

CHAPTER 8 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

8.1 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.

8.2 COORDINATION

8.2.1 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**. 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
- ▶ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ▶ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- ▶ Federal Railroad Administration

What's in Chapter 8?

Chapter 8 - Comments and Coordination

- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Coordination
- 8.3 Comments and Responses
- 8.4 Future Public Involvement Activities

- 1 ▶ Regional Transportation District
- 2 Consulting parties related to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act included:
- 3 ▶ Berthoud Historic Preservation Commission
- 4 ▶ Broomfield Historic Landmark Board
- 5 ▶ Fort Collins Historic Preservation Commission
- 6 ▶ Fort Lupton Historic Preservation Board
- 7 ▶ Greeley Historic Preservation Commission
- 8 ▶ Longmont Historic Preservation Commission
- 9 ▶ Loveland Historic Preservation Commission
- 10 ▶ Boulder County Historic Preservation Advisory Board
- 11 Local agencies involvement included representatives from 32 cities and towns in the project
- 12 area, seven counties, and four regional organizations. These are shown below:

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

8.2.1.1 REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Regional Coordination Committee was organized to provide high-level, policy-related input to the project team. The committee (56 members) is composed of policy-level elected officials or their designated representative and provides observations and feedback for communities in the regional study area. The Regional Coordination Committee has met 18 times since January 2004, as listed in **Table 8-1**.

8.2.1.2 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A Technical Advisory Committee was established to gain input on technical issues. The committee (97 members) included representatives of local government and public sector agencies along the corridor, along with CDOT, DRCOG, FHWA, FTA, NFRMPO, and RTD. The Technical Advisory Committee met 26 times since February 2004, as listed in **Table 8-1**.

8.2.2 Technical Coordination

8.2.2.1 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.

8.2.2.2 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.

8.2.3 Public Coordination

8.2.3.1 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.

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

5 **8.2.3.2 PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS**

6 As a part of the North I-25 EIS, the National Research Center, Inc. was contracted to conduct a
7 household travel survey of residents within the study area. While some transportation information
8 existed that encompassed the study area, transportation planners felt that more information was
9 needed about “special trips” and “long trips” made by residents in the corridor. The survey primarily
10 focused on determining residents’ trip-making behavior for such types of trips. A random sample of
11 10,000 residential mailing addresses from zip codes in the regional study area was selected for the
12 North I-25 EIS Household Travel Study. Of the 9,536 eligible households, 3,152 households
13 completed the survey, providing a response rate of 33 percent. Results of the survey include the
14 following points.

- 15 ▶ Residents take approximately 2 trips per year on average to sporting events in the Denver
16 Metro Area. All other destinations for sporting events are less than 1 trip per year.
- 17 ▶ Residents take approximately 8 trips per year on the weekdays to DIA and approximately 3
18 trips per year to DIA on the weekends.
- 19 ▶ Approximately 95% of residents report using I-25 for at least 1 trip in the previous year.
- 20 ▶ 35% of residents travel a significant distance (5 miles or more) on I-25 for a work or school
21 commute.
- 22 ▶ 46% of residents reported avoiding travel on I-25, with 82% of these identifying “too much
23 congestion” as the reason, and 46% did not “feel safe” on I-25.

24 **8.2.3.3 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

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

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

- 33 ▶ Project newsletters, meeting notification postcards, and e-mail were distributed to the project
34 contact list.
- 35 ▶ Meeting information was posted on the project web site.
- 36 ▶ English and Spanish meeting notification flyers were distributed within the study area in high-
37 traffic areas including libraries, government offices, businesses, and senior centers.
- 38 ▶ English and Spanish meeting notification advertisements appeared in newspapers throughout
39 the study area.
- 40 ▶ News releases were distributed to media.
- 41 ▶ Meeting information was distributed to city and county public information officers to facilitate
42 informing their constituents.

- 1 ▶ Flyers were given to members of the Technical Advisory Committee and Regional Coordination
2 Committee to distribute in their communities.

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

- 5 ▶ February 3, 2004 at the Greeley Recreation Center, Greeley (37 recorded attendees).
6 ▶ February 5, 2004 at the Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont (32 recorded attendees).
7 ▶ February 10, 2004 at the Lincoln Center, Fort Collins (179 recorded attendees).

