

CHAPTER 9 PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

9.1 INTRODUCTION

NEPA and its implementing regulations requires “early and continuing opportunities for the public to be involved...” and that “public involvement shall be proactive and provide complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions and opportunities for early and continuous involvement.” The North I-25 EIS provided ample opportunity for frequent and meaningful public feedback during the process. The project team fostered open communication and was responsive to all groups and individuals interested in this study.

The project team communicated and collaborated with federal, state, and local government officials; regional transportation planning entities; community groups; civic and professional organizations; businesses, and residents during the EIS process. The public involvement process provided information, timely public notice, access to key decisions, public comment opportunities, and outlets for early and continuing participation.

This chapter describes elements of the North I-25 EIS public involvement process and specific activities conducted to date with the public; federal, state, and local agencies; and residential populations in the project area.

9.2 COORDINATION

9.2.1 Agency Coordination

Agency coordination was conducted to ensure a timely flow of project information, to solicit input from local agencies, and to obtain regulatory-related information and involvement from state and federal agencies. Agency involvement began with the Notice of Intent, which was published in the *Federal Register* on December 31, 2003. Cooperating agency letters of invitation were sent to the USACE, RTD, and the Federal Railroad Administration. Agency response to these letters of invitation was received and is included in **Appendix B Agency Coordination**. The USACE and State Historic Preservation Officer participated in a merged process. This merged process was conducted in accordance with provisions of the January 2005 NEPA/Clean Water Act Section 404 Merger Process and Agreement for Transportation Projects in Colorado, as well as with Section 800.8(c) provisions for merging the Section 106 review process with the NEPA process.

State and federal agencies who were involved included:

- ▶ State Historic Preservation Officer
- ▶ Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
- ▶ Colorado Division of Wildlife
- ▶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

What's in Chapter 9?

Chapter 9 - Public and Agency Involvement

- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Coordination
- 9.3 Scoping and Pre-Draft EIS Concerns
- 9.4 Release of the Draft EIS
- 9.5 Future Public Involvement Activities

- 1 ▶ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 2 ▶ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- 3 ▶ Federal Railroad Administration
- 4 ▶ Regional Transportation District

5 Consulting parties related to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act included:

- 6 ▶ Berthoud Historic Preservation Commission
- 7 ▶ Broomfield Historic Landmark Board
- 8 ▶ Fort Collins Historic Preservation Commission
- 9 ▶ Fort Lupton Historic Preservation Board
- 10 ▶ Greeley Historic Preservation Commission
- 11 ▶ Longmont Historic Preservation Commission
- 12 ▶ Loveland Historic Preservation Commission
- 13 ▶ Boulder County Historic Preservation Advisory Board

14 Local agencies involvement included representatives from 32 cities and towns (two which are
15 also counties) in the project area, seven counties, and four regional organizations. These are
16 shown below:

17 **9.2.2 Technical Coordination**

City/Town		County	Regional
Ault	Greeley	Adams County	DRCOG
Berthoud	Johnstown	Boulder County	RTD
Boulder	LaSalle	Broomfield County	NFRMPO
Brighton	Longmont	Denver County	UFRRPC
Broomfield	Louisville	Jefferson County	
Burlstone	Loveland	Larimer County	
Commerce City	Mead	Weld County	
Dacono	Milliken		
Denver	Northglenn		
Erie	Platteville		
Evans	Severance		
Firestone	Timnath		
Fort Collins	Thornton		
Fort Lupton	Wellington		
Frederick	Westminster		
Gilcrest	Windsor		

1 **9.2.2.1 REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

2 The Regional Coordination Committee was organized to provide high-level, policy-related input
3 to the project team. The committee (56 members) is composed of policy-level elected officials
4 or their designated representative and provides observations and feedback for communities in
5 the regional study area. The Regional Coordination Committee has met 32 times since
6 January 2004, as listed in **Table 9-1**. All Regional Coordination Committee meetings were
7 combined with the Technical Advisory Committee (**Section 9.2.2.2**) meetings in October 2008.

8 **9.2.2.2 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

9 A Technical Advisory Committee was established to gain input on technical issues. The
10 committee (97 members) included representatives of local government and public sector
11 agencies along the corridor, along with CDOT, DRCOG, FHWA, FTA, NFRMPO, and RTD.
12 The Technical Advisory Committee met 47 times since February 2004, as listed in **Table 9-1**.
13 Between October 2008 and October 2009, a series of TAC and RCC meetings were held
14 specifically to come to agreement about what components should be included in the Preferred
15 Alternative and in Phase I.

16 **Table 9-1 Regional Coordination Committee / Technical Advisory Committee**
17 **Meetings**

Date	Group
Jan 28, 2004	Regional Coordination Committee
Feb 12, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Mar 11, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Apr 08, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
May 13, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Jun 09, 2004	Regional Coordination Committee
Jun 10, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Jul 08, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Aug 12, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Aug 26, 2004	Regional Coordination Committee
Sep 09, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Oct 14, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee and Regional Coordination Committee
Nov 18, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Dec 09, 2004	Technical Advisory Committee
Jan 13, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
Feb 24, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
Feb 24, 2005	Regional Coordination Committee
Apr 21, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee & Regional Coordination Committee
May 19, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
May 19, 2005	Regional Coordination Committee
June 2, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee & Regional Coordination Committee
Jul 21, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
Aug 18, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee & Regional Coordination Committee
Oct 11, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee

1 **Table 9-1 Regional Coordination Committee / Technical Advisory Committee**
2 **Meetings (cont'd.)**

