardous materials including the completion of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prior to any total property acquisition. A Phase II ESA will then be conducted to characterize, manage, and remediate contaminated properties identified as a concern in Phase I ESAs. A <i>Materials Handling Plan</i> will also be prepared to address contaminated soil and groundwater that may be encountered. An asbestos survey will be conducted and a demolition permit will be obtained prior to the demolition of bridges or buildings. Any asbestos-containing material that is friable or will be friable during construction and demolition activities will be removed prior to demolition.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-42	The anticipated difficult logistics of daily coming and going from our location with construction and traffic impeding our only outlet, with the severe health impacts, daily quality of life issues combined with loss of sleep, makes it now a very undesirable location. We will no longer have trees to look at which have acted as noise & pollution buffers, or the Webster to Vance 6th Avenue Frontage Road buildings acting as similar buffers. You will be substantially changing the character of our neighborhood, and quality of life in a negative way.	Comment noted. See responses to Comments 17-3, 18-3, 19-2, 22-23, 22-25, and 22-26.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-43	An asthmatic since childhood, one family member has had several lung injury incidents involving particulate, asphalt, roofing tar, and diesel fumes from projects. An extreme hypersensitivity reaction closed her lungs down, putting her in critical condition for over 3 months. Some of this treatment necessitated leaving town for a period of time to get out of the local ozone levels for recovery. She is now highly sensitive to environmental pollutants including cigarette smoke, particulates, fugitive dust, asphalt, tar, and diesel fumes. Her critical care pulmonologist advised her that further exposure to these types of pollutants in any significant quantity or chronic exposure could be fatal to her. The impacts of this project pose undue burden to health and welfare.	Comment noted. The Build Alternative includes numerous mitigation measures to limit the emission of environmental pollutants during construction. Air quality is projected to improve in the long term over the existing condition with the implementation of the project, as described in the <i>Air Quality Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-44	Another close member of our family is disabled. She is very sensitive to environmental pollutants and excess noise and vibration levels, due to musculo-skeletal disease and other debilitating conditions. The drastic negative change in daily quality of life with the noise and vibration increases would be overly burdensome for her condition. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) would apply for accommodation by relocation of this individual.	See response to Comment 22-45 (and to previous comments regarding noise and vibration effects). The ADA requires public facilities to be accessible to disabled persons but does not provide any provisions to relocate persons from their residences.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-45	Because of the their pre-existing medical conditions, and the anticipated impacts of noise, vibration, fugitive dust, and other contaminants from this project, we feel it gives us reasonable cause to point out they are candidates for property acquisition and relocation as soon as possible, before this project commences.	Your property does not qualify for acquisition or relocation, as noted in responses to Comments 17-3 and 22-35.
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-46	We are therefore requesting CDOT to acquire our property and relocate us per the "Uniform, Relocation Assistance, and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended." Our neighbors on Webster Street were already notified that their property will be acquired when funding comes through. They received the relocation packet and booklet from CDOT. We are requesting a relocation packet and booklet from CDOT be sent out to us.	All properties identified for either partial or total acquisition were mailed information about the Build Alternative designs and CDOT's ROW acquisition process. This information was not mailed to your residence because CDOT does not require any part of your property to implement the Build Alternative. See responses to Comment 17-3 and 22-35 for a description of how decisions relating to property acquisition are made. Information about CDOT's ROW process is available to all citizens on the project website (US 6Wadsworth.com, Right of Way tab).
Elofson-Hurst, Susan and Paula Elofson-Gardine	Private citizen	22-47	Should CDOT be inclined to relocate us away from this project, we would consider our personal concerns about the project to no longer be valid.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 22-40.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-1	I have read through the Noise Technical Memorandum and feel that the report is incomplete on grounds of the locations where measurement was performed and the mitigation that is proposed.	Comment noted. The noise analysis was conducted according to CDOT's <i>Noise Analysis and Abatement Guidelines</i> (December 2002). Noise modeling for this project was extensive and many walls are recommended to reduce noise levels at residences throughout the project area.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-2	The effect of sound is not only a function of the linear distance from the source, but of topography. At our home, 8230 W. 8th Ave, during the morning (generally 6:00 a.m. to about 9 a.m.) we hear sound that is equally as loud as that within 50 ft of 6th Ave. The noise typically subsides during the day, as indicated in your report, and increases again around the time of the evening rush hour. The loudness is due to the fact that the house sits topographically higher (about 30 ft, based on GPS data) than the highway, and it exceeds COOT's 66 dBA [sic] Noise Abatement Criteria.	To address the effect of topography on noise, the noise model takes into account the elevation of both the road and the residences. As described in the <i>Noise Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix A to the EA, the noise model predicted existing noise levels at the properties east of this residence in the same general topographic location (and closer to both US 6 and Wadsworth) to be between 57 and 59 dBA. Noise levels for properties south of this residence, closer to US 6 but at a lower elevation were predicted to be 57 dBA. These noise levels are audible but fall below CDOT's 66 dBA Noise Abatement Criteria. Existing noise levels would be expected to be lower than this for residences farther removed from US 6 and Wadsworth.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-3	We invite you to measure the sound in the backyard at our house or any of the houses along the street, or we would be happy to furnish you with the supporting data. CDOT's guidelines state that noise mitigation should be considered for any receptor or group of receptors where predicted traffic noise levels, using future traffic volumes and roadway conditions, equal or exceed COOT's Noise Abatement Criteria. My address falls into this category.	See response to Comment 23-2. With the project, noise levels at residences closest to yours (and closer to US 6 and Wadsworth) are predicted to be 59 and 60 dBA, which is below CDOT's 66-dBA Noise Abatement Criteria.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-4	We welcome the implementation of noise walls along 6th Ave, but not if their construction exacerbates the decibel level at our location. Under Noise FAQs, which was part of the Summer 2009 Newsletter of the US 6/Wadsworth Environmental Assessment, Q-15 asks, "How are noise reflections from buildings and barrier walls considered?- the answer was that "some of the sound is diffracted over the barrier. In the case of parallel barriers, however, studies have shown that if two walls are constructed very close together, there is a potential for multiple reflections that may perceptibly increase noise levels." The two sound walls on either side of 6th Ave could act as parallel reflectors.	See responses to Comments 7-1 and 7-2. Because of the distance between the barriers, the use of absorptive materials for noise walls will be considered during final design of the project.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-5	To better ensure that sound at even higher decibel level than at present is not transmitted to nearby residences, I ask that construction material other than concrete be considered for the noise barriers. Concrete is a strong reflector of sound.	See response to Comment 7-2. The use of absorptive materials for noise walls will be considered during final design of the project.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-6	The cost benefit paragraph in the EA does not discuss the construction material of the noise barrier walls, but I suggest that recycled tires be evaluated, similar to that which has been constructed along 6 th Ave between Alkire and Coors streets. It has been called attractive and effective by local residents (Looking at Lakewood, vol. 24, issue 6, December 2008).	As described in the <i>Noise Technical Memorandum</i> , cost-benefit is calculated using a standard unit cost of \$30 per square foot. The effectiveness, durability, and practicality of using recycled tires is still being evaluated, and CDOT is participating with the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) and others in the evaluation of the pilot project that you described along US 6. Please also see Comment 25-2 and its response.
