

**APPENDIX B    NOVEMBER 9, 2006 PUBLIC HEARING  
TRANSCRIPT**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

I-70/32nd AVENUE INTERCHANGE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
PUBLIC HEARING  
COMMENTS IN ACTIVITY ROOM 1

---

Thursday, November 9, 2006

4:00 p.m.

The above-entitled comments were taken at the  
Wheat Ridge Recreation Center, 4005 Kipling,  
Wheat Ridge, Colorado before Denise A. Freeman,  
Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public  
within Colorado.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 PUBLIC COMMENTS:

3 Charles Elmquist:

4 MR. ELMQUIST: Presently I live in  
5 Applewood Mesa Estates, and I would access eastbound  
6 I-70 by going underneath I-70 onto northbound  
7 Youngfield and then getting on I-70 at approximately  
8 38th Avenue.

9 It's my understanding that that on-ramp will  
10 be closed and that a replacement on-ramp, I believe, is  
11 being built at 35th, but I'm not sure if that's what  
12 they told me. Secondly, the proposed hook ramps at  
13 27th Avenue are probably 10 years down the road, if not  
14 longer.

15 So as an impacted soul, I would like to see  
16 if we can't -- back up. One of the people that I talked  
17 to said that the way I will get onto I-70 in the future  
18 is to go eastbound on 32nd, north on Cabela Drive,  
19 underneath the new underpass, and then onto I-70. It  
20 seems very awkward.

21 And from my point of view, it doesn't work.  
22 If I have to wait 10 years -- but maybe at that time I  
23 won't be able to drive anyway. That's really all I have  
24 to say. That's what jumped at me when I was looking at  
25 this stuff.

1 Bob Vermillion  
11919 W I-70 FR N, Unit 128  
2 Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033  
303-442-7111

3

4 MR. VERMILLION: I guess I would start by  
5 saying, I just returned from Lehi, Utah, which is  
6 somewhat similar to Broomfield. And halfway between  
7 Salt Lake City and Provo, where the new Cabela's store  
8 is, it drew 5 million visitors its first year. That's  
9 exceeding our state's population. That's 400,000 a  
10 month. Coors draws 300,000 a year. That's  
11 approaching 14,000 visitors a day.

12 Colorado, Denver, has a larger population.  
13 It has a greater hunting and fishing market. It's  
14 impossible to tell right now what kind of a draw the new  
15 Cabela's store will bring. The Lehi development manager  
16 said that they were experiencing development within a  
17 4-mile radius of the Cabela's store and that the  
18 developer was planning 28 restaurant sites in front of  
19 the new Cabela's.

20 My concern is having a project that we are  
21 trying to develop and having appropriated a large number  
22 of funds towards the frontage road between Kipling and  
23 Ward Road on the north side, that unless it's dealt with  
24 prior to the Cabela's development, that it's going to  
25 destroy our market.

1           We would like to see the west I-70 ramp to  
2 Ward Road be enlarged to two lanes and an additional  
3 lane going north from Ward Road -- from the I-70 west  
4 ramp north on Ward Road as they are planning to do on  
5 the south side for Cabela's.

6           I can only say it's extremely important --  
7 the traffic jams that are occurring now and the traffic  
8 that is backing up on the west ramp is extending well  
9 over a mile long, and that traffic is going north on  
10 Ward Road away from Cabela's. And if there is going to  
11 be work on that ramp area, they certainly need to  
12 include the north traffic and the additional impact that  
13 Cabela's will create on that north traffic. Thank you.

14

15 ANN FREMGEN  
16 14425 West 44th Drive  
17 Golden, Colorado 80403  
18 303-279-1478

19

20           MS. FREMGEN: I really could care less about  
21 most of this project. I do not want to see the  
22 interchange at Cabela Drive and Highway 58, State  
23 Highway 58. And I actually am okay with the  
24 interchange. What I don't want to see is the connection  
25 to 44th Avenue.

26           I live in the little development that's  
27 right across the street from where it will connect onto

1 44th. I think it will -- I think it will really be a  
2 severe negative impact on my neighborhood -- noise,  
3 pollution, light pollution -- because you know there are  
4 going to be streetlights and stuff there, intermittent  
5 traffic.

6 I think there are huge issues with the  
7 railroad being another two blocks down, and there is a  
8 train there often. I just -- I don't think it should  
9 correct to 44th Avenue at all.

10 Basically how I see it is that Wheat Ridge  
11 is going to rip -- they are ripping us off -- but they  
12 are going to reap the economic benefits of this and yet  
13 dump their traffic problems into an unincorporated  
14 neighborhood. I think there are a horrible neighbor. I  
15 think only a fool would shop there. It just infuriates  
16 me that they are going to do this.

17 I think it's also -- I think it could be a  
18 very dangerous situation between -- because, when a  
19 train is at -- when they're jammed up because of a  
20 train -- there is always people that cut through our  
21 neighborhood. And all this is going to do is put even  
22 more traffic in our neighborhood. And these are people  
23 that are mad because they have to wait for a train.  
24 They are whipping through there. It's just -- and there  
25 is no reason for it.

1           This is Wheat Ridge's development. It  
2 should -- their access should be through Wheat Ridge.  
3 The emergency aspect part of it is a pretty poor  
4 argument. The chances of Fairmount Fire Department  
5 being called over there are -- it would be slim.

6           Any hospital medical emergency, that's going  
7 to be coming from Lutheran, which is directly east. So  
8 I just think that's a false argument, and I think it's  
9 just a way to dump their problems on another  
10 neighborhood. So that's pretty much what I think.

11           Also about how well they have notified  
12 people -- and the people who live in Fairmont, or at  
13 least in my neighborhood, this thing that came out, this  
14 is only the second thing I have ever received. I  
15 received one other notice, and that's it. Because in  
16 there it said, phone calls, mailings, small groups, blah  
17 blah, blah, blah, blah. That's just flat out a lie.

18           I have lived in that neighborhood -- it's  
19 not like there is an address issue -- for almost 20  
20 years. The first I have seen of this. So, anyway, I  
21 think it's a little underhanded.

22

23

24

25



1 RICHARD PIERSON  
4400 Gladiola Street  
2 Golden, Colorado 80403  
303-279-0530

3

4 MR. PIERSON: My concern is on the Holman  
5 exchange to 44th Avenue off of Highway 58, is why they  
6 put more traffic on 44th with a railroad crossing down  
7 there that can block up traffic all the way past  
8 McIntyre Street. And the housing developments that are  
9 there -- there are two of them -- and their only access  
10 at getting out of there or getting in there is off of  
11 44th Avenue. So you will not be able to get emergency  
12 vehicles in or out of those housing developments when  
13 44th is backed up.

14 That's about it. I just don't understand  
15 that.

16

17 KEVIN HOOD  
3850 Garland Street  
18 Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033  
303-424-1759

19

20 MR. HOOD: I am the vice president of  
21 Wheat Ridge 20/20, and I strongly am in favor of the  
22 Cabela's project and surrounding development. I think  
23 it's good for the Wheat Ridge economy, and I think  
24 it's infrastructure that the community has desperately  
25 needed for a long time.

1 I think that it will dramatically improve  
2 currently poor traffic flow and will create jobs and  
3 interest in Wheat Ridge that will be the catalyst of  
4 future development.

5

6 EDWARD CHUEY  
2030 Willow Lane  
7 Lakewood, Colorado 80215  
303-239-8852

8

9 MR. CHUEY: My concern regards the  
10 completion of the flyover ramp from I-70 eastbound onto  
11 58 westbound. The completion of that is not going to  
12 happen until after the store opens -- six months, I  
13 understand. By doing that, this will develop traffic  
14 patterns that will force people going to the airport  
15 from the mountains to use the existing off-ramp at the  
16 Youngfield exit. And this will develop bad traffic  
17 patterns and habits for that six-month period.

18

19 DICK MALMROS  
2478 Alkire Street  
20 Golden, Colorado 80401  
303-279-6866

21

22 MR. MALMROS: I am going to give you this.  
23 It's a marked-up rendition of the -- it's pretty close  
24 to the plan that they have described. And my concerns  
25 are that it should be on the -- the main entry should

1 be off of Colorado 58. And that would mean that the  
2 primary traffic eastbound from I-70 would swing over  
3 on 58 and go in and out of the shopping area.

4           And that would mean that leaving from  
5 Cabela's eastbound would also be focused on 58. And why  
6 am I saying that? To put a tunnel under I-70 in that  
7 location is not viable. They would have to close down  
8 I-70 for six months to do it. It's just not viable at  
9 all.

10           To add traffic from that underpass going  
11 towards Ward Road and therefore 44th Avenue just  
12 compounds the traffic that's already onto that and still  
13 causes problems going eastbound to get onto 70.

14           What I suggest is that the off-ramp from  
15 westbound I-70 also be made into an on-ramp on I-70  
16 rather than to go anywhere near 32nd. And that the  
17 existing on-ramp to I-70 westbound at 32nd be closed.

18           Traffic that was from 32nd could go on the  
19 Cabela Drive access, which is at Zinnia, and could loop  
20 back onto that on-ramp going westbound. Eastbound you  
21 would leave the existing ramp at 38th and I-70. Leave  
22 it there. And leave the existing off-ramp -- I'm not  
23 sure exactly what street that is -- but it's like 28th  
24 or 29th or 30th, somewhere around there -- and just  
25 leave it the way it is and not move it back to 27th.

1           What that would do is relieve the congestion  
2 at 32nd. You would still have access at 32nd to get  
3 into the shopping center, which you would need for  
4 emergencies, but it would not be a primary access  
5 because there wouldn't be the need to try and get on  
6 I-70 across 32nd.

7           My second reason for all of these things is  
8 that the way it's presently designed with the underpass  
9 at 40th, with the expansion to five lanes on Youngfield  
10 going towards 44th and Ward Road, and with elimination  
11 of that on-ramp at I-70, it basically does irreparable  
12 damage to the Applewood Shopping Center as presently  
13 constituted where we have a King Soopers, a Wal-Mart, a  
14 number of restaurants, and so on.

15           It's a much cheaper way to go. They are  
16 talking about a possible road extension that goes to  
17 McIntyre, which would be another access and should also  
18 be put in as an emergency exit/entrance. So it's  
19 cheaper.

20           And it was so complicated that, without  
21 giving you some kind of a drawing and information, I  
22 didn't -- I think that it would have been too difficult  
23 to try and write that down. So I thought maybe I could  
24 explain it easier.