Date	Group
Nov 10, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
Dec 15, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
January 12, 2006	Regional Coordination Committee
Mar 09, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
Mar 09, 2006	Regional Coordination Committee
April 13, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
May 11, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee & Regional Coordination Committee
June 8, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
Jul 13, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
Sep 14, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
Sep 14, 2006	Regional Coordination Committee
Oct 12, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
Nov 09, 2006	Technical Advisory Committee
Nov 09, 2006	Regional Coordination Committee
Jan 11, 2007	Technical Advisory Committee
Jan 11, 2007	Regional Coordination Committee
Mar 08, 2007	Technical Advisory Committee
Mar 08, 2007	Regional Coordination Committee
May 10, 2007	Technical Advisory Committee
May 10, 2007	Regional Coordination Committee
Jul 12, 2007	Technical Advisory Committee
Jul 12, 2007	Regional Coordination Committee
Sep 13, 2007	Technical Advisory Committee
Sep 13, 2007	Regional Coordination Committee
Nov 08, 2007	Technical Advisory Committee
Nov 08, 2007	Regional Coordination Committee
Oct 14, 2008	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Dec 15, 2008	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Jan 22, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Jan 29, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Feb 12, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Apr 9, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
June 11, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Jul 23, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Sep 17, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Oct 1, 2009	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Feb 25, 2010	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee
Nov 10, 2010	Technical Advisory Committee/Regional Coordination Committee

9.2.3 Technical Coordination

9.2.3.1 TRAVEL FORECAST WORKING GROUP

In order to gain community understanding and acceptance of the travel demand forecasting model, a working group of technical representatives was established to oversee the development of the EIS model. The group consisted of technical modeling members of NFRMPO, DRCOG, CDOT Region 4, CDOT Division of Transportation Development, RTD, and the City of Fort Collins. Besides members of the local consultant team, the Travel Forecast Working Group also included two travel model experts with extensive national experience combining models and performing transit forecasting. This group met seven times over a 15-month period as the EIS model was developed.

Two additional meetings were held in 2010 to discuss updated ridership forecasts for the commuter rail and bus service planned as a part of the Preferred Alternative.

9.2.3.2 LAND USE EXPERT PANEL

Indirect land use impacts, in particular induced growth, were evaluated through the use of a local expert panel. The panel consisted of municipal planners from Dacono, Firestone, Fort Collins, Frederick, Greeley, Longmont, Loveland, Mead, and Windsor. Also on the panel were representatives from two large developers with projects in the area, as well as agency representatives from CDOT, DRCOG, FHWA, and NFRMPO. The panel convened in October 2006. At that meeting, current induced growth research was described as well as any current drivers of growth. The panel then provided input on potential induced growth patterns for each corridor based on the three alternatives.

9.2.4 Public Coordination

9.2.4.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

Public input was an important component of the North I-25 EIS process. Public feedback helped to shape the options and alternatives considered for the project. Public input also helped to ensure that the best possible transportation improvements will be made, and that the improvements will meet the challenges faced by Northern Colorado residents and travelers both now and in the future. A full and complete record was kept of public comments and feedback obtained throughout the process.

The project team was committed to providing opportunities for frequent and meaningful public input at every step of the process. Team goals included fostering open lines of communication, developing mutually beneficial relationships, and acting in a responsive manner to all groups and individuals interested in this process.

9.2.4.2 PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS

As a part of the North I-25 EIS, the National Research Center, Inc. was contracted to conduct a household travel survey of residents within the study area. While some transportation information existed that encompassed the study area, transportation planners felt that more information was needed about "special trips" and "long trips" made by residents in the corridor. The survey primarily focused on determining residents' trip-making behavior for such types of trips. A random sample of 10,000 residential mailing addresses from zip codes in the regional

1 study area was selected for the North I-25 EIS Household Travel Study. Of the 9,536 eligible
2 households, 3,152 households completed the survey, providing a response rate of 33 percent.
3 Results of the survey include the following points.

- 4 ▶ Residents take approximately two trips per year on average to sporting events in the
5 Denver Metro Area. All other destinations for sporting events are less than one trip per
6 year.
- 7 ▶ Residents take approximately eight trips per year on the weekdays to DIA and
8 approximately three trips per year to DIA on the weekends.
- 9 ▶ Approximately 95 percent of residents report using I-25 for at least 1 trip in the previous
10 year.
- 11 ▶ 35 percent of residents travel a significant distance (five miles or more) on I-25 for a work
12 or school commute.
- 13 ▶ 46 percent of residents reported avoiding travel on I-25, with 82 percent of these identifying
14 “too much congestion” as the reason, and 46 percent did not “feel safe” on I-25.

15 **9.2.4.3 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

16 Public meetings provided an opportunity to solicit and collect comments to provide input to
17 CDOT, FHWA, FTA, the project management team, and representatives from the local
18 jurisdictions. The goals were to inform the public about project progress, to identify any
19 concerns, and, where needed to discuss any concerns or ideas in one-on-one and group
20 formats. The project team presented relevant information and gave the public the opportunity
21 to talk about the study with resource analysts.

22 Public meetings were hosted at key points during the North I-25 EIS project. Multiple avenues
23 were used to notify the public about upcoming meetings.

- 24 ▶ Project newsletters (February 2004, June 2004, October 2004, June 2005, January 2006,
25 October 2006, and October 2008), meeting notification postcards, and e-mail were
26 distributed to the project contact list.
- 27 ▶ Meeting information was posted on the project web site.
- 28 ▶ English and Spanish meeting notification flyers were distributed within the study area in
29 high-traffic areas including libraries, government offices, businesses, and senior centers.
- 30 ▶ English and Spanish meeting notification advertisements appeared in newspapers
31 throughout the study area.
- 32 ▶ News releases were distributed to media.
- 33 ▶ Meeting information was distributed to city and county public information officers to
34 facilitate informing their constituents.
- 35 ▶ Flyers were given to members of the Technical Advisory Committee and Regional
36 Coordination Committee to distribute in their communities.

37 In February 2004, three public scoping meetings introduced the project and determined the
38 issues of concern that would be addressed. The meetings took place:

1 ▶ February 3, 2004 at the Greeley Recreation Center, Greeley
2 (37 recorded attendees)

3 ▶ February 5, 2004 at the Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont
4 (32 recorded attendees)

5 ▶ February 10, 2004 at the Lincoln Center, Fort Collins
6 (179 recorded attendees)

7 Comment trends included:

8 ▶ Support for a rail component

9 ▶ Support for improvements to US 85 highway maintenance

10 ▶ Support for converting current intersections along US 85 to interchanges

11 ▶ Support for improvements to I-25 and I-25 interchanges including additional lanes, and
12 upgrading interchanges

13 ▶ Safety concerns on I-25 regarding speed, congestion, and traffic directly accessing the
14 frontage road from the interstate

15 ▶ Various environmental concerns were expressed with an emphasis on air quality, land use
16 and wildlife.