8 Comment trends included:

- 9
10 ▶ Support for a rail component
11 ▶ Support for improvements to US 85 highway maintenance
12 ▶ Support for converting current intersections along US 85 to interchanges
13 ▶ Support for improvements to I-25 and I-25 interchanges including additional lanes, and
14 upgrading interchanges
15 ▶ Safety concerns on I-25 regarding speed, congestion, and traffic directly accessing the frontage
16 road from the interstate
17 ▶ Various environmental concerns were expressed with an emphasis on air quality, land use and
18 wildlife.

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

- 21 ▶ June 22, 2004 at the Evans Recreation Center, Evans (14 recorded attendees).
22 ▶ June 24, 2004 at the Loveland Museum, Loveland (36 recorded attendees).
23 ▶ June 29, 2004 at the Margaret W. Carpenter Recreation Center, Thornton (12 recorded
24 attendees).
25 ▶ July 1, 2004 at the Lincoln Center, Fort Collins (78 recorded attendees).

26 Comment trends included:

- 27
28 ▶ The project should utilize available resources such as CDOT right-of-way and existing rail
29 corridors.
30 ▶ Widening I-25 to three lanes in each direction is desired
31 ▶ Preference for multi-modal options

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

- 36 ▶ October 19, 2004 at the Commerce City Recreation Center, Commerce City (2 recorded
37 attendees).

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

5 Comment trends included:

- 6
- 7 ▶ Concerns that transit options will encourage development and increase sprawl
- 8 ▶ Transit development concerns
- 9 ▶ Interest in exploring alternative fuel options such as light rail and hybrid buses
- 10 ▶ Support stronger for rail than BRT when considering multi-modal options
- 11 ▶ Options should focus on encouraging higher speed and lower travel times
- 12 ▶ Concerns regarding lack of funding to meet costs associated with alternatives

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

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

21 Comment trends included:

- 22
- 23 ▶ Interest in convenient and direct travel to DIA.
- 24 ▶ Strong support for commuter rail along US 287/BNSF line.
- 25 ▶ Interest in a commuter rail spur from the US 287/BNSF line to Greeley.
- 26 ▶ Interest in implementing the access control plan on US 85.
- 27 ▶ Noise concerns with rail and the widening of I-25.
- 28 ▶ Interest in the impacts of increasing the cost of gas on travel and rail projections.
- 29 ▶ Concern that the Front Range Toll Road will not be able to pull traffic off I-25 if it is built and
30 that it should not be a consideration during the North I-25 EIS.

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

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

14 Comment trends included:

- 15
- 16 ▶ Interest in connecting rail options to planned FasTracks lines
- 17 ▶ Concerns for lack of funding to meet cost associated with alternatives
- 18 ▶ Concerns regarding improvements being implemented behind demand
- 19 ▶ Interest on toll operations including usage fees, how tolled lanes work with HOV, what the
- 20 money from fees will fund, utilizing transponders and enforcing toll fees
- 21 ▶ Support for multi-modal transit including a combination of rail and highway improvements
- 22 ▶ Questions regarding wildlife and habitat impacts

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

- 26 ▶ November 13, 2006 at the Northglenn Recreation Center, Northglenn (10 recorded attendees).
- 27 ▶ November 15, 2006 at the Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont (27 recorded
- 28 attendees).

29 Comment trends included:

- 30
- 31 ▶ Concerns surrounding the type of impacts to wetlands
- 32 ▶ Noise impact concerns
- 33 ▶ Concern that there will not be ample parking at station locations
- 34 ▶ Support for the North Metro Rail connection component added to Package A

1 **Table 8-1 Regional Coordination Committee / Technical Advisory Committee 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
Nov 10, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
Dec 15, 2005	Technical Advisory Committee
Jan 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

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

4 **Table 8-2** provides a list of public meetings by date, meeting purpose, location, and number of
5 attendees.