25

1 CONNIE PATTERSON  
14400 West 45th Drive  
2 Golden, Colorado 80403  
303-279-7212

3

4 MS. PATTERSON: My concerns in opposition to  
5 the questions and answers: Why does the new  
6 SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange connect to 44th Avenue?  
7 Second question: Why is the new SH 58/Cabela Drive  
8 interchange located at Holman Street?

9 As a federal, state and county taxpayer, I  
10 am opposed to the funding for the infrastructure for a  
11 private business in a neighboring city. I am also  
12 opposed to the extra traffic being brought on into our  
13 single-lane rural neighborhood street. It is totally  
14 illogical to spend millions of dollars on a Cabela  
15 Drive/44th Avenue/Holman Street interchange.

16 Here are a couple of logical reasons for  
17 unnecessary spending: At this time, 6/10 of a mile from  
18 Holman Street down 44th Avenue to McIntyre, is a  
19 multimillion dollar project being built. It is to  
20 accommodate the heavy traffic on a major thoroughfare  
21 and a well-needed safety improvement that the taxpayers  
22 will benefit from.

23 Next, spending millions of dollars --  
24 millions of dollars of state and county taxpayers to  
25 build a new SH 58/Cabela Drive interchange located at

1 Holman Street, 1/10 of a mile long; single-lane, rural  
2 asphalt; no sidewalks, gutters; no drainage; dead-end  
3 street ending in our front yards of our homes.

4           It is a small -- Holman is a small rural  
5 street for local residents only and is filled with  
6 children playing, riding bicycles and horses. Who will  
7 be benefitting from the millions of dollars spent on it  
8 and who will be paying? Not only tax dollars, but the  
9 high price of hazards to our families.

10           If the state and county want to spend some  
11 tax dollars for taxpayers' problems, we have one on 44th  
12 and Indiana, a major thoroughfare. Indiana is a major  
13 thoroughfare.

14           We need a stoplight as it is a very  
15 hazardous intersection, and it is 1/10 of a mile west of  
16 Holman. I think a little more research on this problem  
17 should be done. Let the City of Wheat Ridge and the  
18 private businesses fund and build their own streets and  
19 roads in their own neighborhood for their own benefit  
20 and profit.

21           I am a property owner and taxpayer of  
22 Jefferson County. Connie Patterson, and you can reach  
23 me at 14400 West 45th Drive, Golden, Colorado 80403.

24

25

1 HENRY VAN FLEET  
2 2267 Zinnia Street  
3 Golden, Colorado 80401  
4 303-238-2905

5

6 MR. VAN FLEET: My comments are relative  
7 to the 40th underpass at Youngfield. This underpass  
8 is going to be a hazard. It's going to be a death  
9 trap, and it's going to be a high maintenance area.  
10 The distance between 38th and 40th is very minimal for  
11 this type of a workable solution. It's a 5 percent  
12 grade with stop signs -- stoplights both at 38th and  
13 on the new 40th underpass.

14 This is on the back slope, the north slope,  
15 and it's going to be hazardous because the slope, the  
16 drainage -- weather, icing -- the northwest winds are  
17 going to affect this.

18 Most of all, it's one of the poorest  
19 designed configurations I have ever seen, and you are  
20 talking to an engineer that's retired, for 40 years, 23  
21 years as director of engineering for the City of Denver,  
22 teacher of engineering classes for the University of  
23 Colorado.

24 This tunnel is going to be below -- the  
25 grade of the tunnel is going to be below Youngfield  
26 Avenue -- Youngfield Street, rather. To climb out of  
27 it, you are going to have an up-ramp and then a right

1 turn of a 5 percent grade, which is going to be  
2 hazardous. And it's going to be difficult to climb that  
3 grade in the wintertime with snow and ice on that slope  
4 because the sun is not going to reach it.

5           And just the reverse of it, those that are  
6 traveling north on Youngfield are going to have a hard  
7 time stopping at a short distance at the 40th underpass.

8           And lane switching. Currently there are two  
9 lanes on Youngfield. You might say there's two or three  
10 lanes because there is a left-turn lane there. But  
11 widening of this is going to cause no end of problems  
12 trying to go from the left to the left-turn lane to go  
13 into the underpass into Cabela's.

14           This is going to be hard to stop on the down  
15 grade. And if you are climbing to the south, you are  
16 going to have trouble climbing the grade after you have  
17 stopped at 40th and get started again. Over the years  
18 it's worked reasonably well because of basically two  
19 lanes. You have two traffic lanes there, and this keeps  
20 the snow and ice beat down so cars can climb it. But  
21 they do not have to have a stop at the proposed 40th,  
22 which is going to increase problems.

23           Anybody associated with this in the future  
24 should be called in to state their business as far as  
25 this because I think a class action suit should be



1 forthcoming for anybody injured in this construction.  
2 And that is Wheat Ridge and Jefferson County because  
3 they are the two principals in here and possibly the  
4 Colorado Department of Highways/Transportation for their  
5 allowing this to go under I-70 in an unworkable manner.

6           It's going to be a hazard, high maintenance,  
7 very difficult to maintain, and there are going to be  
8 some serious consequences in the future.

9

10 SHIRLEY PIERCE  
11 11712 West 21st Place  
12 Lakewood, Colorado 80215  
13 303-237-0978

14

15           MS. PIERCE: I am Shirley Pierce, and my  
16 family and I have lived here in our house in Applewood  
17 for 42 years. And we have had a wonderful life in  
18 Applewood -- a quiet, nice neighborhood to raise a  
19 family in. We live between 20th and 26th below Simms.

20           We are all very concerned about the traffic  
21 pattern. It will change drastically if the hook ramp  
22 goes in on 27th and Youngfield. And there will be lots  
23 of traffic that now uses 20th and 26th that does not use  
24 it now, and it will change our quality of living in the  
25 area.

26           And it is terribly upsetting to those of  
27 us -- it's an old neighborhood that has established

1 homes, and we are used to a quiet way of life, and we  
2 don't want it changed. And I hope that Wheat Ridge and  
3 Cabela's will listen to our comments because it doesn't  
4 seem like they have been listening before.

5 All of the hundreds and hundreds of people  
6 that have gone to all these meetings, all the comments  
7 seem like they never got anywhere. So it's kind of  
8 upsetting to all of us who have tried our best to keep  
9 it the way we want it. Thank you.

10

11 ROBERT H. ROBINSON  
12 13506 West 22nd Place  
13 Golden, Colorado 80401  
14 303-278-0786

15

16 MR. ROBINSON: I feel this project  
17 benefits practically no one except Cabela's, and so I  
18 guess I am -- it just doesn't seem to make any sense  
19 to me. It's not going to benefit the residents  
20 because there are plenty of shopping opportunities in  
21 Denver for the kind of goods that they supply.

22 It's not going to benefit the current  
23 businessmen in the Applewood Shopping Center. That  
24 shopping center already has a number of closed  
25 storefronts. And if they build a Cabela's across the  
26 highway and they allow additional business development  
27 already, that will make things even worse in the

1 Applewood Shopping Center.

2           This kind of development is mostly staffed  
3 by minimum wage or slightly above minimum wage kind of  
4 jobs. Those people will probably bus in or drive in  
5 from other parts of the city. They probably can't  
6 afford the kind of houses that are in the immediate  
7 area. The managers of the stores probably won't live in  
8 this area either. They'll probably live in some  
9 high-priced high-upscale place.

10           But the worst part about it is that Wheat  
11 Ridge -- I'm not sure I have my facts on this -- but  
12 Wheat Ridge either has a delayed revenue stream from  
13 this because they are exempt from sales taxes or it's  
14 been delayed. So who -- I just don't get it. Who is  
15 benefitting from this? That was my opener.

16           My own personal disappointment about this is  
17 that I am moving from Applewood to Paramount Heights to  
18 get away from the traffic noise on I-70. And one of  
19 these new interchanges at I-70 and 27th is going to  
20 direct more traffic right down to where I bought another  
21 house. I can't get away from it. So I am dead set  
22 against the whole thing.

23

24

25

1 BOYD HOBACK  
2 601 Corporate Circle  
3 Golden, Colorado 80401  
4 303-384-1411  
5

6 MR. HOBACK: We operate the Good Times  
7 restaurant at 32nd and I-70. Currently there exists a  
8 full turning access into Conoco and Good Times which  
9 will be restricted to a right in/right out. All of the  
10 traffic for Good Times and Conoco needs access back to  
11 the full turning access point on Cabela Drive.

12 Today there currently exists no cross access  
13 from Conoco or Good Times north. The access will have  
14 to go north from Good Times across Country Cafe to the  
15 full turning access point. Good Times currently has  
16 parking across the east edge of its lot, and all of its  
17 drive-through traffic exits onto that internal roadway.

18 There appears to be enough room to extend a  
19 common access road to the east of Good Times' property.  
20 There is a current access easement that runs east/west  
21 between Good Times and Conoco, but there is no  
22 north/south cross access.

23 We would like to see a signalized full  
24 turning intersection at Cabela Drive or all of Conoco  
25 and Good Times and Country Cafe traffic would have to  
26 access southbound Cabela Drive. Very truly yours.

27 (WHEREUPON, the comments concluded at 6:38 p.m.)

1 STATE OF COLORADO)

2 ) SS. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 COUNTY OF DENVER )

4 I, Denise A. Freeman, do hereby certify  
5 that I am a Registered Professional Reporter and  
6 Notary Public within the state of Colorado.

7 I further certify that these comments were  
8 taken in shorthand by me at the time and place herein  
9 set forth and were thereafter reduced to typewritten  
10 form, and that the foregoing constitutes a true and  
11 correct transcript.

12 In witness whereof, I have affixed my  
13 signature this 21st day of November, 2006.



14 *Denise Freeman*

15 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO

16 Denise A. Freeman  
17 Registered Professional Reporter  
18 and Notary Public  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1

20

2

3 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO  
4 2170 South Parker Road, Suite 263  
5 Denver, Colorado 80231

6

November 21, 2006

7 MR. KEVIN R. MADDOUX  
8 Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
9 6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600  
10 Centennial, Colorado 80111

11

12 Re: I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental  
13 Assessment, Public Hearing, Comments In Activity Room 1

14 Dear Mr. Maddoux:

15 Enclosed is the original transcript of the  
16 above-referenced comments:

17

18 \_\_\_ Previously filed. Forwarding signature page  
19 and any amendment sheets.