17 At the end of June 2004, four public meetings took place to introduce the project's Purpose
18 and Need and further determine the issues of concern regarding the project. The meetings
19 took place:

20 ▶ June 22, 2004 at the Evans Recreation Center, Evans
21 (14 recorded attendees)

22 ▶ June 24, 2004 at the Loveland Museum, Loveland
23 (36 recorded attendees)

24 ▶ June 29, 2004 at the Margaret W. Carpenter Recreation Center, Thornton
25 (12 recorded attendees)

26 ▶ July 1, 2004 at the Lincoln Center, Fort Collins
27 (78 recorded attendees)

28 Comment trends included:

29 ▶ The project should utilize available resources such as CDOT right-of-way and existing rail
30 corridors.

31 ▶ Widening I-25 to three lanes in each direction is desired

32 ▶ Preference for multi-modal options

33 In October 2004, the project team hosted four public meetings to introduce the types of
34 technologies and alternatives being consider during Level One Screening, share information
35 on criteria used to evaluate the alternatives in Level Two Screening, and outline the
36 environmental data collection process. The meetings took place:

- 1 ▶ October 19, 2004 at the Commerce City Recreation Center, Commerce City
2 (2 recorded attendees)
- 3 ▶ October 21, 2004 at the McKee Conference & Wellness Center, Loveland
4 (22 recorded attendees)
- 5 ▶ October 26, 2004 at the Lincoln Center, Fort Collins
6 (58 recorded attendees)
- 7 ▶ October 28, 2004 at the Greeley Recreation Center, Greeley
8 (17 recorded attendees)

9 Comment trends included:

- 10 ▶ Concerns that transit options will encourage development and increase sprawl
11 ▶ Transit development concerns
12 ▶ Interest in exploring alternative fuel options such as light rail and hybrid buses
13 ▶ Support stronger for rail than BRT when considering multi-modal options
14 ▶ Options should focus on encouraging higher speed and lower travel times
15 ▶ Concerns regarding lack of funding to meet costs associated with alternatives

16 In June 2005, four public meetings took place to present the Level Two Screening alternative
17 evaluation results and the recommended alternatives that would be further developed and
18 evaluated in the Level Three Screening process. The meetings took place:

- 19 ▶ June 14, 2005 at the Greeley Recreation Center, Greeley
20 (14 recorded attendees)
- 21 ▶ June 16, 2005 at the Lincoln Center, Fort Collins
22 (62 recorded attendees)
- 23 ▶ June 21, 2005 at the Loveland Police and Court Building, Loveland
24 (24 recorded attendees)
- 25 ▶ June 23, 2005 at the Radisson Hotel and Conference Center, Longmont
26 (27 recorded attendees)

27 Comment trends included:

- 28 ▶ Interest in convenient and direct travel to DIA.
29 ▶ Strong support for commuter rail along US 287/BNSF line.
30 ▶ Interest in a commuter rail spur from the US 287/BNSF line to Greeley.
31 ▶ Interest in implementing the access control plan on US 85.
32 ▶ Noise concerns with rail and the widening of I-25.
33 ▶ Interest in the impacts of increasing the cost of gas on travel and rail projections.
34 ▶ Concern that the Front Range Toll Road will not be able to pull traffic off I-25 if it is built and
35 that it should not be a consideration during the North I-25 EIS.

1 Throughout January and February 2006, twelve town hall meetings took place to present the
2 eight packages that were developed and evaluated during Level Three Screening, and to
3 recommend which alternatives would move forward into the Draft Environmental Impact
4 Statement. The meetings took place:

- 5 ▶ January 23, 2006 at the Aztlan Community Center, Fort Collins
6 (64 recorded attendees)
- 7 ▶ January 24, 2006 at the Windsor Community Center, Windsor
8 (39 recorded attendees)
- 9 ▶ January 25, 2006 at the Frederick Town Hall, Frederick
10 (26 recorded attendees)
- 11 ▶ January 26, 2006 at the Thornton City Hall, Thornton
12 (12 recorded attendees)
- 13 ▶ January 30, 2006 at the Gilcrest Valley High School, Gilcrest
14 (8 recorded attendees)
- 15 ▶ January 31, 2006 at the Mead Town Hall, Mead (17 recorded attendees).
- 16 ▶ February 1, 2006 at the Longmont Museum, Longmont
17 (42 recorded attendees)
- 18 ▶ February 2, 2006 at the Loveland Public Library, Loveland
19 (32 recorded attendees)
- 20 ▶ February 6, 2006 at the Greeley Recreation Center, Greeley
21 (19 recorded attendees)
- 22 ▶ February 7, 2006 at the Harmony Library, Fort Collins
23 (49 recorded attendees)
- 24 ▶ February 15, 2006 at the Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont
25 (28 recorded attendees)
- 26 ▶ February 16, 2006 at the Milliken Town Hall, Milliken
27 (18 recorded attendees)

28 Comment trends included:

- 29 ▶ Interest in connecting rail options to planned FasTracks lines
- 30 ▶ Concerns for lack of funding to meet cost associated with alternatives
- 31 ▶ Concerns regarding improvements being implemented behind demand
- 32 ▶ Interest on toll operations including usage fees, how tolled lanes work with HOV, what the
33 money from fees will fund, utilizing transponders and enforcing toll fees
- 34 ▶ Support for multi-modal transit including a combination of rail and highway improvements
- 35 ▶ Questions regarding wildlife and habitat impacts

36 In November 2006, two public meetings introduced the addition of the NorthMetro Rail
37 Connection that would connect the proposed rail alignment in Package A from the Longmont
38 Sugar Mill site to the FasTracks North Metro line. The meetings took place:

1 ▶ November 13, 2006 at the Northglenn Recreation Center, Northglenn
2 (10 recorded attendees)

3 ▶ November 15, 2006 at the Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont
4 (27 recorded attendees)

5 Comment trends included:

6 ▶ Concerns surrounding the type of impacts to wetlands

7 ▶ Noise impact concerns

8 ▶ Concern that there will not be ample parking at station locations

9 ▶ Support for the North Metro Rail connection component added to Package A

10 Study team members periodically reviewed public comments to identify recurring comments
11 and common concerns. These were addressed in project newsletters and added to the project
12 web site.