6 **8.2.3.4 TRANSIT STATION WORKING GROUPS**

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

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

14 **8.2.3.5 INTERCHANGE WORKING GROUPS**

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

- 20 ▶ Group 1 – US 36, E-470, and SH 7
- 21 ▶ Group 2 – SH 7 and WCR 8
- 22 ▶ Group 3 – WCR 8 and SH 52
- 23 ▶ Group 4 – SH 119, SH 66, and WCR 34
- 24 ▶ Group 5 – SH 56, SH 60 East, LCR 16, and SH 402
- 25 ▶ Group 6 – SH 402, US 34, Crossroads, and SH 392
- 26 ▶ Group 7 – Harmony, Prospect, SH 14, SH 392, and SH 1

1 **Table 8-2 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 **Table 8-3 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

1 **8.2.3.6 SPECIALIZED ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE OUTREACH**

2 In an effort to ensure that everyone residing in the North I-25 regional study area receives project
3 information and is afforded the opportunity to provide input, special outreach efforts were
4 conducted to reach low-income and/or minority communities within the regional study area.
5 These populations have been historically underrepresented in public processes. Potential
6 environmental justice populations were identified using 2000 U.S. Census Bureau data and
7 through local community and agency contacts. Outreach activities were conducted in identified
8 locations for low-income and/or minority environmental justice populations in Brighton, Greeley,
9 Fort Collins, Gilcrest, Longmont, Loveland, and Thornton.

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

14 The public involvement team conducted outreach to businesses by going door-to-door and
15 distributing bi-lingual project information and surveys for potentially affected business owners in
16 the identified areas.

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

21 Outreach to low-income and/or minority populations will continue through the course of the EIS
22 process. The project team will continue to widely disseminate information in areas of common
23 use before key project milestones to supply additional information and seek input. In addition, the
24 project team will continue to be attentive and responsive to any environmental justice needs,
25 issues, or concerns that may arise.

1 **Table 8-4 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 Comite 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

2 The project team also identified and attended local cultural and community events to distribute
 3 information about the project, answer questions, and gather comments. Fifteen events were
 4 attended between 2004 and 2006 (**Table 8-5**). These include:

5 **Table 8-5 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

- 1 Input received through specialized outreach centered on community needs and concerns
2 regarding the proposed improvements. Participants indicated repeatedly that transit service was
3 needed between Longmont, Loveland, Denver, Boulder, and southwest Weld counties.
- 4 Congestion on I-25 was seen as limiting access to businesses and participation in cultural events
5 in Metro Denver. Most residents from Fort Collins, Greeley, Longmont, and Loveland would be
6 willing to drive to access transit service to Denver.
- 7 Participants expressed general concern about the cost of the alternatives and how alternatives
8 would be funded. Participants disagreed about the impacts of tolling. Some felt that public
9 transportation should be open to all and that tolling would exclude citizens. Others preferred tolling
10 because it provided funding for construction and maintenance and would ease congestion.
- 11 Participants indicated a need for transit options to reach important community facilities (local
12 schools and churches), regional employment centers (DIA and the Denver Technical Center),
13 and commuter cities (Cheyenne, Denver, Fort Collins, Greeley, Longmont, and Loveland). It also
14 was pointed out that many minority community members do not work typical business hours and
15 may hold multiple jobs. For transit to be effective, it should be flexible, affordable, accommodate
16 persons with disabilities, accommodate persons with bicycles, and operate on weekends and
17 evenings.
- 18 In a meeting held in Brighton, attendees indicated that there were negative feelings toward transit
19 because it is unreliable, provides limited service, and requires lengthy wait times. In addition,
20 transit was not deemed feasible for those with construction jobs who are required to be in several
21 locations throughout the day. While some suggested that bus service should be provided along
22 US 85, most felt that more lanes are needed on US 85, SH 7, and I-25. Other than Brighton,
23 participants generally felt that transit alternatives would enhance employment opportunities and
24 increase access to shopping, cultural events, and services for minority and low-income
25 populations throughout the Front Range. Many participants also preferred transit to highway
26 widening because they considered it a cheaper, safer, and a less stressful option.
- 27 Most participants felt that existing transit does not adequately serve minority and low-income
28 communities. Some underserved locations identified by meeting participants include the OUR
29 Medical Center (Longmont), new development east of SH 119 in Longmont, the Casa Vista
30 residential subdivision (Longmont), St. John's Church (Longmont), Casa Esperanza (Longmont),
31 Bill Reed middle school (Loveland), Centerra (Loveland), and the Holy Catholic Church (Fort
32 Collins). Participants preferred options that included transit to these destinations.
- 33 Participants also identified key community facilities, minority and low-income neighborhoods, and
34 minority-owned businesses throughout the study area. These include the Pullman Center (12th
35 and Garfield in Loveland); Wal-Mart (Loveland); Loveland Lake Park; Wynona Elementary
36 School (Loveland); the Hispanic neighborhoods of Cherry Street, Buckingham, La Colonia,
37 Andersonville, Poudre Valley Mobile Home Park, and Cloverleaf Mobile Home Park (Fort
38 Collins); Hispanic businesses along US 287 north of Cherry Street in Fort Collins; and Hispanic
39 businesses along US 34 east of US 287 in Longmont. Participants also preferred options that
40 included transit to these destinations.
- 41 Participants were concerned about immigration policy. Hispanic or Latino populations may not
42 use public transit if they have to show identification or are distrustful of authority. Some also
43 indicated that they avoid using I-25 because they feel that Hispanic/Latino drivers are pulled over
44 more frequently by the Colorado State Highway Patrol.