20 \_\_\_ Signed, no changes.

21 \_\_\_ Signed, with changes; copy attached.

22 \_\_\_ X\_\_\_ No signature required.

23 \_\_\_ Signature waived.

24 \_\_\_ Forwarding original transcript unsigned;  
25 signature pages and/or amendments will be forwarded  
if received.

\_\_\_ Original exhibits included in ongoing notebook  
and will be filed with counsel at conclusion of  
discovery.

\_\_\_ Case settled.

\_\_\_ Reading and signing not requested pursuant to CRCP  
Rule 30(e).

26

Enclosures: (As above noted)

27

PATTERSON REPORTING &amp; VIDEO

I-70/32nd AVENUE INTERCHANGE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

COMMENTS IN ACTIVITY ROOM 1 - VOLUME II

---

Thursday, November 9, 2006

4:00 p.m.

The above-entitled comments were taken at the Wheat Ridge Recreation Center, 4005 Kipling, Wheat Ridge, Colorado, before K. Michelle Dittmer, Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public within Colorado.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 PUBLIC COMMENTS:

3 Don Whetsel  
4 8770 W. 38th Avenue  
5 Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033  
6 303-423-0989

7

8 MR. WHETSEL: Now, I think there have been  
9 too much emphasis on the traffic, because it isn't like  
10 a factory, where everybody goes in at an hour and comes  
11 back out at an hour. This is going to be, you know,  
12 local traffic and traffic all day long. So we aren't  
13 talking about a jam, you know. We're talking about  
14 just normal traffic going through.

15 And I think that we're -- the people are  
16 too concerned about the traffic that's going to be. I  
17 don't think there's going to be any problem at all,  
18 especially the way they got it set up. There's  
19 multiexits that you can get in and out of there, so  
20 it's -- I don't -- I don't understand why everybody is  
21 so concerned about the traffic. That's my comments.

22

23 Rob Osborn  
24 WR 2020  
25 4350 Wadsworth Boulevard  
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033  
720-259-1030

26

27 MR. OSBORN: Wheat Ridge 2020 is a



1 nonprofit community and economic development  
2 corporation focused on revitalization efforts in the  
3 city of Wheat Ridge.

4           Wheat Ridge 2020 fully supports the  
5 proposed highway improvements as identified in the  
6 I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental Assessment.  
7 The improvements are essential to alleviate  
8 long-standing traffic congestion along its major  
9 corridor and will promote long-term transportation  
10 benefits that will enable sustainable commercial  
11 development in our community.

12           We support the proposed highway  
13 improvements because the proposed improvements will  
14 provide solutions to existing long-standing traffic  
15 congestion problems on the I-70 and 32nd Avenue  
16 Interchange area.

17           The proposed improvements will provide  
18 direct access between Interstate 70 and State  
19 Highway 58 that will effectuate better traffic flow to  
20 the northwest areas of Wheat Ridge, Golden, and Arvada.  
21 The proposed improvements improve and enhance egress on  
22 and off Interstate 70 and Ward Road, eliminating  
23 existing and future congestion problems by widening the  
24 road and allowing direct turn lanes.

25           The proposed improvements at Interstate 70

1 and the 27th Avenue and Youngfield Streets will provide  
2 additional access point to I-70 that will reduce  
3 traffic congestion on northbound Youngfield Avenue.

4 The proposed improvements at the west side of  
5 Interstate 70 and 32nd Avenue Interchange will provide  
6 safer egress on and off I-70 and improve the flow of  
7 traffic at that interchange.

8           These improvements will provide traffic  
9 conditions that calm the flow of traffic and minimize  
10 backups at these egress points. The proposed  
11 improvements will facilitate enhanced access to  
12 existing commercial facilities along Youngfield Street  
13 and the proposed new commercial development that will  
14 provide sustainable taxed growth and generation for  
15 Wheat Ridge and Jefferson County.

16           For these reasons, Wheat Ridge 2020  
17 Corporation supports the I-70 and 32nd Avenue  
18 Interchange highway improvements as addressed in the  
19 Environmental Assessment.

20

21 Cheryl Brungardt  
22 5621 W. 36th Place  
23 Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033  
24 303-425-0230

25

26           MS. BRUNGARDT: I've been watching this  
27 whole process, and I appreciate CDOT taking the

1 comments. And I am in favor of the Environmental  
2 Assessment that's happened, and we'd just like to see  
3 it go through so Cabela's could be built.

4           And I think that this traffic situation is  
5 going to get worse as the area grows in the next 20 to  
6 30 years, and so what we can do now that we have money  
7 for would be great. Because if we don't plan for  
8 growth, the growth is going to happen anyway, and then  
9 the road is going to be way out under -- like it is  
10 now, and it's not able to serve the traffic that's  
11 there now, much less 20 or 30 years of additional  
12 growth.

13

14 Dennis Brungardt  
15 5621 W. 36th Place  
16 Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033  
17 303-425-0230

18           MR. BRUNGARDT: I'd like to speak to  
19 endorse the development of the 32nd Street/I-70  
20 Interchange. I've utilized that interchange for  
21 30-some years, and I've seen the need for improvement  
22 to take place in that area.

23           Now is the time to do it, and we need to  
24 be proactive and do what needs to be done for the -- in  
25 a transportation vein for the betterment of the  
community.

1 Flora Andrus  
4790 Easley Road  
2 Golden, Colorado 80403  
303-278-8660

3

4 MS. ANDRUS: I'm very pleased with the  
5 product that has been offered in the EA because it  
6 represents consideration of our 44th and Holman  
7 intersection with Cabela Drive, whereas they're going  
8 to try to design it to help us keep the community  
9 character alive.

10 As we go forward, there will be the  
11 I-70/58 process that I'd be interested in being a  
12 participant in, but for all of the work that has been  
13 done, I think they have done a marvelous job and that  
14 our concerns have been represented very, very well.

15

16 Following is written statement Flora Andrus wanted  
17 entered into the record:

18

19 November 8, 2006

20 Re: Remaining Fairmount Concerns at 44th/Holman  
21 Street/Cabela Drive

22 Dear CDOT staff: In review of the I-70/32nd Avenue  
23 Interchange Environmental Assessment we are pleased to  
24 find recognition of the concern relative to the  
25 extension of Cabela Drive north to connect with 44th

1 Avenue, which is at the Holman Street intersection.

2           Executive summary: It is recognized that  
3 such a connection would reduce the quality of the view  
4 of South Table Mountain by the residents along Holman  
5 Street. To address this concern, as well as others  
6 identified, the Mitigation Measures-Visual is to  
7 "Incorporate landscaping and other design elements  
8 within right-of-way, where space is available to  
9 provide a visual transition between the adjacent area  
10 and the new signalized intersection at Cabela Drive,  
11 44th Avenue and Holman Street."

12           Environmental Assessment Manual: While  
13 there may be other references, we are particularly  
14 pleased with the following statements to continue the  
15 resolution of and mitigation of the aspects so  
16 designated through/during the design process, with  
17 public comment from the particular neighborhood  
18 impacted. References are as follows:

19           Mitigation - Section 4.1.2.3 and  
20 Section 4.16.3 Mitigation - page 4-139, last paragraph  
21 and continued on page 140 the first paragraph, which  
22 reads:

23           "The signalized intersection at Cabela  
24 Drive, 44th Avenue, and Holman Street would introduce a  
25 new traffic signal on 44th Avenue and affect the visual

1 character of the area for the adjacent residences.  
2 During final design, CDOT will investigate landscape  
3 design options and/or other design features that will  
4 soften the effect of the new signalized intersection  
5 and provide an appropriate transition to the  
6 residential area (Fairmount neighborhood).

7           "CDOT will incorporate landscaping and  
8 other design elements within the right-of-way, where  
9 space is available, in order to provide a visual  
10 transition with the adjacent neighborhood, such as  
11 entry treatment, entry signage, sidewalk constrictions,  
12 and other traffic calming devices.

13           "Public input will be solicited on  
14 aesthetic issues, such as bridge design treatments at  
15 grade-separated intersections and retaining walls.  
16 These will include facing materials, colors, textures,  
17 and aesthetic elements. Input will also be solicited  
18 on roadway appurtenances, such as lighting fixtures,  
19 signs, and traffic control devices that have visual  
20 effects."

21           We look forward to meeting with the design  
22 staff to formulate a suitable design and mitigate  
23 measures that will preserve the solitude of this 100  
24 home community into the future.

25           Please see the attached presentation to

1 Wheat Ridge City Council at the ODP/FDP hearing of  
2 August 14, 2006. This conveys the primary concerns of  
3 this Fairmount community.

4           We certainly appreciate your willingness to  
5 meet with us at this special meeting. Your  
6 understanding has made the difference in the outcome of  
7 this major change to our communities. Thanks to you  
8 all.

9           Most sincerely, Flora A. Andrus, President,  
10 Fairmount Improvement Association.

11

12 (Attached Presentation):

13           Wheat Ridge City Council Hearing. Rezone,  
14 ODP and FDP of WR Annexed properties in Clear Creek  
15 Valley, August 14, 2006, Fairmount Improvement  
16 Association Comments.

17           As president of the Fairmount Improvement  
18 Association, I would first like to take this  
19 opportunity to publicly express our appreciation for  
20 all of the considerations afforded our communities by  
21 Wheat Ridge, Cabela's and Coors.

22           I would like to appeal to you regarding a  
23 concern of your northerly neighbors. This situation is  
24 relevant to the north terminus of the Diamond  
25 Interchange as it is to be connected to 44th Avenue at

1 Holman Street. We understand that this connection is  
2 mandated and not desired by Cabela's any more than the  
3 residential community of Fairmount.

4           There are two adjacent enclaves located  
5 just north of 44th Avenue between Holman and Eldridge  
6 streets, each of approximately 50 homes, one built in  
7 the '50s and the other less than 15 years old. These  
8 properties have only 44th Avenue as their ingress/egress  
9 to their homes. They are surrounded by dead-end streets  
10 on the north by the RR tracks and no exits either east  
11 or west.

12           Because of this unusual situation in  
13 Fairmount, we request that you give particular  
14 consideration to the impacts that will be felt in this  
15 community and provide mitigation for this area. We hope  
16 that the EA will identify needed protections for these  
17 residential properties along 44th Avenue.

18           Potential Applications: Privacy walls (of  
19 masonry type construction - not plastic or wood that  
20 deteriorate). Sound walls would be helpful, if not a  
21 total noise abatement, although privacy is a major  
22 consideration.