Greenman, Celia	Private citizen	23-7	The objective of mitigation is to provide benefit to a population, but also to not worsen a bad situation for a portion of the population. I suggest that modeling and field tests be performed to determine how rubber would perform with regard to sound absorption, sound reflection, and cost. It could prove a win-win situation and also be highlighted as a "green" project.	Your concern is understood. See responses to Comments 7-2 and 23-6.
Murphy, Bob	City of	24-1	The City believes that improvements to Wadsworth and the	Thank you for your support.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
(Mayor)	Lakewood		Wadsworth/US 6 interchange are greatly needed and appreciates the work to date by the team led by CDOT.	
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-2	Three through lanes in each direction combined with controlled median access will provide significant congestion reduction on Wadsworth.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-3	The US 6/Wadsworth interchange has been identified by DRCOG as one of 18 "chokepoints" on the regional freeway system. The proposed layout is expected to relieve congestion on US 6 traffic flow.	Comment noted.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-4	Controlled median access management on Wadsworth greatly reduces the number of left turn conflicts to/from businesses and side streets.	Comment noted.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-5	Interchange layout eliminates weaving conflicts. On and off ramps include longer acceleration/deceleration merge lanes making it safer to transition between speeds of the interchange ramps, US 6, and Wadsworth.	Comment noted.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-6	Throughout the EA process, citizens identified pedestrian and bicycle safety as one of the most important issues to address (as identified in the Purpose and Need statements on Page 1-1 and the public comment on Page 1-5). The North Wadsworth Boulevard Corridor Plan and other adopted Lakewood plans also identify the need to improve conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users along and across the Wadsworth Boulevard corridor and the Build Alternative provides an excellent opportunity to do so.	Agreed. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility was one of the most important issues raised by the community, and the Build Alternative was developed to significantly improve safety, access, and comfort of multi-modal transportation.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-7	On Page 1-5, Wadsworth Boulevard is identified as "...an important component of bicycle mobility in Lakewood because it offers the only opportunity for bicycles to cross US 6 in the 2.5 mile stretch between Sheridan Boulevard and Garrison Street." Wadsworth Boulevard is a critical link in the Lakewood bicycle system for this reason and it is important to capitalize on the opportunity to provide a safe, convenient crossing of US 6 at Wadsworth Boulevard. With the future light rail station at 13th Avenue and Wadsworth Boulevard, this crossing will become even more important with the expected increase in pedestrians and bicyclists accessing the station from Belmar and other areas south of US 6.	Agreed. The EA acknowledges on page 3-7 that the future light rail station will likely increase pedestrian and bicycle travel along Wadsworth.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-8	On Page 3-7 of the EA, concern is raised about out-of-direction travel or unsafe mid-block crossings by pedestrians on Wadsworth if the pedestrian/bicycle crossing at Lakewood Gulch is not constructed. The proposed new Lakewood Gulch drainage culvert under Wadsworth will include an additional section for a trail crossing. Future plans for trail system along Lakewood Gulch can connect to this new crossing. A future connection from the new Wadsworth sidewalks could also provide a grade separated crossing for pedestrians/bicyclist could eventually be constructed (by others). We support the installation of the widened box culvert during project construction and future completion of this	Thank you for your support.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
			crossing.	
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-9	The EA acknowledges that visibility for pedestrians and bicyclists at the interchange ramps, while slightly improved over existing conditions, would remain poor with the Build Alternative (page 3-7). The EA addresses measures that will be considered during final design to improve visibility and safety of these crossings (Pages 3-7 and 3-8). We strongly support inclusion of these proposed mitigation options.	As noted, additional measures to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety around the interchange (pages 3-7 and 3-8) will be considered and implemented in the final design of the Build Alternative.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-10	Continue sidewalks along Wadsworth (on both the east and west sides) and through the interchange area. Detached sidewalk provides a safer and more comfortable buffer between pedestrians and vehicle traffic	Agreed. The Build Alternative includes detached sidewalks throughout the corridor, except in select locations where detaching the sidewalk would require a residence or business to be relocated. In those locations, an attached sidewalk is proposed to allow the residence or business to remain.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-11	Safer controlled crossings through the interchange area. Potential to incorporate a grade separated (underpass) of the loop ramp in the NW quadrant (determination of feasibility during final design).	Agreed. Please see response to Comment 24-9.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-12	Revised configuration proposed by the neighborhood and adopted as a study recommendation reduces neighborhood cut through traffic in northeast quadrant.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-13	[Improved frontage road] Improves access to adjacent businesses in the northwest quadrant of the interchange.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-14	Three through lanes in each direction on Wadsworth provides for bus stop sites without need for additional turn-out lanes.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-15	Interchange bridge carrying U.S. 6 is long enough to accommodate future transit needs along Wadsworth should they be developed.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-16	Over 2 miles of proposed new noise walls would mitigate noise levels along US 6 between Garrison and Wadsworth. Includes extended noise mitigation around the interchange area.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-17	The City of Lakewood appreciates the opportunity to work with area residents and CDOT to provide input on design elements related to noise mitigation (Page 3-11) during final design.	Thank you for your comment. As noted, CDOT has committed to working with Lakewood on noise wall aesthetics, and this commitment also is reflected in the FONSI.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-18	Drainage culverts and channels will accommodate the look-year [100-year] storm events, reducing the probability of flooding and overtopping of Wadsworth and adjacent properties.	Thank you for your support.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-19	Permanent water quality features provide treatment for surface water runoff	Thank you for your support.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-20	The EA proposes a water quality pond at 1355 Wadsworth Boulevard. This parcel is zoned Transit Mixed Use-Station Core and is less than one block from the future light rail station at 13th Avenue and Wadsworth Boulevard. A great deal of planning has been done for this area with substantial effort from the City and area citizens. The area was rezoned by the City of Lakewood in 2007 to allow for higher-density transit oriented development (Station Core Area). Future aggregation of parcels is very likely because of the proximity to the Wadsworth major light rail station. Locating a water quality pond on this parcel is not conducive to implementing the long-term vision of the adopted plans and adopted zoning.	