13 **Table 9-2** provides a list of public meetings by date, meeting purpose, location, and number of
14 attendees.

15

1 **Table 9-2 Public Meetings**

Date	Purpose/Topic	Location	No. of Attendees
Feb 03, 2004	Scoping Meeting	Greeley	37
Feb 05, 2004	Scoping Meeting	Longmont	32
Feb 10, 2004	Scoping Meeting	Fort Collins	179
Jun 22, 2004	Purpose and Need	Evans	14
Jun 24, 2004	Purpose and Need	Loveland	36
Jun 29, 2004	Purpose and Need	Thornton	12
Jul 01, 2004	Purpose and Need	Fort Collins	78
Oct 19, 2004	Level One Screening	Commerce City	2
Oct 21, 2004	Level One Screening	Loveland	22
Oct 26, 2004	Level One Screening	Fort Collins	58
Oct 28, 2004	Level One Screening	Greeley	17
Jun 15, 2005	Level Two Screening	Greeley	14
Jun 17, 2005	Level Two Screening	Fort Collins	62
Jun 21, 2005	Level Two Screening	Loveland	24
Jun 23, 2005	Level Two Screening	Longmont	27
Jan 23, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Fort Collins	64
Jan 24, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Windsor	39
Jan 25, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Frederick	26
Jan 26, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Thornton	12
Jan 30, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Gilcrest	8
Jan 31, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Mead	17
Feb 01, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Longmont	42
Feb 02, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Loveland	32
Feb 06, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Greeley	19
Feb 07, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Fort Collins	49
Feb 15, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Longmont	28
Feb 16, 2006	Town Hall Meeting/Level Three Screening	Milliken	18
Nov 13, 2006	Interchange Update and Southern Connectivity	Northglenn	10
Nov 15, 2006	Interchange Update and Southern Connectivity	Longmont	27

2 **9.2.4.4 TRANSIT STATION WORKING GROUPS**

3 As part of the North I-25 EIS, CDOT developed another forum for community members to
4 become involved in the study process by creating Transit Station Working Groups.

5 Three transit alternatives were evaluated as part of the North I-25 EIS: commuter bus,
6 commuter rail, and bus rapid transit. The working groups were organized to allow members of
7 the community to discuss and share ideas regarding transit station locations, bike and
8 pedestrian connectivity, and maintenance facilities. **Table 9-3** summarizes information
9 regarding Transit Station Working Group meetings.

10

1 **Table 9-3 Transit Station Working Group Meetings**

Date	Group	Attendees
Oct 18, 2005	Frederick	9
Oct 19, 2005	Loveland	19
Dec 05, 2005	North I-25	15
Dec 08, 2008	US 287	3
Dec 12, 2005	South I-25	5
Dec 15, 2006	US 85	2
Mar 20, 2006	North I-25/US 85	11
Mar 23, 2006	South I-25/US 287	7

2 **9.2.4.5 INTERCHANGE WORKING GROUPS**

3 From February 2006 through January 2007, 43 interchange working group meetings were
4 conducted with a total 241 public and civic participants. In addition, several one-on-one
5 meetings took place with property owners. During these meetings, participants interacted with
6 project engineers to determine interchange designs, right-of-way impacts, property impacts,
7 and future traffic patterns. The designated interchange working groups were:

- 8 ▶ Group 1 – US 36, E-470, and SH 7
- 9 ▶ Group 2 – SH 7 and WCR 8
- 10 ▶ Group 3 – WCR 8 and SH 52
- 11 ▶ Group 4 – SH 119, SH 66, and WCR 34
- 12 ▶ Group 5 – SH 56, SH 60 East, LCR 16, and SH 402
- 13 ▶ Group 6 – SH 402, US 34, Crossroads, and SH 392
- 14 ▶ Group 7 – Harmony, Prospect, SH 14, SH 392, and SH 1

15 **9.2.4.6 SPECIALIZED ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE OUTREACH**

16 In an effort to ensure that everyone residing in the North I-25 regional study area received
17 project information and was afforded the opportunity to provide input, special outreach efforts
18 were conducted to reach low-income and/or minority communities within the regional study
19 area. These populations have been historically underrepresented in public processes.
20 Potential environmental justice populations were identified using 2000 U.S. Census Bureau
21 data and through local community and agency contacts (see **Section 3.2.4**). Outreach
22 activities were conducted in identified locations for low-income and/or minority environmental
23 justice populations in Brighton, Greeley, Fort Collins, Gilcrest, Longmont, Loveland, and
24 Thornton.

25 The public involvement team prepared supplementary copies of project newsletters, fact
26 sheets, and meeting announcements, which were translated into Spanish. English and
27 Spanish project materials were distributed during other outreach efforts and to frequently
28 visited locations in the identified areas for posting where visible to the general public.

1 The public involvement team conducted outreach to businesses by going door-to-door and
2 distributing bi-lingual project information and surveys for potentially affected business owners
3 in the identified areas. Outreach also included specialized small group meetings, attendance at
4 community events, and preparation of focused newsletters.

5 **Specialized Outreach Meetings**

6 The project team contacted approximately 42 Hispanic/Latino community and church leaders
7 throughout the project. Hispanic/Latino community leaders were offered information about the
8 project and the opportunity for small group meetings. Small group meetings were held with the
9 groups shown in **Table 9-4**.