23           Safety protection for the community whose  
24 properties are no more than 15 feet from the ROW of  
25 44th Avenue. Privacy walls would be effective to



1 protect this community as a safety measure. 44th  
2 Avenue is the current school bus stop for this  
3 community.

4           Mandated Connection: Trail connections  
5 between Clear Creek Trail and 44th Avenue will likely  
6 be part of the bridge over CH 58. A trail along 44th  
7 Avenue should be upgraded to access the bridge  
8 connection to Clear Creek Trail. Traffic signals for  
9 pedestrian/bicyclists to safely cross 44th Avenue and  
10 access the bridge to the Clear Creek Trail should be  
11 provided.

12           Preservation of Residential Communities:  
13 Protect Home Values. Identification that the Holman  
14 Street is 'local' street. It is essentially a dead-end  
15 street, not to be invaded by travelers.

16           An obvious limitation of direct access to  
17 Holman. As truckers who are unfamiliar with the area  
18 approach 44th Avenue, it should be very clear that they  
19 must turn right or left.

20           Front Door - Back Door: Since this  
21 interchange is considered the front door to the  
22 Cabela's by many, there should be considerations of an  
23 aesthetic entryway: A, not just a trucking entry -  
24 like an unloading dock at the back of a store; B,  
25 lighting should be mitigated to protect the community;

1 C, pollution from the trucking exhaust should be  
2 mitigated; D, noise levels need to be controlled.

3           The Environmental Assessment will hopefully  
4 recognize these very real concerns. We just want to  
5 make you aware of the impact of this decision. We also  
6 would like to work with you to accomplish the greatest  
7 abatement of these concerns.

8           Respectfully, Flora A. Andrus.

9

10 Dr. Debra S. Moulton  
11 12245 W. 29th Place  
12 Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80215  
13 303-238-4987

12

13           MS. MOULTON: My name is Dr. Debra S.  
14 Moulton, and I'm currently a resident of Wheat Ridge,  
15 and I further own a business located in Wheat Ridge.  
16 I would like to address the flaws in the proposed hook  
17 ramps on Youngfield and 27th.

18           Youngfield and 27th is both a residential  
19 and commercial neighborhood. The current proposal  
20 would highly impact the residents surrounding this area  
21 due to the proposed exit and entrance ramps for  
22 eastbound I-70. The current EA proposal requires the  
23 exit ramp location through the acquisition of  
24 residences and properties and feet from homes and  
25 backyards not acquired.

1                   27th Avenue is a two-lane road with a park  
2 on the corner. Due to the fact that 27th crosses a  
3 dam, it can never be expanded in the future. This EA  
4 pointed out that the traffic on 27th would only  
5 increase to 900 cars per day and will not affect the  
6 dam.

7                   With a Ph.D. in statistics, I question  
8 this arbitrary number, not considering the current  
9 traffic patterns for both ramps. Many cars currently  
10 utilize 32nd and 38th to head to the current eastbound  
11 ramps, as well as exit from eastbound to get to their  
12 homes.

13                   I predict this figure to be considerably  
14 higher than 900 cars per day on 27th Avenue, which  
15 leads east into a residential community on 26th Avenue.  
16 Children cross this street to go to Stober Elementary  
17 on a daily basis, and we would be put at risk with this  
18 proposal.

19                   This EA points out that it is better to  
20 have an entrance and exit ramp in the same location for  
21 convenience to drivers. This assumes that people are  
22 headed in the same direction from where they came. If  
23 drivers want to head back west, they will need to drive  
24 close to a mile to go under a bridge to the other side  
25 of I-70 in order to do so.

1           The distance of the Applewood Shopping  
2 Center is too far from the exit ramp; so far, it will  
3 be impossible to see signs from I-70 to know that a  
4 shopping center even exists.

5           The proposal sets an entryway to the  
6 highway right at the exit of a park. How safe is it to  
7 put an entryway to a highway next to a park?

8           The five lanes on Youngfield are proposed  
9 to 27th Avenue, but Youngfield south of 27th is not  
10 addressed, nor are lights to allow community members an  
11 exit to Youngfield.

12           This EA is filled with mentions of public  
13 preferences with plans eliminated due to acquisition of  
14 land, yet this proposal suggests acquiring over 156,000  
15 square feet of land from three residences, five  
16 businesses, in addition to disrupting an entire  
17 community exit to 26th and Beech Court with a freeway  
18 exit affecting hundreds of homes.

19           Page 2-49 of the summary, Figure 2-16,  
20 depicts an interim lane addition to the existing  
21 off-ramp from westbound I-70 initially. The proposed  
22 action, as indicated on 2-48 is, quote, "not currently  
23 required and will be delayed until no later than 2030,"  
24 unquote.

25           There are other viable options that must

1 be carefully considered now before this EA is approved  
2 north of 27th, closer to the commercial shopping  
3 center.

4           One quite feasible alternative is called  
5 the "blue location," depicted in Figure 2-4 on  
6 page 2-31 and is described as having been eliminated  
7 for the following reasons depicted in Table 2-3 on  
8 page 2-29. Quote: "A second signal on Youngfield  
9 would be introduced," unquote.

10           Of course, this makes no sense since the  
11 current light where the exit ramp exists would  
12 obviously be eliminated in this proposal; thus, no  
13 second signal would be introduced.

14           2. Quote: "Requires the eastbound I-70  
15 bridge to be widened to provide for required  
16 acceleration distance," unquote.

17           My counter to this is simple: Think of  
18 the money saved not extending the Youngfield lanes to  
19 five all the way up to 27th on questionable acquisition  
20 of over 156,000 square feet of homes and commercial  
21 properties, as well as not having addressed the impact  
22 of the residential communities on both Youngfield south  
23 of 27th and 27th east of Youngfield; specifically, the  
24 inability to expand 27th from a two-lane road and the  
25 lack of safety measures of our residential communities

1 along Youngfield and 26th Avenue.

2                   Although I know these issues have been  
3 publicly discussed in previous meetings, they are not  
4 present in this EA and thus needed to be reiterated.

5

6 Kathleen Krager  
899 Logan Street, #210  
7 Denver, Colorado 80203  
303-446-2626

8

9                   MS. KRAGER: My name is Kathleen Krager.  
10 I'm a transportation engineer with the firm of Krager &  
11 Associates, and I'm here tonight representing the  
12 business interests along the I-70 Frontage Road north  
13 of 32nd Avenue.

14                   And I want to remind both CDOT and the  
15 City of Westminster that there is a full-movement  
16 access proposed from new Cabela Drive that serves the  
17 established existing business area. And because of  
18 Cabela's increased traffic on this roadway, that  
19 intersection will require signalization.

20                   This signal should be paid for by Cabela's  
21 and should not be the responsibility of any of the  
22 existing businesses, since without Cabela's traffic, no  
23 signal would be warranted.

24                   Thank you.

25

1 Dwaine Richter  
4505 S. Yosemite Street, #371  
2 Denver, Colorado 80237  
303-741-2123

3

4 MR. RICHTER: I am the property owner of  
5 existing businesses and vacant lots in 70 West Business  
6 Center, which is the northwest corner of 32nd and I-70.  
7 We will be negotiating with the City, or whoever  
8 acquires the right-of-way, for additional widening of  
9 Cabela Drive from 32nd Avenue north to 40th Avenue.

10 I would like the City, or whoever does the  
11 construction design of the street, to consider using  
12 the existing 25-foot-wide berm and 10-foot wall as part  
13 of the necessary street, Cabela Drive, for 93 feet of  
14 proposed right-of-way width.

15 In the design, I'd like to have them look  
16 at using that and maybe tearing down or relocating the  
17 wall further west. The 10-foot wall does not need to  
18 have a 25-foot-wide strip of land, and some of that  
19 25 feet could be added to the required 93 feet of  
20 street width.

21

22 Elizabeth Ternes  
2572 Beech Court  
23 Golden, Colorado 80401  
303-233-8352

24

25 MS. TERNES: The impacts of the 27th

1 Avenue hook ramps would greatly impact my neighborhood,  
2 as well as my neighbors. Part of my neighbor's yard is  
3 going to be impinged upon because of this.

4 My children are not even going to be able  
5 to go outside to play, much less cross the street, to  
6 be able to go to the park to play.

7 I can't even sell my house because I have  
8 to have this as a disclosure, of this coming in. It  
9 creates just a total impact and a degrade of our  
10 environment and our neighborhoods.

11 There are schools all throughout that  
12 area, down off of 38th: Maple Grove, Stober  
13 Elementary. All these areas are going to be heavily  
14 impacted: Eastbound exit and then eastbound entrance,  
15 all in one area.

16 Novacek's, the nurseries that sit right  
17 there, that is -- that is a historical area. It's the  
18 last standing carnation farm. That family has been  
19 there for almost 100 years. And they're just willing  
20 to just come trampling across somebody's space,  
21 somebody's livelihood, somebody's entire life and  
22 history, and just take it away for growth, for greed,  
23 and nothing but.

24 Have respect for your neighborhoods, have  
25 respect for the people that help to maintain



1 businesses, and don't run us out of our neighborhoods  
2 by making it unlivable.

3           Keep our children safe. There's a park  
4 right there. An exit ramp right onto I-70 right by a  
5 park, right by where children cross, go back and forth,  
6 that's a hazard waiting to happen: Number one,  
7 injuries; number two, kidnappings.

8           It's just, it's a dangerous -- it's not  
9 the answer. 27th Avenue is not the answer. Move it  
10 down to the industrial area.

11           Thank you.

12

13 Claudia Browne  
14 14362 W. 30th Place  
15 Golden, Colorado 80401  
16 303-271-1884

17 MS. BROWNE: While I intend to provide  
18 more detailed comments prior to the December 8  
19 deadline, I felt it only fair to inform you of my  
20 serious concerns about the draft Environmental  
21 Assessment submitted by Wheat Ridge and Cabela's.

22 Truly, the neighbors are not trying to be  
23 obstructionist and believe that Cabela's could be a  
24 quality addition to the area if planned well. However,  
25 the current EA does not provide convincing evidence of  
no significant impact and, in fact, seems to be

1 designed to avoid the need for meaningful mitigation.