As part of the EA, CDOT conducted analysis of water quality treatment requirements and determined locations that would be suitable for water quality treatment facilities, such as the basin proposed at 1355 Wadsworth. The sizes and locations of basins have been determined based on existing conditions and preliminary engineering of the Build Alternative. Another key criterion to siting water quality basins for the Build Alternative was to look for opportunities to use "remainder" parcels that were identified as total acquisitions based on other roadway requirements. This parcel met those requirements and, therefore, was identified as a water quality basin location. Water quality treatment is a requirement for the Build Alternative, which is consistent with Lakewood's plans and zoning. Water quality treatment also would be required for any future redevelopment within the Station Area Core. For these reasons, the basin would be consistent with adopted plans and zoning. As noted in the response to the next comment (Comment 24-21), CDOT is open to cooperating with public entities to find alternative methods or locations for achieving water quality treatment. See also responses to Comments 20-3 through 20-5.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-21	We understand that detention / water quality facilities in this area are necessary for the Build Alternative and based on current conditions, the identified parcel may be an appropriate location for a water quality pond. However, during final design we would support CDOT in considering locally regionalized detention water quality possibilities and/or coordinating these efforts with private development in the area to design a combined water quality detention feature that would be an amenity to the Station Core area.	CDOT is open to working with Lakewood or another public entity, such as RTD, to consider joint or regional water quality treatment. Joint private-public water quality treatment is not feasible due to permit conditions, maintenance requirements, and other logistical considerations. CDOT would also consider options for water quality treatment that might complement private development. For instance, if properties were aggregated and a specific development plan was proposed, CDOT would consider an alternative location for a water quality basin as long as another similarly sized basin could be implemented within the larger development to meet CDOT's water quality treatment requirements. CDOT will work with Lakewood during final design to review any land use changes or development plans that may arise between now and the time the US 6/Wadsworth project is funded and implemented.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-22	Final design and right-of-way negotiations by CDOT will coordinate with Lakewood to address compatibility with land-use plans and potential allowances for nonconforming properties that may result from right-of-way acquisition	Thank you for your comment. CDOT appreciates the opportunity to work cooperatively with Lakewood to minimize disruption to residents and businesses from the ROW acquisition process.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-23	Throughout the EA, references are made to zoning nonconformance that could occur as a result of a construction project. On July 13, 2009 the City of Lakewood adopted an ordinance amending Article 17-16 of the Lakewood Municipal Code. The amendment related to the effects of acquisitions for, or construction of, public projects on individual properties. The ordinance amendment ensures that existing parcels and structures remain conforming, when appropriate. A copy of the ordinance is enclosed.	Clarification of the new ordinance and its requirements has been added to Section 4.4 and Appendix B of the FONSI. Lakewood's non-conforming use ordinance clarifies options for property owners with non-conforming uses that result from acquisition of private property for public projects (such as the US 6/Wadsworth project). The revised ordinance now allows a permanent variance for a parcel or structure to be legally non-conforming if the variance is not more than 20 percent. If the property acquisition causes a variance of more than 20 percent and creates a hazardous or otherwise unreasonable situation, the parcel or structure would be considered non-conforming and subject to the City's non-conforming standards.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-24	On Page 3-23, the EA states that Lakewood is "...considering rezoning Colfax Avenue to promote pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented development." The Colfax Avenue rezoning process occurred concurrently with the EA project. On May 11, 2009, the Lakewood City Council approved the legislative rezoning of properties along Colfax Avenue within the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority boundaries to the new Colfax Mixed Use Zone District. The zoning became effective on June 29, 2009.	Thank you for the clarification. This information has been added to Section 4.4 of the FONSI.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-25	Also on Page 3-23, the EA references the Wadsworth Boulevard Strategic Plan. This Plan was repealed on June 22, 2009 and the North Wadsworth Boulevard Corridor Plan was adopted on this date. The Plan envisions Wadsworth Boulevard as a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly corridor.	Thank you for the clarification. This information has been added to Section 4.4 of the FONSI.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-26	The City of Lakewood appreciates the opportunity to work closely with CDOT during the final design phase on the aesthetics of project design elements. The EA recognizes that the new interchange has the potential to establish visual distinction and to be a gateway and a positive image for Lakewood (Page 3-45).	CDOT looks forward to continuing the cooperative partnership with Lakewood in the design and construction of the Build Alternative.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-27	Environmental assessment document completed in two years (compared to the typical 3 to 4 year schedule).	Comment noted.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-28	Document and streamlined process being recognized by CDOT and FHWA as a model for future EA studies.	Comment noted.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-29	Efficient and effective public outreach effort. Received numerous compliments on the team's ability to keep stakeholders informed and up-to-date on progress of the study, issues of concern, and decisions made throughout the study schedule.	Thank you for your support. Community input has been important in shaping the Build Alternative.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-30	Agency charter with key participants provided structured guidelines for coordination, review, and approval roles for primary team members.	CDOT agrees that the charter was helpful and appreciates the partnership with Lakewood established and followed in this charter.
Murphy, Bob (Mayor)	City of Lakewood	24-31	I reiterate the appreciation the City has for the project team's work with the community during the development of the environmental assessment. We look forward to continued progress toward fully implementing the improvements.	Thank you for your support. CDOT looks forward to continuing to work with Lakewood and community members in the design and construction of this important project.
Villano, Michael	Private citizen	25-1	When you construct the US 6 soundwall, it would be nice if you extended it along the highway all the way to the west side of the Garrison Street overpass, like the soundwalls on the elevated portion of I-70 over the 20th Avenue overpass. For those of us not immediately adjacent to the highway, the worst noise comes from the elevated portion of US 6.	As noted in response to Comment 22-8, extending the noise wall to Garrison Street was included based on a logical end point rather than project effects or requirements for noise mitigation. As described in the <i>Noise Technical Memorandum</i> (included in Appendix A), the noise model did show a benefit to residential receptors northeast of Garrison interchange (east of the commercial businesses near the interchange) from the proposed 15-foot wall without a wall over the Garrison Street bridge. Further, extending the noise walls to the west side of the Garrison Street overpass is not feasible at this time because the bridge was not designed to handle the load of the wall and the bridge is not slated for reconstruction at this time. See response to Comment 22-8 for a discussion of the terminus for the noise walls.
Villano, Michael	Private citizen	25-2	Please, please, please construct the soundwall out of something like the tan block construction of the existing soundwall east of	Your preferences are noted. The City of Lakewood will have the opportunity to provide input on design elements related to noise