10 **Table 9-4 Specialized Outreach Meetings**

Date	Name of Group	Location
Nov 04, 2004	Loveland Housing Authority	Loveland, CO
Aug 06, 2005	Greeley Farmers' Market	Greeley, CO
Aug 13, 2005	Greeley Farmers' Market	Greeley, CO
Jul 28, 2005	Windsor Farmers' Market	Windsor, CO
Jan 23, 2006	Aztlan Fort Collins Town Hall Meeting	Fort Collins, CO
Mar 14, 2006	Mountain Range Shadows Subdivision	Larimer County, CO
Sep 21, 2006	El Komite de Longmont	Longmont, CO
Sep 21, 2006	A New Image, LLC	Brighton, CO
Oct 25, 2006	Templo Betel	Fort Collins, CO
Nov 11, 2006	Agua Viva Baptist Church	Loveland, CO
Nov 19, 2006	Holy Family Catholic Church	Fort Collins, CO
October 26, 2010	City of Longmont	Longmont, CO

11 **Specialized Outreach Events**

12 The project team also identified and attended local cultural and community events to distribute
13 information about the project, answer questions, and gather comments. Fifteen events were
14 attended between 2004 and 2006 (**Table 9-5**). These include:

15

1 **Table 9-5 Specialized Outreach Events**

Date	Name of Event	Location
Jun 05, 2004	Berthoud Day	Berthoud, CO
Aug 07, 2004	Loveland Art in the Park	Loveland, CO
Aug 24, 2004	Frederick Miners Day	Frederick, CO
Sep 11, 2004	Celebrate Lafayette	Lafayette, CO
Sep 18, 2004	Greeley Fiesta	Greeley, CO
Dec 01, 2004	Colorado HUG Banquet and Expo	Greeley, CO
Aug 05, 2005	Greeley Farmers Market	Greeley, CO
Aug 13, 2005	Loveland Art in the Park	Loveland, CO
Aug 13, 2005 and Aug 14, 2005	Milliken Beef-n-Bean Day	Milliken, CO
Sep 10, 2005	Celebrate Lafayette	Lafayette, CO
Sep 17, 2005	Frederick Miners Day	Frederick, CO
Sep 16, 2006	Mexican Independence Day	Longmont, CO
Sep 30, 2006	Bridging the Immigration Divide	Longmont, CO
Sep 30, 2006	Community Development Resource Fair	Adams County, CO

2 **Specialized Outreach Newsletters**

3 Following the release of the Draft EIS, specialized outreach included the distribution of focused
4 newsletters that summarized the impacts and benefits of the project (**Table 9-6**).

5 **Table 9-6 Specialized Outreach Newsletters**

Date	Name of Group	Location
Nov, 2008	City of Longmont	Longmont, CO
Nov, 2008	Mountain Range Shadows Subdivision	Larimer County, CO

6 **Summary of Input Received During Specialized Outreach**

7 Input received through specialized outreach centered on community needs and concerns
8 regarding the proposed improvements. Participants indicated repeatedly that transit service
9 was needed between Longmont, Loveland, Denver, Boulder, and southwest Weld counties.

10 Congestion on I-25 was seen as limiting access to businesses and participation in cultural
11 events in Metro Denver. Most residents from Fort Collins, Greeley, Longmont, and Loveland
12 would be willing to drive to access transit service to Denver.

13 Participants expressed general concern about the cost of the alternatives and how alternatives
14 would be funded. Participants disagreed about the impacts of tolling. Some felt that public
15 transportation should be open to all and that tolling would exclude citizens. Others preferred
16 tolling because it provided funding for construction and maintenance and would ease
17 congestion.

1 Participants indicated a need for transit options to reach important community facilities (local
2 schools and churches), regional employment centers (DIA and the Denver Technical Center),
3 and commuter cities (Cheyenne, Denver, Fort Collins, Greeley, Longmont, and Loveland). It
4 also was pointed out that many minority community members do not work typical business
5 hours and may hold multiple jobs. For transit to be effective, it should be flexible, affordable,
6 accommodate persons with disabilities, accommodate persons with bicycles, and operate on
7 weekends and evenings.

8 In a meeting held in Brighton, attendees indicated that there were negative feelings toward
9 transit because it is unreliable, provides limited service, and requires lengthy wait times. In
10 addition, transit was not deemed feasible for those with construction jobs who are required to
11 be in several locations throughout the day. While some suggested that bus service should be
12 provided along US 85, most felt that more lanes are needed on US 85, SH 7, and I-25. Other
13 than Brighton, participants generally felt that transit alternatives would enhance employment
14 opportunities and increase access to shopping, cultural events, and services for minority and
15 low-income populations throughout the Front Range. Many participants also preferred transit
16 to highway widening because they considered it a cheaper, safer, and a less stressful option.

17 Most participants felt that existing transit does not adequately serve minority and low-income
18 communities. Some underserved locations identified by meeting participants include the OUR
19 Medical Center (Longmont), new development east of SH 119 in Longmont, the Casa Vista
20 residential subdivision (Longmont), St. John's Church (Longmont), Casa Esperanza
21 (Longmont), Bill Reed middle school (Loveland), Centerra (Loveland), and the Holy Catholic
22 Church (Fort Collins). Participants preferred options that included transit to these destinations.

23 Participants also identified key community facilities, minority and low-income neighborhoods,
24 and minority-owned businesses throughout the study area. These include the Pullman Center
25 (12th and Garfield in Loveland); Wal-Mart (Loveland); Loveland Lake Park; Wynona
26 Elementary School (Loveland); the Hispanic neighborhoods of Cherry Street, Buckingham,
27 La Colonia, Andersonville, Poudre Valley Mobile Home Park, and Cloverleaf Mobile Home
28 Park (Fort Collins); Hispanic businesses along US 287 north of Cherry Street in Fort Collins;
29 and Hispanic businesses along US 34 east of US 287 in Longmont. Participants also preferred
30 options that included transit to these destinations.

31 Participants were concerned about immigration policy. Hispanic or Latino populations may not
32 use public transit if they have to show identification or are distrustful of authority. Some also
33 indicated that they avoid using I-25 because they feel that Hispanic/Latino drivers are pulled
34 over more frequently by the Colorado State Highway Patrol.

35 Input received through specialized outreach helped the project team to understand what
36 community resources are important to minority and low-income communities. Meeting
37 participants identified key community facilities, neighborhoods, businesses, underserved
38 areas, and important relationships between communities (social, familial, employment). These
39 resources will be given special consideration throughout the impact analysis.

40 **9.2.4.7 LOCAL GROUP AND ORGANIZATION MEETINGS**

41 Project team members conducted localized group and organization meetings that provided the
42 opportunity to present detailed project information in a very personalized manner to a larger
43 number of individuals.

1 Through targeted outreach, the team contacted neighborhood associations, business
2 associations, and civic groups to offer briefings. Forty-one meetings took place with
3 individuals, businesses, and organizations as listed in **Table 9-7**.

4 All information gathered from these meetings was documented in HIRSYS, the comment
5 tracking database, and shared with the project team.