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

6 **8.2.3.7 LOCAL GROUP AND ORGANIZATION MEETINGS**

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

10 Through targeted outreach, the team contacted neighborhood associations, business
11 associations, and civic groups to offer briefings. Forty-one meetings took place with individuals,
12 businesses, and organizations as listed in **Table 8-6**.

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

15 **8.2.3.8 PROJECT WEB SITE**

16 The project web site (<http://www.cdot.info/northi25eis/>) went online in May 2003. The web site
17 serves as an educational and information-sharing tool providing the most up-to-date project
18 information. This integral part of the public outreach program provides the public with access to
19 past project information documents and the latest project information including:

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

25
26 In addition to sharing information, the project web site provides the public with opportunities to share
27 input, request a speaker, or request to be added to the project distribution list through the contact
28 form. Key project information is also displayed in Spanish.

29 **8.2.3.9 MEDIA OUTREACH**

30 Periodic news releases and media advisories were prepared and sent to the local media in advance
31 of public meetings. News releases and media advisories were sent in January 2004, June 2004,
32 October 2004, June 2005, January 2006, November 2006, and September 2007. News releases and
33 media advisories also were translated into Spanish and distributed to Spanish-language news media
34 in the Denver Metro Area.

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

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

1 **Table 8-6 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

2

8.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

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.

The HIRSYS database of public comments contains 5,040 records. 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.

8.3.1 Transit

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

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

23 8.3.2 Highway

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

- 29 ▶ Support was given for upgrading 287 and/or US 85 to expressways to compete with the speed
30 and convenience of I-25. It was felt that US 85 needs major improvements and upgrades as
31 part of the solution.
- 32 ▶ Support was given for using tolls to finance highway improvements.
- 33 ▶ Interest was expressed for only improving existing roads and not building new roads.
- 34 ▶ It was felt that toll roads would 'cater' to higher-income portions of society and a public
35 transportation system should be accessible to the entire community.
- 36 ▶ There is a perception that if the highway were widened and traffic was no longer stop-and-go,
37 people would use the highways.
- 38 ▶ It was felt that if I-25 were to be widened through Weld County, it would result in heavy
39 congestion. Pressure to develop that area is high and an eight-lane highway would expedite
40 development and exacerbate congestion.

8.3.3 Environment

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

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

8.3.4 Other Comments

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

8.4 FUTURE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Following the Public Hearing and 45-day comment period for the Draft EIS, all comments received will be considered before identifying a Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will be identified in the Final EIS. The Final EIS will be advertised and available for public comment. A 30-day public comment period will be provided for review of the Final EIS. Following review of the comments received, and after funding has been identified for the first phase of construction, the FHWA will issue a Record of Decision, documenting the decisions made for the North I-25 EIS.