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
			Wadsworth, and not the horrible pink demonstration soundwalls between Simms Street and Indiana. The adobe/stucco/used tire demonstration soundwall is perhaps the ugliest thing I've ever seen. Even grey patterned concrete would be better than the pink stuff.	mitigation, including grading, landscaping, color, and material of any noise walls. Please also see Comment 23-6 and its response.
Villano, Michael	Private citizen	25-3	Finally, I assume the soundwall is going between the frontage road and highway, rather than outside the frontage road like it is east of Sheridan. The piecemeal approach east of Sheridan is nearly worthless.	Yes, because of the need to tie side streets and driveways into the frontage roads, the walls proposed west of Wadsworth would be located along the highway.
Koclanes, George Peter	Olympia Investments	26-1	...from the Proposed Project presentations at the public meetings, it is clear that the Proposed Project would have a significant and material negative impact on the Olympia Property. We stand to lose the entire Olympia Property.	Comment noted. You are correct that this property has been identified as a total acquisition. See response to Comment 17-3 for a description of the methodology utilized to determine property acquisitions. All property acquisition and relocation will comply fully with federal and state requirements, including the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (Uniform Act). As described in Section 3.4 of the EA, the Uniform Act provides protections, compensation, and assistance for property acquisitions and relocations.
Koclanes, George Peter	Olympia Investments	26-2	...we are not the only ones who stand to lose our property. According to the Executive Summary for the Proposed Project, "[approximately 31.1 acres of property would need to be acquired from 96 property owners through 114 acquisition parcels, including 45 residential, 65 commercial, and 4 publicly owned parcels." The Proposed Project is adversely affecting a whole lot of people.	Comment noted. ROW acquisition was similar for all of the alternatives considered by the project team. The project is located in a developed urban area, with private property surrounding state-owned ROW. As such, there is little area within CDOT's existing ROW to expand its facilities.
Koclanes, George Peter	Olympia Investments	26-3	...there are other alternatives for the US 6 and Wadsworth Blvd. project that would <u>not</u> result in us losing all the Olympia Property and would not result in other negative affects [sic]. These alternatives have been identified at the public meetings we have previously attended.	Two of the four interchange alternatives that met the purpose and need for the project (tight diamond and single-point urban interchange [SPUI]) would affect only one of the two Olympia properties, while the Build Alternative (and the partial cloverleaf) would require acquisition of both properties. As explained in the <i>Alternatives Development and Selection Technical Memorandum</i> included in Appendix C to the EA, the tight diamond with loop was selected as the preferred alternative over the tight diamond, SPUI, and partial cloverleaf because it has better traffic performance than the tight diamond and SPUI and required less ROW than the partial cloverleaf. Additionally, the reconfiguration of the frontage road and improvements (widening of) to Lakewood Gulch, which were design features that were refined and included after the identification of the tight diamond with loop as the Build Alternative, would require acquisition of both Olympia properties regardless of the interchange alternative selected. That is, both properties would be considered total acquisitions under all final interchange alternatives. As noted in response to Comment 26-2, property acquisitions are required for any reconstruction of the interchange.