2           My initial impressions are that the  
3 document is seriously flawed for the several reasons  
4 listed below:

5           1: The No Action alternative is a false  
6 construct with erroneous assumptions about traffic  
7 volumes. The traffic volumes in the No Action  
8 alternative are by no means a given, because while  
9 another commercial development may occupy the site, it  
10 would not necessarily be a development that draws  
11 3 million cars per year.

12           Therefore, the No Action alternative is an  
13 inappropriate basis for comparison. There needs to be  
14 a sensitivity analysis comparing the proposed  
15 improvements to a realistic alternative such as no  
16 improvements and significantly lower traffic flows,  
17 assuming a smaller local development that does not  
18 depend on regional traffic inflows.

19           2: The air and noise analyses do not  
20 adequately take into account the cumulative impacts of  
21 the project.

22           3: Because of the inappropriate use of  
23 the No Action alternative and the absence of cumulative  
24 impact analysis, impacts from key issues such as air  
25 and noise are downplayed; and as a result, no

1 meaningful mitigation measures are proposed, such as  
2 providing alternative transportation to reduce the  
3 inflow of traffic.

4           4: The EA does not provide a full  
5 explanation of its assumptions or a systematic  
6 fact-based analysis (e.g. about traffic volumes and  
7 vehicle mix, delivery vehicles, road usage), and  
8 therefore it is not possible to determine if the EA is  
9 complete, accurate, or reasonable.

10           5: I believe the EA needs to be revised  
11 to address these and other concerns and/or that the  
12 process needs to move to a full EIS evaluation.

13           However, we are losing confidence in the  
14 process and are at a critical crossroads. For two  
15 years we have tried to comment on inadequacies in the  
16 alternative screening process and assumptions made by  
17 FHU about traffic.

18           Now that we see the lack of detailed  
19 consideration of our serious concerns and avoidance of  
20 mitigation measures, we are no longer comfortable with  
21 the developer and Wheat Ridge handling the scoping of  
22 the EA. We believe it is essential that, at a minimum,  
23 CDOT step in and provide more oversight and scrutiny of  
24 assumptions, analytical methods, and presentation of  
25 results.

1

2 James Horne  
3 3381 Alkire Court  
4 Golden, Colorado 80401  
5 303-854-7495

6

7 JAMES HORN: I have two main concerns.

8 One is the safety of my property. I live right on the  
9 property line of this development, next to Wheat Ridge.

10 We met with -- neighbors and I met with  
11 Cabela's, their representatives, in March 2005 about a  
12 security wall, some tree sheltering, noise issues, and  
13 kind of, you know, plantings that would obscure the  
14 development from my home. And I haven't heard anything  
15 since.

16 I have five young children, and I'm  
17 concerned about pedestrian traffic or people from the  
18 development migrating into my area; it's right into my  
19 backyard, basically.

20 And the second issue is pedestrian safety  
21 across 32nd from my neighborhood, which is north of  
22 32nd, across 32nd to the two schools on Alkire Street.

23 The existing crosswalk conditions are  
24 substandard. The sidewalk actually stops before you  
25 get to the crosswalk, and there's inadequate tree lawn  
or other sort of buffering from the sidewalk to the  
street. It's right next -- they're right next to each

1 other.

2           I feel a fence is needed between the  
3 sidewalk and the street, and that the City of Wheat  
4 Ridge should pay for a crossing guard during the school  
5 morning and afternoon hours to improve safety. This is  
6 especially important due to the increased traffic that  
7 Cabela's will surely bring to that intersection.

8           (WHEREUPON, the comments concluded at  
9 9:10 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF COLORADO)

2 ) Ss. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 COUNTY OF DENVER )

4 I, K. Michelle Dittmer, do hereby certify  
5 that I am a Registered Merit Reporter and  
6 Notary Public within the state of Colorado.

7 I further certify that these comments were  
8 taken in shorthand by me at the time and place  
9 herein set forth and were thereafter reduced to  
10 typewritten form, and that the foregoing constitutes  
11 a true and correct transcript.

12 In witness whereof, I have affixed my  
13 signature this 21st day of November, 2006.



14  
15 *K. Michelle Dittmer*  
16 K. Michelle Dittmer  
17 Registered Merit Reporter  
18 and Notary Public  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO  
Highpoint  
2 2170 South Parker Road, Suite 263  
Denver, Colorado 80231

3 November 20 , 2006

4 MR. KEVIN R. MADDOUX  
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
5 6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600  
Centennial, Colorado 80111

6  
Re: I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental  
7 Assessment, Public Hearing, Comments in Activity Room 1  
Volume II

8  
9 Dear Mr. Maddoux:

10 Enclosed is the original transcript of the  
11 above-referenced comments:

12 \_\_\_ Previously filed. Forwarding signature page and  
amendment sheet(s).

13  
\_\_\_ Signed, no changes.

14  
\_\_\_ Signed, with changes, copy of which is enclosed.

15  
\_XX\_ No signature required.

16  
17 \_\_\_ Reading and signing not requested pursuant to CRCP  
Rule 30(e)

18  
\_\_\_ Signature waived.

19  
\_\_\_ Forwarding original transcript unsigned; signature  
20 page and/or amendments will be forwarded if  
received.

21  
\_\_\_ Original exhibits included in ongoing notebook  
22 and will be filed with counsel at conclusion of  
discovery.

23  
Enclosures: (As above noted)

24  
25





I-70/32nd AVENUE INTERCHANGE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
PUBLIC HEARING

---

Thursday, November 9, 2006

7:00 p.m.

The above-entitled public hearing was taken at the Wheat Ridge Recreation Center, 4005 Kipling, Wheat Ridge, Colorado before Denise A. Freeman, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public within Colorado.

1                   P R O C E E D I N G S

2                   MS. GH AIS: Good evening, everyone. Welcome  
3 to the town hall-style portion of the formal public  
4 hearing for the environmental assessment of I-70, 32nd  
5 Avenue and vicinity. My name is Suzanne Ghais. I am an  
6 independent facilitator and mediator, just brought in to  
7 help run this portion of the meeting.

8                   As I think you know by now, there are lots  
9 of different ways for you to provide input. So if you  
10 would like to stand up and take the microphone in this  
11 next hour or so, you are more than welcome. If you are  
12 the type of person that would prefer not to do that,  
13 that's fine too.

14                  And on this green sheet that was distributed  
15 at the entrance, it lists all the different ways you can  
16 participate. There is still a court reporter in  
17 Activity Room 1 who is still going to take individual  
18 comments and enter them into the formal record. And I  
19 think she's here until 8:00. So that's an option.

20                  You can fill out the white comment forms,  
21 phone in to the hotline, enter comments on the website,  
22 mail in your comments, fax in your comments. All of  
23 these will have the same effect in the sense that they  
24 all become part of the official record.

25                  And CDOT is -- because this is the formal

1 public hearing prior to finalization of the  
2 environmental assessment, they will respond to each  
3 point or question in writing in the final document.  
4 And, of course, we have a court reporter here to take  
5 down the comments that you will be making.

6           The main goal of this portion of the meeting  
7 is to listen to you. There are a lot of you here. We  
8 are anticipating there will be a lot of comments, and so  
9 there will not be a question-and-answer session as part  
10 of this part of the meeting. That's partly because of  
11 time restraints and also partly because the public  
12 officials who are here would prefer to give your  
13 comments thoughtful consideration and give a really  
14 considered response rather than a knee-jerk response.

15           So we will not do Q and A here during this  
16 portion of the meeting. The goal will be to listen to  
17 you. At the end of the meeting, folks from CDOT will do  
18 a brief summary of what they have heard as some of the  
19 key themes, just before we close the meeting.

20           There will also be -- in addition to the  
21 court reporter, we will have someone being an unofficial  
22 scribe, taking comments, and that's Jennifer here behind  
23 me. She will be doing just very summary form write-ups  
24 of your comments on a flip chart.

25           That is not to be confused with the formal

1 record taken by the court reporter. It's just so that  
2 you can sort of mentally track what's already been said  
3 and so that the state and federal officials here can  
4 also sort of scan the flip charts to get a feel for,  
5 okay, what are some of the themes and points that they  
6 want to remember.

7           When we get to the part where you can  
8 comment, there will be a time limit of three minutes per  
9 person. And we have Claire here who is going to be  
10 running a stopwatch. If I interrupt you to ask you a  
11 clarifying question or to summarize or something like  
12 that, she will pause the timer to make sure I am not  
13 detracting from your three minutes. So we are high tech  
14 here tonight, folks.

15           Of course, we are hoping and expecting  
16 common decency, courtesy, and respect shown to everyone  
17 here tonight. I recognize that you all are anticipating  
18 very dramatic changes to your neighborhood and your  
19 community and maybe your home. And so some of you are  
20 probably very upset, and that's understandable.

21           So I am not going to tell you, Don't be  
22 emphatic. I am not going to tell you, Don't show  
23 emotion, don't raise your voice. I won't tell you that.  
24 What I will ask is that you please show some  
25 understanding of the folks who are here trying to listen

1 and understand your concerns and trying their best to  
2 respond to them, and, of course, this process of  
3 planning that goes with it.

4           I am sure that you are hoping that they will  
5 have compassion for what you are going through, and I  
6 think you will get that to the extent that you treat  
7 them as human beings as well and folks who have a very  
8 difficult job.

9           I hope that you will come with the spirit of  
10 learning, and they too will have a spirit of learning --  
11 bring a spirit of learning to this. So that's the goal,  
12 that you will learn from what's going to be presented  
13 here in a moment and that they learn from you and come  
14 to understand your needs and worries and requests and  
15 questions better.

16           There are a lot of people here tonight and  
17 probably a wide range of different views and a wide  
18 range of different specific concerns depending on where  
19 you live and so forth. So if you can please try to  
20 refrain from repeating points that have already been  
21 made, that will help us out a lot and that will help us  
22 hear the full range of views tonight.

23           So before we get to the portion where you  
24 can offer your comments, we are going to have a short  
25 presentation by Pam Hutton from the Colorado Department

1 of Transportation. Until about a week ago, Pam was the  
2 transportation director at CDOT Region 6, which, of  
3 course, includes this area.

4 She got a promotion. Randy Jensen has taken  
5 that position. But as part of that transition, since it  
6 was so recent and since Pam has been so intimately  
7 involved with this project from the beginning, she is  
8 representing -- she's the key representative of CDOT  
9 here tonight, although there is a crew of others from  
10 CDOT.

11 So Pam is now the chief engineer, which  
12 means that she supervises the activities of all the  
13 regions statewide. And I happen to know that Pam was up  
14 at approximately 5:00 this morning because she sent me  
15 an e-mail at that time, so thanks for sticking it out,  
16 Pam, until the evening.