6 **9.2.4.8 PROJECT WEB SITE**

7 The project web site (<http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/north-i-25-eis>) went online in May
8 2003. The web site serves as an educational and information-sharing tool providing the most
9 up-to-date project information. This integral part of the public outreach program provides the
10 public with access to past project information documents and the latest project information
11 including:

- ▶ Calendar of events
- ▶ Purpose and need
- ▶ Newsletters
- ▶ Final technical reports
- ▶ FAQs
- ▶ Maps
- ▶ Community-specific information
- ▶ The EIS process
- ▶ Public meeting boards and records
- ▶ Project schedule
- ▶ Opportunities for public involvement

12 In addition to sharing information, the project web site provides the public with opportunities to
13 share input, request a speaker, or request to be added to the project distribution list through the
14 contact form. Key project information is also displayed in Spanish.

15 **9.2.4.9 MEDIA OUTREACH**

16 Periodic news releases and media advisories were prepared and sent to the local media in
17 advance of public meetings. News releases and media advisories were sent in January 2004,
18 June 2004, October 2004, June 2005, December 2005, January 2006, October 2006,
19 November 2006, September 2007, November 2008, and January 2010. News releases and
20 media advisories also were translated into Spanish and distributed to Spanish-language news
21 media in the Denver Metro Area.

22 The project team conducted two rounds of media tours during which the project manager and
23 public involvement manager met with reporters and editors of the newspapers with the largest
24 circulation in the study area. The team visited the Fort Collins Coloradoan, Loveland Reporter-
25 Herald and the Greeley Tribune.

26 Additionally, the public involvement team prepared media kits, which were distributed to
27 reporters who attended public meetings. The content of these kits varied slightly for each
28 meeting but typically included the most recent meeting notification news release, frequently
29 asked questions, and graphics of alternatives being considered by the project team.

30

1 Table 9-6 Local Group and Organization Meeting

Date	Group	No. of Attendees
Apr 05, 2004	Northern Colorado Public Communicators	23
Apr 23, 2004	Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce Legislative Affairs Committee	25
Apr 23, 2004	Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce Legislative Affairs & Transportation Committee	30
Apr 26, 2004	Fort Collins Board of Realtors	25
May 04, 2004	Fort Collins Lions Club	15
May 11, 2004	Erie Lion's Club Small Group	12
May 12, 2004	Loveland Commercial Realtor Association.	25
May 12, 2004	Windsor Chamber	12
May 18, 2004	Northern Colorado Economic Development Corporation	20
May 19, 2004	Ft. Lupton Chamber of Commerce	30
May 20, 2004	PEDAL – Loveland Bicycle Group	15
May 21, 2004	Rodarte Center Seniors	40
May 24, 2004	Johnstown/Milliken Lions	10
May 27, 2004	Eaton Lion's Club Small Group	24
Jun 11, 2004	Johnstown/Milliken Rotary	20
Jun 15, 2004	Loveland Rotary Club	120
Jun 24, 2004	Brighton Chamber of Commerce	84
Jul 12, 2004	City of Greeley	12
Jul 14, 2004	Longmont Kiwanis Club	15
Jul 15, 2004	Broomfield Econ. Development Corporation	25
Jul 20, 2004	Longmont Rotary Club	125
Aug 10, 2004	Loveland Connection Club	20
Sep 02, 2004	Broomfield Transportation Commission	7
Sep 08, 2004	Loveland Kiwanis	40
Sep 08, 2004	Westminster Transportation Commission	10
Sep 20, 2004	Commerce City Development	5
Oct 02, 2004	ColoRail	45
Oct 11, 2004	Larimer County Engineering	15
Nov 04, 2004	Housing Authority of Loveland	20
Nov 08, 2004	League of Women Voters of Larimer County	40
Nov 14, 2004	Riders For Justice	25
Nov 16, 2004	Weld County League of Women Voters	20
Dec 13, 2004	Longmont Transportation Advisory board	10
Jan 10, 2005	Johnstown/Milliken Lion's Club	10
Jan 13, 2005	American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Northern Colorado Chapter	8
Jan 18, 2005	City of Greeley Community Outreach Staff	2
Jan 17, 2007	Mulberry Corridor Owners Association	23
Feb 06, 2007	Downtown Loveland Association	11
Mar 14, 2007	Mason Corridor Open House	15-20
Mar 13, 2007	Colorado Rail Association	2
Apr 10, 2007	US 36 Commuting Solutions	30

9.3 SCOPING AND PRE-DRAFT EIS CONCERNS

The study team developed a protocol for responding to public comments to comply with NEPA suggestions for an interactive and comprehensive public involvement process. The process encouraged interested parties to provide comments and developed processes for responding to comments or incorporating community concerns into project informational materials.

Public comments were received through a variety of means, and by many people on the project team. Comments were evaluated, and if necessary, responded to in the following manner:

- ▶ **HIRSYS / Hotline Comments** – Comments received via web entry or hotline call that requested information were routed through the appropriate project team members for a response.
- ▶ **Routine Comments and Questions** – Frequently asked comments or questions were handled by public involvement representatives using prepared responses.
- ▶ **Web Entries or Hotline Messages** – Information from web entries or persons leaving individual contact information was added to the project contact database.
- ▶ **Verbal Notes from Meetings** – Comments received through verbal communication at meetings were added to the project database.
- ▶ **Specific Requests** – Specific requests requiring follow-up by a project team member were addressed by the individuals receiving the comment.
- ▶ **Public Meeting Comment Forms (received at the meetings)** – Comments received via comment forms submitted at the meeting were added to the database.
- ▶ **Public Meeting Comment Forms (mailed after public meetings)** – Comments received via comment forms mailed to project representatives after public meetings were added to the database.
- ▶ **Hard Copy Documents** – Letters received via regular mail from interested parties were routed through the appropriate project team members for a response, if necessary. Comments offering suggestions for the project team, but not requesting information or answers to questions were reviewed and addressed through the project process, where possible. These documents were scanned and added to the project database.

Comment summaries were reviewed by project team members to analyze public concerns and needs. Action on specific outstanding questions or comments was taken where needed. Common questions were answered in the “frequently asked questions” section on the project web site, and distributed at public meetings.