EXHIBIT 4-3: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO US 6/WADSWORTH EA

Name	Organization	No.	Comment	Response
Koclanes, George Peter	Olympia Investments	26-4	...the Proposed Project is already way over budget. Significantly, we have been told that the budget for this project is approximately \$70 million and the estimated cost for the Proposed Project is more than \$90 million. These estimated costs likely have increased over time. We cannot understand how anyone would consider this project when, among other things, (a) the project is \$20 million over budget, (b) the project will materially and negatively affect a large number of property owners in the area, and (c) the federal, state, and local governments, as well as the citizens, are now facing severe financial and economic hardships. There simply is no justifiable reason to embark on a project of the grandiose scale at this time. In our opinion, there are far more important public improvement matters that would be better served with these financial resources.	Comment noted. In 1996, the Colorado Transportation Commission officially identified the US 6/Wadsworth interchange as one of 28 strategic high-priority projects by CDOT. Currently, it is one of the last of the remaining strategic projects to be funded. DRCOG has also identified the US 6/Wadsworth interchange as one of the top 20 “bottleneck points” in the Denver metro area. As described in Chapter 1 of the EA, the US 6/Wadsworth project is needed to improve safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists (the existing interchange has the highest number of accident reports in Lakewood), improve operational efficiency of the interchange and along Wadsworth, meet current and future traffic demands, and support multi-modal connections.
Schmidt, Philip	Private citizen	27-1	I am a homeowner in Green Acres, very close to the proposed new frontage road route. My wife and I support the proposed interchange design and feel the frontage road changes will be beneficial to our neighborhood, primarily because it should reduce non-resident travel through the neighborhood, from those trying to travel east from Wadsworth on the frontage road.	Thank you for your support.
Schmidt, Philip	Private citizen	27-2	we do feel that the noise walls along the frontage road (as they appear in the proposed interchange graphic) are absolutely necessary to minimize the impact of the increased travel on the Wadsworth end of the frontage road.	Thank you for your comment. As noted, noise walls are included in the Build Alternative.
Schmidt, Philip	Private citizen	27-3	we strongly support the current design proposal	Thank you for your support.
Crockett, Olin	Private citizen	28-1	My property is on the west side at 1355, 1345 Wadsworth, including 1340 and 1360 Yukon. I believe you are going to need these properties with light rail going through there.	The Build Alternative would require the total acquisition of 1355 Wadsworth and the partial acquisition of 1345 Wadsworth. The properties on Yukon Street do not need to be acquired in part or in full for the Build Alternative. The US 6 and Wadsworth project is not responsible for property acquisition related to RTD’s West Corridor light rail line or station; properties acquired for the West Corridor project are being acquired by RTD.