17 When she is finished, we will have brief  
18 introductions from the other state and federal officials  
19 here at the front of the room just so you know who is  
20 here. But for now I will turn the mike over to Pam.

21 MS. HUTTON: Thank you, Suzanne. Before I  
22 get started, Mayor Jerry DiTullio would like to welcome  
23 you to his beautiful facility here as well as his city,  
24 and I thought that was appropriate.

25 MR. TUTILIO: Thanks, Pam. I wanted to

1 thank everybody for coming tonight and taking time out  
2 on a Thursday night. It's been a two-year process. I  
3 appreciate you being engaged in the process.

4           The City of Wheat Ridge is really trying to  
5 listen to your concerns. I ask that you study the  
6 boards and really learn and understand where we are at  
7 on this process so there's no misconceptions. And thank  
8 you for coming tonight and feel free to give your  
9 comments. And I want to thank Pam for helping organize  
10 this. So welcome. Thank you.

11           MS. HUTTON: Thank you, Mayor. Before I get  
12 started -- and what I want to do is go through where we  
13 are today -- but before I get started, I just want to  
14 say how far have we come since the first meeting that I  
15 attended which was nearly two years ago.

16           Two years ago we had a room full -- and I  
17 would say approximately 900 people who were very upset  
18 about this project. And CDOT promised, along with the  
19 City of Wheat Ridge, FHWA, Jefferson County and the  
20 developers, to go through what we call a 16-01 process  
21 which leads us into an environmental assessment of the  
22 roadway and transportation system that we ultimately are  
23 proposing here tonight.

24           I guess I would hope that you feel as  
25 though, through those two years, we have listened to

1 you, we have tried to respond to your concerns. I know  
2 that you have additional concerns or comments that you  
3 would like to make, and we want to listen to those, and  
4 we will respond to those as well.

5           But I do want to compliment my staff and the  
6 staff of the consulting team for doing at least what  
7 they thought in their mind was an honest response to at  
8 least the early concerns that we have heard.

9           I also want to thank you all, but in  
10 particular the CCBNC, who is -- I know you know them.  
11 You all have representatives from your homeowners  
12 association that sit on that committee.

13           They have been engaged with us in routine  
14 meetings all the way through the last two years. We  
15 have used them as a sounding board. We have taken ideas  
16 to them. They have commented on this process with us  
17 all through those two years.

18           I think in large part what you see that we  
19 have done in response to at least some of your concerns  
20 is because they were always there, they were always  
21 engaged, they were always making us accountable for your  
22 comments. So I guess I would really thank them. They  
23 have been helpful to us, and we have used them a lot in  
24 that process.

25           Real quick, where we are in the



1 environmental process is that we have now developed a  
2 preferred alternative. And that preferred alternative  
3 has many, many components. And I just would like to run  
4 through those really quick.

5 I am going to assume that some people  
6 haven't been here all night and that some people would  
7 like us to briefly go through those very quickly, though  
8 we have been here since 4:00 trying to answer other  
9 questions as they were raised to us.

10 What we heard early on from most of the  
11 citizens here is, Don't make 32nd Avenue the front door  
12 to this development. Don't do that. Provide another  
13 way in and another way out.

14 And through that process -- and I think it  
15 was a long process -- what we are trying to do is focus  
16 the entrance to this development at this interchange on  
17 State Highway 58. It's a brand-new interchange, and the  
18 proposal is that it is built before the store opens.

19 In addition to that, there will be a new  
20 road built. It's called Cabela Drive. The  
21 development -- the Cabela store and much of the other  
22 surrounding development will be approximately in this  
23 location. And we will get access from this way. You  
24 can get access from I-70 on these hook ramps that also  
25 do not mean that traffic has to come in on 32nd Avenue.

1           And CDOT will be building the two missing  
2 ramps, this one and this one, from I-70 to State  
3 Highway 58. The improvements that you see here, here,  
4 and most of the improvements that you see along here, as  
5 well as those missing ramps, will be done in the near  
6 term, most of them before the store opens.

7           CDOT right now has a project that's being  
8 advertised that will build those two missing ramps from  
9 I-70 to State Highway 58 under ad, which means that we  
10 are advertising for contractors. We hope to have a  
11 contractor selected, and work will begin very, very  
12 shortly on those. So those are those improvements.

13           We also have some improvements at the 27th  
14 Avenue location which will replace what we are calling  
15 the Taco Bell hook ramp and the ramp that allows you to  
16 get on I-70 with a left turn right in here. These  
17 improvements, we think, are necessary in the long term,  
18 but we don't think are necessary in the short term.

19           And our proposal right now is not to build  
20 those until 10 to 15 years from now. It has a lot to do  
21 with when traffic volumes warrant the need for those,  
22 and also there are safety considerations that we have to  
23 think about. The existing ramps do not meet our current  
24 design standards, and we really think that we would be  
25 irresponsible transportation planners and engineers if

1 we didn't provide a safety solution, at least for the  
2 long term at that location. So that's why those are  
3 improved.

4           And then the last thing I want to talk to  
5 you about are improvements up here at Ward Road and 44th  
6 Avenue. CDOT is committed to building those  
7 improvements. That was part of an earlier environmental  
8 assessment that we have a decision document for, and we  
9 will be building those also in the -- not in the near  
10 term, but farther out. We don't know for sure.

11           I would really, really hope they would be  
12 between 5 to 10 years and hope it's closer to 5. We did  
13 receive from our very generous legislature this year --  
14 some additional funding came to CDOT for transportation.  
15 We were able to put some money -- not only were we able  
16 to fund the missing ramps at I-70 and State  
17 Highway 58 -- and that's why they will be under  
18 construction here very shortly -- but we were also able  
19 to put some money to the design and to right-of-way  
20 purchases for the improvement at Ward Road and 44th.

21           So we are moving along with that too. Then,  
22 if additional funds were to become available, we think  
23 we have a design project ready to go to receive those  
24 funds.

25           So I would ask my team if I have forgotten

1 any big, big issues? Got it? Got it mostly? Because  
2 we really want to save as much time as we can to hear  
3 your comments and listen one more time to your concerns.

4           We do want you to know who is going to be  
5 listening to those and taking notes and trying to  
6 capture in their minds your comments and how -- we start  
7 to think about how best we might respond to those, so I  
8 am going to have them introduce themselves to you.

9           MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Ed Martinez. I am  
10 a resident engineer in the north engineering section for  
11 region 6, which includes this area. I'm also the  
12 resident engineer for our CDOT project, which includes  
13 the State Highway 58 and I-70 interchange. And I'm also  
14 overseeing this environmental assessment as it impacts  
15 us and the comments that come out of this EA.

16           MR. AWAZNEZHAD: Hello. My name is Moe  
17 Awaznezhad. I am program engineer for CDOT, region 6.  
18 I basically manage design and construction for anything  
19 happening north of I-70.

20           MS. PAVLIK: I am Monica Pavlik, a senior  
21 operations engineer for the Federal Highway  
22 Administration. And I am the primary point of contact  
23 for the north metro area, which includes this project.

24           MR. NICOL: I am David Nicol. I am the  
25 division administrator with the Federal Highway

1 Administration in Colorado. And what's a division  
2 administrator? That means I am in charge of the  
3 Colorado office.

4 MS. HUTTON: To be clear, Wheat Ridge is  
5 preparing this study. It's at their direction that this  
6 study is being prepared. And CDOT receives that,  
7 reviews it, and makes sure that, in our minds, we have  
8 addressed all the environmental issues as well as the  
9 social issues and the transportation needs.

10 We recommend to FHWA whether or not this  
11 document -- the decision document, when it's written --  
12 should be approved. And then it's FHWA that decides  
13 whether or not the proposed action can be decided on and  
14 approved.

15 So, Suzanne, I think we are done.

16 MS. GHAI: Thank you, Pam. So we are now  
17 going to hand it over to you, and I am going to give up  
18 this microphone for this one, which is not as good. I  
19 will talk more loudly. And what we are going to invite  
20 you to do is come and form a line in this aisle here so  
21 that you can come up and use this microphone.

22 And, again, on the timekeeping, Claire Haupt  
23 here has three cards. The green one means you are fine.  
24 The yellow one is an important one. It's when you have  
25 30 seconds left. And the red one means you are out of

1 time, and we really will be vigilant to make sure you  
2 don't go over your three minutes. So just keep an eye  
3 on the little colors as you are speaking.

4 I understand that there is a group of you  
5 who are doing a tag team presentation and have set up  
6 some visual aids there, which I think is a pretty  
7 ingenious use of the three-minute rule. So if the rest  
8 are okay with that, we are okay with it. So in any  
9 case, why don't you come on up to the center aisle if  
10 you are interested in speaking, and I will hand the  
11 first person the mike.

12 DR. ESTEL: My name is Dr. Deborah Estel,  
13 and I am currently a resident of Wheat Ridge, and I  
14 further own a business located in Wheat Ridge. I  
15 would like to address the flaws in the proposed hook  
16 ramps on Youngfield and 27th.

17 Youngfield and 27th is both a residential  
18 and commercial neighborhood currently. The current  
19 proposal would highly impact the residents surrounding  
20 this area due to the proposed exit and entrance ramps  
21 for eastbound I-70. The current EA proposal requires  
22 the exit ramp location through the acquisition of  
23 residences and properties and feet from homes and  
24 backyards not acquired.

25 Twenty-seventh Avenue is a two-lane road

1 with a park on the corner. Due to the fact that 27th  
2 crosses a dam, it can never be expanded in the future.  
3 This EA pointed out that the traffic on 27th would only  
4 increase 900 cars per day and will not affect the dam.

5           With a Ph.D. in statistics, I question this  
6 arbitrary number, not considering the current traffic  
7 patterns for both ramps. Many cars currently utilize  
8 32nd and 38th to head to the current eastbound ramp as  
9 well as exit from eastbound to get to their homes. I  
10 predict this figure to be considerably higher than --  
11 more than 900 cars per day on 27th Avenue, which leads  
12 east into a residential community on 26th Avenue.

13           Children cross this street to go to Stober  
14 Elementary on a daily basis, including my own, and would  
15 be put at risk with this proposal. This EA points out  
16 that it is better to have an entrance and exit ramp in  
17 the same location for convenience to drivers. This  
18 assumes that people are headed in the same direction  
19 from where they came.