Comments that are the most common or that reflect trends are summarized below. Please see **Appendix A** for a complete list of all public comments received by the project team.

1 9.3.1 Transit

2 There is significant support among members of the public for transit, especially rail. People
3 mentioned the public stigma attached to bus service. The general sentiment is that rail service
4 would attract more people to transit than bus service would. Comments received relative to
5 transit are summarized below:

- 6 ▶ A significant number of comments were received in support of a train or rail alternative.
- 7 ▶ Support was given for rail service that would use existing rail lines in order to reduce the
8 cost to riders and facilitate quick implementation of service.
- 9 ▶ Bus service was seen in some ways as being the most economical, but concern was
10 expressed that it would add to congestion on already stressed highways.
- 11 ▶ It is perceived that mass transit would not help to relieve highway congestion.
- 12 ▶ Bus rapid transit, with fast and timely supporting local service, was seen to be the most
13 affordable option.
- 14 ▶ Links to DIA were considered important.
- 15 ▶ Bus stations are needed at major intersections. Bus stations with protected shelters are
16 needed to attract riders and buses should run 24 hours-a-day. Bus shelters/stations are
17 critical to shifting travelers from automotive to mass transit. Private enterprise would work
18 best. Also most people consider bus service as a third-class mode of transportation. Mass
19 transit needs to be made more attractive to help change people's attitudes towards it.
- 20 ▶ There is interest in locating stations and rail lines near larger population areas. There is
21 interest in placing rail near the "Tri-town" area of Frederick, Dacono, and Firestone,
22 determining the type of driver who would be willing to drive to reach the station and how far
23 those riders would be willing to drive, for eliminating the need for feeder buses from east,
24 and for locating a station at WCR 7 and SH 52 to service high-traffic volume on SH 52.
- 25 ▶ Most towns along the western alignment were built along rail. Developments tend to occur
26 along transportation routes. I-25 could have the same kind of appeal and resulting
27 economic development impacts should be considered.

28 9.3.2 Highway

29 The general sentiment is that highway improvements are already overdue. There were many
30 comments regarding safety and the deteriorating condition of bridges and interchanges. The
31 public understands and agrees that the highway will require improvements regardless of what
32 transit service is provided. Comments received relative to highway improvements are
33 summarized below:

- 34 ▶ Support was given for upgrading 287 and/or US 85 to expressways to compete with the
35 speed and convenience of I-25. It was felt that US 85 needs major improvements and
36 upgrades as part of the solution.
- 37 ▶ Support was given for using tolls to finance highway improvements.
- 38 ▶ Interest was expressed for only improving existing roads and not building new roads.

- 1 ▶ It was felt that toll roads would ‘cater’ to higher-income portions of society and a public
2 transportation system should be accessible to the entire community.
- 3 ▶ There is a perception that if the highway were widened and traffic was no longer stop-and-
4 go, people would use the highways.
- 5 ▶ It was felt that if I-25 were to be widened through Weld County, it would result in heavy
6 congestion. Pressure to develop that area is high and an eight-lane highway would
7 expedite development and exacerbate congestion.

8 **9.3.3 Environment**

9 Concern for the protection of the natural environment was strong. Diminishing air quality and
10 loss of wetlands along I-25 were of special concern. Comments received relative to the
11 environmental resources are summarized below:

- 12 ▶ Support was given for putting the environment, especially air quality, above the needs of
13 development. “After air quality, the river corridors and wetlands should take precedence.”
- 14 ▶ Transportation improvements should be placed where they won’t affect open space or
15 degrade views. Open space and important views should be saved.
- 16 ▶ Alternative fuels should be considered.
- 17 ▶ Regarding noise impacts, it was felt there were problems with current noise levels and
18 additional lanes would cause property owners to be unable to hear anything but I-25 in
19 their yards. There is a preference for higher noise walls, even if that would result in losses
20 to residents’ view of the mountains.

21 **9.3.4 Other Comments**

- 22 ▶ Package A offers a lot of support for current transportation needs. Northern Coloradans
23 make a lot of short trips and Package A would have a positive impact on their ability to
24 make such trips by allowing people to take advantage of other modes of transportation.
- 25 ▶ Package B lacks an east-west connection, which would not be beneficial for persons
26 traveling from Loveland to Greeley.
- 27 ▶ The business community was supportive of either of the Draft EIS build packages moving
28 forward.
- 29 ▶ A 20-year timeframe was felt to be too short. It would be better to use a time frame that
30 looks 50 years and beyond.
- 31 ▶ Regarding safety, increased law enforcement is needed to counter an increase in
32 accidents between 1991 and 2001.
- 33 ▶ I-25 should not be a barrier to bicyclists (and pedestrians). Many safe crossings should be
34 provided to accommodate people who will use modes other than automobiles to cross I-25.

35

9.4 RELEASE OF THE DRAFT EIS

A Notice of Availability for the North I-25 Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register on October 31, 2008. The Notice of Availability included the date and locations of the public hearings. The following means were also used to notify the public of the release of the Draft EIS and the public hearings:

- ▶ Mailed newsletters to 3,700 people
- ▶ Ran ads in thirteen English-language and two Spanish-language newspapers that have a total circulation of almost 200,000
- ▶ Distributed news releases to approximately 100 newspapers, radio and TV stations

The Draft EIS was made available to the public on the the project website at: <http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/north-i-25-eis> and at the following locations:

- ▶ Brighton City Hall, 22 S. 4th Ave., Brighton
- ▶ Longmont Civic Center, 350 Kimbark St., Longmont
- ▶ Erie Town Hall, 645 Holbrook, Erie
- ▶ Ft. Collins City Bldg., 300 Laport, Fort Collins
- ▶ Ft. Collins Regional Library District, 201 Pertson, Fort Collins
- ▶ Longmont Public Library, 409 4th Avenue, Longmont
- ▶ Northglenn City Hall, 11701 Community Center Dr., Northglenn
- ▶ Thornton City Hall, 9500 Civic Center Dr., Thornton
- ▶ Dacono City Hall, 512 Cherry St., Dacono
- ▶ Firestone Town Hall, 151 Grant Ave., Firestone
- ▶ Frederick Town Hall Admin Bldg, 401 Locust St., Frederick
- ▶ Greeley City Bldg, 1000 10th Avenue, Greeley
- ▶ Greeley Lincoln Park Library, 919 7th St., #100, Greeley
- ▶ Johnstown Town Hall, 101 Charlotte St., Johnstown
- ▶ Larimer County, 200 West Oak St. Suite 3000, Ft. Collins
- ▶ Loveland City Hall, 500 E. 3rd St., #110, Loveland
- ▶ Loveland Library, 300 N. Adams, Loveland
- ▶ Mead Town Hall, 441 Third St., Mead
- ▶ Milliken Town Hall, 2951 Ash St., Milliken
- ▶ SW Weld County Bldg, 915 10th St., Greeley