CHAPTER 4: COORDINATION AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

US 6/Wadsworth Finding of No Significant Impact and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

Crockett, Olin	Private citizen	28-2	<p>An example of not planning ahead was for parking on the light rail down Santa Fe near Quincey [sic] Ave. Their parking lot had to be expanded several times at a higher cost each time. You could possibly combine this project with a developer to help keep costs down. The longer you wait, costs will keep going up.</p>	<p>CDOT has worked with RTD and Lakewood throughout the project to coordinate the design of the Build Alternative with the design of the West Corridor project and is committed to continuing this coordination throughout final design and project implementation. CDOT is not involved in the station area plan or parking for the Wadsworth light rail station, only in the traffic circulation around the property.</p> <p>For information on the RTD West Corridor project, please contact the RTD West Corridor project hotline or public information manager. RTD FasTracks West Corridor Team Project Hotline: 303-299-2000 Brenda Tierney Public Information Manager, West Corridor RTD FasTracks Team 10455 W. 6th Avenue Lakewood, CO 80215 Office: (303) 299-2401 Fax: (303) 299-2425</p> <p>For more specific construction information, please contact the construction contractor's public information manager: Kathy Berumen Public Information Manager Denver Transit Construction Group 10455 W. 6th Avenue Lakewood, CO 80215 Office: 303) 626-6762 Fax: (303) 238-2244</p>
Taylor, Willie R.	Department of Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	29-1	<p>The third bullet of the Fish and Wildlife Resource column in Appendix B, page B-2, states that trees will not be removed between April 1 and August 15 to avoid impacts to migratory birds. The Department is now recommending that the window be extended to August 31.</p>	<p>Thank you for the clarification. The revised timeframe has been included in Section 4.4 of the FONSI.</p>
Taylor, Willie R.	Department of Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	29-2	<p>Following our review of the Section 4(f) Evaluation, the Department concurs that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternative selected in the document and that all measures to minimize harm to these resources has been taken. The Department acknowledges your consultation with the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office and that a Memorandum of Agreement to minimize adverse effects to historic properties will be prepared.</p>	<p>Thank you for your concurrence, which also is reflected in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation in Section 5 of the FONSI.</p>
Clark, Rebecca	Lakewood Reinvestment Authority Director	30-1	<p>[In assisting a property owner relocation on behalf of Lakewood and RTD]...I do have knowledge that 1190 Wadsworth will potentially be affected by the proposed highway widening. The affect on 1190 Wadsworth would be caused by acquiring and dedicating additional travel lane(s) and right-of-way, as well as an illustrated detention pond on CDOT's 15% design drawings.</p> <p>As you and I both know, by way of a legislative rezoning, 1190 Wadsworth has been rezoned to TMU-MDR (Transit Mixed Use-Medium Density Residential) due to its proximity to the Wadsworth/13th elevated Light Rail Station. Which the City has taken extraordinary measures to improve upon the RTD design</p>	<p>After reviewing the comments received on the EA, we had three primary comments about the water quality basins: two opposing the location of the water quality basin at 1355 Wadsworth (see Comments 20-3 and 24-20) and one (yours) requesting consideration of an alternative location for the basin at 1190 Wadsworth. After reviewing options for water quality basins, CDOT has confirmed the need for a basin at 1190 Wadsworth. Suitable locations for water quality basins on the north side of the project area are sparse; CDOT wishes to minimize disruptions to property owners in the corridor and, therefore, sited basins in locations that were already affected by other project improvements. In the case of the basin at 1190 Wadsworth, the location has an additional benefit of enhancing the</p>