20           If drivers want to head back west, they will  
21 need to drive close to a mile to go under a bridge to  
22 the other side of I-70 in order to do so. The distance  
23 of the Applewood Shopping Center is too far from the  
24 exit ramp, so far that it will be impossible to see  
25 signs from I-70 to know that a shopping center even

1 exists.

2           The proposal sets an entryway to the highway  
3 right at the exit of a park. How safe is it to put an  
4 entryway to a highway next to a park? The five lanes on  
5 Youngfield are proposed to 27th Avenue, but Youngfield  
6 south of 27th is not addressed, nor are lights to allow  
7 community members an exit to Youngfield.

8           This EA is filled with mentions of public  
9 preferences with plans eliminated due to acquisition of  
10 land. Yet this proposal suggests acquiring over 156,000  
11 square feet of land from three residences, five  
12 businesses, in addition to disrupting an entire  
13 community exit on 26th and Beech Court with a freeway  
14 exit affecting hundreds of homes.

15           Page 2-49 of Summaries, Figure 216 depicts  
16 an interim lane addition to the existing off-ramp from  
17 westbound I-70 initially. The proposed action as  
18 indicated on 2-48 is not currently required and will be  
19 delayed until no later than 2030. There are other  
20 viable options that must be carefully considered now  
21 before this EA is approved -- north of 27th, closer to  
22 the commercial shopping center.

23           One quite feasible alternative is called --

24           MS. GHAI: This is my first opportunity to  
25 be the process Nazi. You are out of your three minutes.



1 The rest of it, if you like, could be --

2 DR. ESTEL: I timed myself on this.

3 MS. GHAI: Thank you very much. A lot of  
4 concerns. It sounds like a lot of them grouped around  
5 the exit -- that ramp being at 27th Street.

6 DR. ESTEL: You cannot expand 27th ever.  
7 It's on a dam.

8 MS. GHAI: Thank you very much.

9 MS. MALDEN: My name is Connie Malden.  
10 Inasmuch as traffic coming in and off of 32nd has  
11 always been a concern, we are requesting that  
12 Youngfield Service Road be left with that name, not  
13 Cabela Drive.

14 It will, in fact, be an exit/entrance to  
15 Cabela's. However, the signage on 32nd and also up on  
16 I-70 would remain as it is. Local people will know it  
17 is an entrance to Cabela's. However, those coming from  
18 a distance would not, and therefore we feel traffic on  
19 32nd would not be increased to the extent that it is  
20 presently anticipated. Thank you.

21 MS. GHAI: Could I just get a  
22 clarification? So you are saying that -- your concern  
23 is the traffic on 32nd, and you're saying that the  
24 out-of-towners at least would not use that to get to  
25 Cabela's?

1 MS. MALDEN: Right. They'd come in off of  
2 I-70 and 58. The signage right now says, "Youngfield  
3 Service Road," both there at 32nd and up on I-70 -- on  
4 I-70 it just says, "Youngfield" and "32nd." Leave it  
5 that way and don't call it Cabela Drive in those two  
6 locations.

7 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

8 MS. THACKER: My name is Ann Thacker, and  
9 I represent 198 home and business owners, so I am not  
10 quite within three minutes, but I hope you will take  
11 that into consideration since there are so many people  
12 that I am representing here tonight. We have written  
13 several letters and made several comments over the  
14 last two years, and I am going to read the most recent  
15 letter written November 1 to Dennis Highby at  
16 Cabela's.

17 MS. GHAI: Let me just interrupt you about  
18 the time limit. I am going to have to be consistent  
19 with everyone, but since you have written comments --  
20 and the same thing with the first speaker -- you are  
21 welcome to enter the written comments into the record.  
22 So we will get the clock back going again, and we'll let  
23 you get as far as you can.

24 MS. THACKER: Dear Mr. Highbee, thank you  
25 for Mike Callahan's considered response dated May 30

1 to our prior letter of April 25th. We are pleased to  
2 learn that Cabela's shares our primary concerns about  
3 the current traffic design and is committed to working  
4 with the community to, as Mr. Callahan writes, arrive  
5 at a livable traffic solution that would both address  
6 the need for much improved access to our proposed  
7 development and help mitigate any burden of an already  
8 inadequate traffic situation around the site.

9           However, based on the EA, actions have not  
10 been taken to mitigate the principal community concerns.  
11 As a result, the EA is inadequate as written. Now is  
12 the time to put dollars and influence with your words.  
13 Here are the facts as we understand them based on the  
14 paper trail provided to our communities over the past  
15 two years:

16           Twenty-seventh Avenue hook ramps:  
17 August 2004, CDOT finalized an EA of the traffic needs  
18 of our community through the year 2025. It did not  
19 require the use of eminent domain to displace homeowners  
20 and businesses in the community, nor was there any  
21 mention of hook ramps at 27th Avenue.

22           What changed? Late 2004 Cabela's announced  
23 its plan to join our community. Cabela's development  
24 plan was not included in the 2003 EA. Clearly,  
25 increases in traffic flow due solely to the Cabela's

1 development created a perceived need for the 27th Avenue  
2 hook ramps and multiple displacements.

3           2005: Felsburg Holt & Ullevig presented to  
4 our community the traffic plan it designed on behalf of  
5 Cabela's. Its design for the development included the  
6 27th Avenue hook ramps. Those ramps were previously  
7 unnecessary based on CDOT's 2003 EA and 2004 FONSI  
8 through the year 2025.

9           Yet clearly they were thought to be  
10 necessary to handle development traffic. Mr. Callahan  
11 states, Now to the hook ramps at 27th Avenue. These are  
12 part of CDOT's overall proposal to address the regional  
13 traffic issue clear out to the year 2030 that was  
14 insisted on by various groups.

15           The EA states that CDOT simply allowed for  
16 these hook ramps in the developer's design; CDOT did not  
17 propose these ramps. Therefore Mr. Callahan's statement  
18 is disingenuous because these ramps were placed in the  
19 traffic design for the development's benefit, not for  
20 the public good.

21           Building these ramps will require full or  
22 partial displacement of nine residences and businesses  
23 through the use of eminent domain. The overall traffic  
24 plan for the development calls for full or partial  
25 displacement of a total of 35 residences and businesses.

1 The EA does not discuss or mitigate these issues.

2           Based on documents presented to our  
3 community, it's clear those hook ramps were added due to  
4 a perceived need to handle the increased traffic flow  
5 created by Cabela's. We urgently believe it would be in  
6 the community's and Cabela's best interest to remove the  
7 27th Avenue hook ramps from the design.

8           MS. GHAI: I'm sorry. I'll cut you off  
9 here. If we have time, we'll hear the rest of it after  
10 other folks have had a chance to speak.

11           But I hear your point is that you all were  
12 kind of blindsided by this new 27th Avenue hook ramp  
13 idea, and you are inferring that that was a direct  
14 result of the developer's interest as opposed to coming  
15 from CDOT as a traffic solution independent of the  
16 development.

17           MS. THACKER: That's the perception, yes.

18           MR. MARRIOTT: My name is John Marriott.  
19 I own the ski shop down here on Kipling Street at  
20 I-70, and I am for most of these improvements. I  
21 think particularly the State Highway 58/I-70  
22 interchange has long been needed to be done. I think  
23 the improvements at Ward Road are very important too.

24           My concern is for my customers and their  
25 ability to get where they are going, which is generally

1 the mountains and back. I think Highway 58 is  
2 underutilized as a route into the mountains for ski  
3 traffic, and, of course, ski traffic has been ridiculous  
4 the last few years. And I think this can help that.

5           And I think the improvements at 32nd Avenue  
6 are real necessary too. A great number of my  
7 out-of-town customers, in addition to stopping by and  
8 getting their ski business done at my shop, head to the  
9 businesses in the Applewood Center, and that's a very  
10 difficult place for them to get into and get out of.

11           I think it would be a big improvement for  
12 them as well as the City to improve those things, and I  
13 like those parts of this plan very much.

14           MS. GHAI: Thanks. Emphasizing the 58  
15 improvements and the improvements that allow easier  
16 access into Applewood Shopping.

17           I appreciate it. It is useful to mention  
18 positive comments as well as critiques, so that folks  
19 know what they're doing right as well. So thank you.

20           MS. STEARNS: My name is Colleen Stearns.  
21 For the past two years, our community has been  
22 actively involved in expressing significant concerns  
23 about the traffic design of Cabela's development.

24           The current EA does not fully discuss or  
25 mitigate these previous submitted concerns. Failing to

1 demonstrate that the primary entrance to the development  
2 will be at State Highway 58 and I-70 to mitigate traffic  
3 congestion at 32nd Avenue and Cabela Drive. Failing to  
4 remove the 27th Avenue hook ramps from the traffic  
5 design requires full acquisition of four properties  
6 including residences and businesses, one known as the  
7 Novacek Nursery.

8           It also requires partial acquisition of five  
9 additional properties. Extensive community  
10 acquisition -- the acquisition of neither has been  
11 discussed or mitigated by the EA.

12           Failing to address the impact of additional  
13 traffic that would funnel south of the proposed 27th  
14 Avenue ramps and negatively affect residential  
15 neighborhoods. Therefore the current draft of the EA is  
16 incomplete. The foregoing issues need to be addressed  
17 in an environmental impact statement.

18           MS. GHAI: Thank you. You are saying that  
19 the EA hasn't addressed some of the points that have  
20 been raised all along. Several of you have now  
21 mentioned the property takes, which, of course, are a  
22 huge impact, as well as some of those that are not taken  
23 will then be right up against some of the changes. So  
24 thank you.

25           MR. DRYER: My name is John Dryer. I live

1 in Applewood south of 32nd and east of Eldridge. I am  
2 very concerned about access into Cabela's from 32nd.  
3 The stated purpose of this access, I was told this  
4 evening, was to draw people from the southern part of  
5 the region south of Cabela's.

6           What that's going to do is funnel people  
7 down Eldridge, which is a residential street which has  
8 been severely impacted by the Colorado Mills Mall and is  
9 now going to be even worse.

10           MS. GHAI: You are saying the improvement  
11 on the intersection at 32nd will --

12           MR. DRYER: The access into Cabela's is  
13 going to draw people down Eldridge.

14           MS. GHAI: Down Eldridge south of 32nd?

15           MR. DRYER: The second thing is, the  
16 access to what's called Cabela Drive is going to  
17 severely impact the people who live along -- live in  
18 that residential neighborhood and that have lived  
19 there for a long time. I think you're basically --  
20 you are destroying that neighborhood, and you are also  
21 going to negatively impact the Youngfield/32nd Avenue  
22 egress and access to our neighborhood. Thank you.