1 Additional public and agency involvement activities, including Regional Coordination
2 Committee and Technical Advisory Committee meetings, specialized outreach, and
3 coordination with agencies that were conducted prior to the release of the Draft EIS are
4 included in **Table 9-1** through **Table 9-6**.

5 **9.4.1 Summary of Comments**

6 The 60-day comment period for the Draft EIS ended on December 31, 2008. During the
7 comment period, three public hearings were held at:

- 8 ▶ Fort Collins—Fort Collins Lincoln Center—November 19, 2008
- 9 ▶ Longmont—Longmont Public Library—November 18, 2008
- 10 ▶ Loveland—Outlets at Loveland—November 20, 2008

11 The purpose of the public hearings was to present the findings of the Draft EIS to the
12 communities in the regional study area and receive feedback on the proposed alternatives.

13 During the Draft EIS comment period, a total of 1,025 comments were received from the public
14 in the following manners:

- 15 ▶ 352 comments were submitted through the project web site
- 16 ▶ 152 were mailed to CDOT
- 17 ▶ 70 verbal comments were made at public hearings
- 18 ▶ 16 comments came in by phone call to the project hot line
- 19 ▶ 10 comments were received via email
- 20 ▶ 425 individuals signed a petition with the title “Front Range on Track”, which was submitted
21 to CDOT. The text of the petition is: We, the undersigned, express our support for
22 Commuter Rail, along Hwy 287 from Fort Collins to Denver Metro FasTracks connections
23 as described in Package A of CDOT’s North I-25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
24 We support the mass transit components of Package A and necessary safety upgrades
25 on I-25.

26 The comments received on the Draft EIS reflected the following community sentiment:

- 27 ▶ 194 support commuter rail
- 28 ▶ 166 support Package A because of commuter rail
- 29 ▶ 34 provide support for Package A without stating specifically why
- 30 ▶ 30 support all the components in Package A
- 31 ▶ 50 support transit of any kind. Most of them indicate that they support the use of bus until
32 rail can be developed.
- 33 ▶ 15 comments were received in support of rail along I-25
- 34 ▶ 21 comments stated opposition to rail along I-25
- 35 ▶ 5 indicated that they do not support rail at all

- 1 ▶ 21 state that they are opposed to any highway improvements at all
- 2 ▶ 8 support only highway improvements
- 3 ▶ 4 stated they support rail but only if monorail is the technology selected
- 4 ▶ 4 support both packages
- 5 ▶ 3 don't support either package
- 6 ▶ 3 want whatever safety improvements can be made

7 Comments were also received from the following federal, state, regional, and local agencies:

- 8 ▶ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- 9 ▶ North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization
- 10 ▶ Denver Regional Council of Governments
- 11 ▶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- 12 ▶ State Historic Preservation Officer
- 13 ▶ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- 14 ▶ U.S. Department of Interior
- 15 ▶ Town of Erie
- 16 ▶ Town of Berthoud
- 17 ▶ Boulder County
- 18 ▶ City and County of Broomfield
- 19 ▶ Town of Frederick
- 20 ▶ Larimer County Board of County Commissioners
- 21 ▶ City of Loveland
- 22 ▶ City of Longmont
- 23 ▶ City of Greeley
- 24 ▶ Weld County
- 25 ▶ Town of Timnath
- 26 ▶ City of Fort Collins

27 A copy of the agency and public comments received and responses to the comments,
28 including the court report transcripts of oral comments received at the public hearings are
29 included in **Appendix A** *Public Involvement* and **Appendix B** *Agency Coordination*.

30

9.5 FUTURE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The availability of the Final EIS and the dates and locations of the public hearings will be announced at least 15 days in advance of the hearings. A 30-day public comment period will be provided for review of the Final EIS. Comments received during the comment period will be reviewed and responses will be provided in a Record of Decision to be issued by CDOT and FHWA documenting the decisions made for the North I-25 EIS.

The Final EIS will be made available to the public at the project website (<http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/north-i-25-eis>) and at the same locations where the Draft EIS was available. These locations are as follows:

- ▶ Brighton City Hall, 22 S. 4th Ave., Brighton
- ▶ Longmont Civic Center, 350 Kimbark St., Longmont
- ▶ Erie Town Hall, 645 Holbrook, Erie
- ▶ Ft. Collins City Bldg., 300 Laport, Fort Collins
- ▶ Ft. Collins Regional Library District, 201 Pertson, Fort Collins
- ▶ Longmont Public Library, 409 4th Avenue, Longmont
- ▶ Northglenn City Hall, 11701 Community Center Dr., Northglenn
- ▶ Thornton City Hall, 9500 Civic Center Dr., Thornton
- ▶ Dacono City Hall, 512 Cherry St., Dacono
- ▶ Firestone Town Hall, 151 Grant Ave., Firestone
- ▶ Frederick Town Hall Admin Bldg, 401 Locust St., Frederick
- ▶ Greeley City Bldg, 1000 10th Avenue, Greeley
- ▶ Greeley Lincoln Park Library, 919 7th St., #100, Greeley
- ▶ Johnstown Town Hall, 101 Charlotte St., Johnstown
- ▶ Larimer County, 200 West Oak St. Suite 3000, Ft. Collins
- ▶ Loveland City Hall, 500 E. 3rd St., #110, Loveland
- ▶ Loveland Library, 300 N. Adams, Loveland
- ▶ Mead Town Hall, 441 Third St., Mead
- ▶ Milliken Town Hall, 2951 Ash St., Milliken
- ▶ SW Weld County Bldg, 915 10th St., Greeley