CHAPTER 4: COORDINATION AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

US 6/Wadsworth Finding of No Significant Impact and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

			and the Reinvestment Authority will be providing additional funding to design and construct betterments on the elevated station. It has always been the intention and now through a variety of actions and approvals by the City Council and Reinvestment Authority, to develop and redevelop the properties within the TMU zone districts.	planned Two Creek park by providing a compatible green space that acts as a frontage to Wadsworth and provides visibility to the park entrance on 12th Avenue. In short, we have reviewed the basin locations again, and based on current information, this location is a prime location for a water quality basin. Final engineering design will determine the final size and location of the basin; for now, it is CDOT's intention to acquire 1190 Wadsworth and put a water quality basin at this location when the US 6/Wadsworth project is approved and constructed. The timing of that acquisition is uncertain due to funding shortfalls. Please see also response to Comment 24-21.
Clark, Rebecca	Lakewood Reinvestment Authority Director	30-2	Are the proposed layouts for WQ basins based on current situations only?	Yes. Although CDOT is aware that rezoning has occurred and redevelopment is desired and likely, the analysis of impacts is based on current situations (except in the area of the RTD station, where CDOT has coordinated with RTD because RTD has a specific plan and funding for development of that parcel).
Clark, Rebecca	Lakewood Reinvestment Authority Director	30-3	If this area (the site with the proposed WQ basin) were to be redeveloped due to the TOD, would the 6/WW plan consider alternative sites?	It is unlikely that the preferred location of the basin at 1190 Wadsworth would change even if the area were redeveloped, particularly because redevelopment has the potential to affect numerous properties in the corridor. At this point, CDOT is not aware of a specific redevelopment proposed for the Enterprise (car rental) site (and the property owner has confirmed that there is no interest in selling the property at this time). Under current circumstances, CDOT would already acquire this commercial property and displace the active business. However, as noted in response to Comments 20-1 through 20-5, CDOT is open to investigating joint or regional water quality treatment with another public entity, such as RTD or Lakewood, which could change the options for water quality treatment. Changes to the development landscape would be evaluated in final design along with other site constraints, such as utility locations, etc.
Clark, Rebecca	Lakewood Reinvestment Authority Director	30-4	Is CDOT/consultant in the process of investigating contingent designs for WQ facilities in the area?	CDOT confirmed the basin locations and requirements in response to comments. At this point, more suitable locations do not seem to be present, especially for the 1190 Wadsworth location. The sizes and locations of the basins are, however, based on conceptual-level design and will be confirmed during final design. Please see also responses to Comments 30-3 and 24-21.

4.4 CLARIFICATIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

There are two clarifications to Section 3.7, Land Use, of the EA. Page 3-23 of the EA states that Lakewood is "...considering rezoning Colfax Avenue to promote pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented development." The Colfax Avenue rezoning process occurred concurrently with the EA project, was approved by the Lakewood City Council, and became effective on June 29, 2009. On the same page (3-23), the EA references the Wadsworth Boulevard Strategic Plan. This plan was repealed and replaced with the North Wadsworth Boulevard Corridor Plan, which was adopted on June 22, 2009.

In analysis of both Land Use and ROW, the EA references discussions with Lakewood regarding non-conforming uses that may result from ROW acquisition. Reference to non-conformance in the EA is found in the Executive Summary; Sections 2.2.3, 3.7, and 3.8; Exhibit 3-26; and Appendix B. Since publication of the EA, Lakewood's non-conforming use ordinance has been revised to clarify options for property owners with non-conforming uses that result from acquisition of private property for public projects (such as the US 6/Wadsworth project). The revised ordinance now allows a permanent variance for a parcel or structure to be legally non-conforming if the variance is not more than 20 percent. If the property acquisition causes a variance of more than 20 percent and creates a hazardous or otherwise unreasonable situation, the parcel or structure would be considered non-conforming and subject to the City's non-conforming standards. The revised ordinance does not affect the analysis in the EA, but it does clarify the process that Lakewood will follow in working with CDOT through the ROW process to determine if variances for non-conforming uses are appropriate. A copy of the ordinance was enclosed with Mayor Murphy's comments on the EA, which are included in Appendix C to the FONSI.

There are two additional clarifications to the body of the EA related to historic properties and floodplains. First, Exhibit 3-13, Historic Properties Located within the Study Area, illustrates the location of the Jefferson

County Open School Historic District incorrectly. The district is bounded by 10th and 12th Avenues, rather than 9th and 10th Avenues as shown by the shading in the exhibit. The boundaries are correctly described in Exhibit 3-14 in the EA, and the analysis of effects to the district also is accurately portrayed in the EA. The second technical clarification relates to a sentence in Section 3.10.2, specifically lines 40 to 45 on page 3-34, which imply that all culverts under US 6 and Wadsworth will be replaced. The culvert under US 6 to the east of the interchange (at South Lakewood Gulch) would not be replaced; the other three culverts would be replaced as described in the EA. Replacing the culvert at South Lakewood Gulch is not necessary and not included in the Build Alternative.

The air quality conformity statement in Section 6.0 of the air quality technical memorandum (CH2M HILL, 2009e) is revised as follows:

Because the project is not expected to create any new violations or increase the frequency of an existing violation of air quality standards, it is determined to conform with the purpose of the current State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the requirements of the Clean Air Act. The proposed project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the *2035 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan* (DRCOG, 2007), and in the outlying years of the 2008-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 2035 fiscally constrained RTP meets the conformity requirements identified by federal and state regulations for CO, PM₁₀, and O₃, and by including the project in DRCOG air quality conformity modeling, the project also meets these requirements. Air quality conformity modeling predicts future pollutant emissions to ascertain the likelihood of pollutants exceeding of SIP emissions budgets allocated for 5-year incremental interim years, or staging years, within the 2035 planning horizon.

In fulfilling air quality conformity analyses completed for the 2035 RTP, the US6/Wadsworth interchange reconstruction has been included in the 2015 staging year of the air

1 quality conformity modeling run. Widening along
2 Wadsworth Boulevard has been included in the
3 2020 staging year of the air quality conformity
4 modeling run. This project will be implemented
5 consistent with the staging years in the
6 conformity analysis for the STIP and RTP.

7 This revision replaces the entire paragraph of the
8 Section 6.0 of the air quality technical memorandum
9 included in Appendix A to the EA. Correspondence
10 between CDOT and APCD since the publication of the
11 EA is included in Appendix C to the FONSI.

12 The remaining clarifications to the EA relate to
13 mitigation commitments, which were presented in
14 Exhibit 3-26 and Appendix B to the EA. The following
15 represent the additional mitigations reflected in
16 Appendix B. Appendix B to the FONSI now includes
17 these measures as well as those presented in the EA.
18 As such, it contains the comprehensive list of
19 mitigation measures that will be included in the design
20 and construction of the Build Alternative.

- 21 ◆ The construction contractor will be required to
22 follow CDOT's *Standard Specifications for Road*
23 *and Bridge Construction*, which governs
24 construction practices near private properties.
- 25 ◆ Trees will not be removed between April 1 and
26 August 31 to avoid impacts to migratory birds. This
27 timeframe represents an extension from the
28 August 15 end date published in the EA.
- 29 ◆ Noise walls will be constructed according to
30 FHWA's *Highway Noise Barrier Design Handbook*
31 and in accordance with the requirements of ASTM
32 Standard D1557-91 (2007), "Test Method for
33 Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil
34 Using Modified Effort," to ensure that soils are
35 properly compacted and reduce the potential for
36 settling near adjacent properties.
- 37 ◆ The use of absorptive materials for noise walls will
38 be considered during final design of the project.
- 39 ◆ During final design, CDOT will consider adjusting
40 the noise wall configuration along the north side of
41 US 6 at its eastern terminus to provide better
42 visibility to the commercial property at the 6th
43 Avenue Business Center. If feasible, the wall will
44 wrap around the west side of the 6th Avenue
45 Business Park and continue adjacent to residential
46 properties west to Ammons Street. West of

47 Ammons Street, the wall will continue between the
48 frontage road and highway as described in the EA.

- 49 ◆ CDOT will construct permanent noise walls early in
50 the construction schedule, if feasible, to provide for
51 additional noise mitigation during construction.
- 52 ◆ The construction contractor will comply with state
53 and local noise regulations, and will adhere to
54 industry standard thresholds for building damage
55 from vibration. Contractors will be required to
56 follow requirements outlined in CDOT's *Standard*
57 *Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*.
- 58 ◆ CDOT will provide for all-weather access and
59 detours to minimize disruptions for businesses
60 during construction.
- 61 ◆ Lane closures during construction will comply with
62 CDOT's Region 6 Lane Closure Strategy.
- 63 ◆ CDOT will develop a traffic control plan and, prior
64 to construction, make that plan available to
65 Lakewood and the CDOT public relations office,
66 which will relay additional notifications for lane
67 closures.
- 68 ◆ A construction newsletter will be prepared and
69 distributed as needed to keep businesses,
70 residences, and travelers up to date.