23           MS. GHAI: Thank you. I know this is a  
24 very well-established neighborhood, so that these  
25 changes are big.



1           MR. EVANS: My name is Roger Evans. I've  
2 lived in Applewood for 22 years. While recognizing  
3 the need for growth and development, it's critical to  
4 preserve the attributes that make Applewood a special  
5 place within the Denver metropolitan area. Those  
6 attributes are best characterized by low-density,  
7 single-family homes set in a suburban, if not  
8 semirural, environment.

9           As indicated in the preferred alternative,  
10 achieving direct, easy and safe access to the site is  
11 best accomplished via the proposed interchange off of  
12 State Highway 58. That interchange appropriately  
13 identifies the front door or entry to the development.

14           Using the EA logic of linking the eastbound  
15 I-70/32nd Avenue exit and entrance hook ramps, it should  
16 also function as the exit from the site. No amount of  
17 redesign to the I-70 and 32nd Avenue interchange can do  
18 the same.

19           The lack of available open land, coupled  
20 with existing public infrastructure, make this option  
21 much more untenable and costly. 32nd Avenue is already  
22 heavily congested and needs relief from the current  
23 traffic volume. Moreover, it serves as a key arterial  
24 to a junior high and elementary school.

25           Additional community traffic that supports

1 commercial retail activity is not in the best interest  
2 of school children's safety, no matter what the degree  
3 of sidewalk widening, pedestrian wait timing, and  
4 traffic signalization.

5           Assuming this project proceeds, emergency  
6 access is both critical and required. It does not,  
7 however, necessarily need to be open to the public.  
8 Therefore, the Cabela Drive connection to 32nd Avenue  
9 should also be carefully evaluated.

10           Lastly, it is 3.2 miles from the Ward  
11 Road/I-70 interchange to the Denver West I-70  
12 interchange. That short distance should not meet the  
13 need for constructing a third interchange in the  
14 Applewood environment. Projected costs for the  
15 I-70/32nd Avenue interchange with hook ramps is  
16 \$27.6 million. This one aspect of the project  
17 represents 24 percent of the total cost.

18           MS. GHAI: Of the total transportation  
19 costs?

20           MR. EVANS: For all the transportation  
21 improvements. The only more expensive component is  
22 the State Highway 58 interchange. Therefore, given  
23 the cost, the neighborhood impacts earlier mentioned,  
24 and preference for the State Highway 58 site entry, I  
25 recommend that the I-70/32nd Avenue interchange

1 associated with hook ramps be deleted from this  
2 project.

3           If this interchange is not deleted from the  
4 project, the impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and  
5 environment are greater than the scope of this  
6 environmental assessment and not even minimally  
7 addressed. Thank you.

8           MS. GHAI: Thank you. So you are saying  
9 that the 58/Cabela Drive connection is adequate to serve  
10 the development and that Cabela Drive shouldn't be  
11 extended to 32nd because of the impacts on 32nd and that  
12 whole interchange, 32nd and I-70, should just be pretty  
13 much left as is?

14           MR. EVANS: It should be without the  
15 connection to the highway.

16           MS. GHAI: Thank you.

17           MS. SERGANY: My name is Gretchen Sergany.  
18 I was the former mayor of Wheat Ridge for eight years.  
19 And I have been driving through the intersection of  
20 32nd and Youngfield since 1959. So I remember when  
21 Rolling Hills Country Club was where Applewood Golf  
22 Course is now, and I remember my kids used to ride  
23 horses on Table Mountain.

24           I was there before I-70. The intersection  
25 has gotten worse with I-70 and is just terrible right

1 now. So I want to thank Cabela's for coming because I  
2 don't think we ever had anything happen to 32nd and  
3 Youngfield or the interchange with I-70. And I want to  
4 thank also Cabela's for planning their main entrance off  
5 of Highway 58. I think that will work very well.

6           The other thing that people -- I know people  
7 have lived here maybe longer than I have -- remember  
8 that Applewood is a very old neighborhood. But there's  
9 been many, many homes built since I have been using that  
10 intersection. And all those houses, people come down  
11 east 32nd to get off to I-70 to go either east or west.

12           And having that westbound exit ramp is just  
13 awful there, and people keep trying to get off and they  
14 block all the traffic. So I really appreciate it, and I  
15 think 32nd and I-70 will run much better with the plans  
16 that you have.

17           And I know that the people who have been  
18 here long like to think of 32nd as a neighborhood  
19 street. Unfortunately, it really is a collector street.  
20 And I think it will get busier because there's a lot of  
21 open land out there and people are going to build houses  
22 on it.

23           So I am in support of the changes. I am in  
24 support of Cabela's. It's too important for the City of  
25 Wheat Ridge. Thank you very much.

1 MS. GHAI: Thank you. So you are saying  
2 that the Cabela's development is prompting traffic  
3 improvements that were needed anyway at that  
4 interchange?

5 MS. SERGANY: Yeah.

6 MS. NESTON: My name is Kathleen Neston.  
7 I now live at 2015 Applewood Drive in Lakewood. My  
8 husband and I built our first home in Applewood on  
9 Winfield Drive in 1960, so I have been here 46 years.  
10 We built the new one where we live now in 1977.

11 The Applewood area is a very, very special  
12 community. We who live here treasure every aspect of  
13 this community and the neighborhood. We help each  
14 other. It's almost like a family. We care and take  
15 care of our homes and yards because we love them.

16 As a result, our property values have not  
17 fallen. It is a very desirable area. I have often  
18 remarked that, if a family thinks they might want to  
19 sell, you better be careful because often these homes  
20 sell quickly. Applewood is an important part of the  
21 history of north Lakewood. Please help us to keep this  
22 place a special place. Thank you.

23 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

24 MS. NESTON: I don't think we are opposed  
25 to it. We're just opposed to the other things.

1 MS. GHAI: "To the other things" -- the  
2 transportation changes, the traffic? Can you say more  
3 specifically?

4 MS. NESTON: Especially the 27th exit.  
5 It's devastating. That's all I can say.

6 MS. GHAI: Devastating to the character of  
7 that neighborhood?

8 MS. NESTON: Exactly.

9 MS. KREGER: Hi. My name is Lydia Kreger.  
10 I am a member of the Applewood Valley Association and  
11 have participated in numerous open houses held over  
12 the past two years regarding this project.

13 This draft EA does not direct the majority  
14 of the traffic north or east on Cabela Drive. You have  
15 three lanes going north and approximately five lanes  
16 going south to 32nd. It does not address the traffic  
17 level and the impacts on local streets south of the  
18 proposed 27th and Youngfield interchange. I mentioned  
19 this last year when we were at the CDOT meeting.

20 It does not address the possibility of using  
21 the office space area at 28th and Youngfield or any area  
22 north of that versus taking by eminent domain the  
23 historic property, homes and businesses that are located  
24 at this proposed interchange at 27th and Youngfield.

25 This proposed interchange at 27th and

1 Youngfield will have an adverse impact on our  
2 neighborhood south of that area and to the east of that  
3 area. It does not leave the option of not constructing  
4 the 27th and Youngfield interchange if it is not needed  
5 or the possibility of totally eliminating this off-ramp  
6 and pushing the traffic north.

7           It does not fully address mitigation of the  
8 properties that are taken. It does not address  
9 increased road maintenance on Youngfield, life cycle  
10 costs associated with this impact, and the tax burden  
11 that this impact will have on our neighborhood. Because  
12 we, the Applewood community, will be paying the taxes  
13 for keeping these roads maintained.

14           It does not address the economic growth and  
15 development that's going to be happening in the rest of  
16 the community. It talks about taking Cabela's and  
17 putting a nice big store there for them. It does not  
18 talk about what's going to happen to the people that  
19 have been there since 1950 at the 27th and Youngfield  
20 location and taking that historic business. So as far  
21 as I am concerned, that is totally unacceptable.

22           I am not opposed to Cabela's coming here and  
23 joining our community. I am fine with that. If it's  
24 not them, it's going to be somebody else. However, I do  
25 believe that the traffic impacts need to be mitigated

1 properly so that it does not cause an adverse impact on  
2 the Applewood community. Thank you.

3 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

4 MS. EVANS: My name is Barbara Evans. I  
5 live at 2055 Applewood Drive, Lakewood. I have been  
6 there for the last 22 years. I received your mailing  
7 which states, We want to hear from you. You have  
8 heard from me. You have heard from all the people  
9 here tonight. Over the last two years, you have heard  
10 from us loud and clear.

11 And yet you have ignored our concerns for  
12 the ill-conceived traffic plan necessitating the 27th  
13 Avenue hook ramps. You have dismissed our thoughtful,  
14 relevant and impassioned comments about the needless  
15 destruction of our neighborhood and our community when  
16 other viable options are available.

17 In my April 26 letter to Kevin McCaskey,  
18 chairman of the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners,  
19 I said, quote, It is folly to assume that the  
20 neighborhood south of the proposed 27th Avenue hook  
21 ramps will not be negatively impacted by the  
22 construction of these hook ramps. The environmental  
23 assessment must be expanded to include the residential  
24 area south of 27th Avenue to Colfax, east to Simms and  
25 west to Eldridge.



1           Tonight I was speaking with Chris Fashing --  
2 I believe he's of your engineering group -- and we  
3 discussed traffic on 27th Avenue that might want to find  
4 I-70 westbound. You have a convoluted solution here  
5 directing traffic up north before they get on the ramp  
6 to go back south. Chris said another option is, quote,  
7 They can just go south on Youngfield to 20th.

8           I repeat here tonight, the environmental  
9 assessment must be expanded to include these residential  
10 areas that will be negatively impacted. We have been  
11 misled and deceived by the developers. The entire  
12 traffic study needs to be examined. Do an environmental  
13 impact statement. The EIS must be completed to address  
14 these legitimate concerns before one shovel of dirt is  
15 overturned at the proposed Cabela's site.

16           Dean Bradley referred us to your "We Heard  
17 Your Comments" display board over here against the wall.  
18 Your response to the public outcry for the ill-conceived  
19 hook ramps at 27th Avenue is "Construction Delayed." We  
20 are here tonight to tell you the only acceptable  
21 solution is "Construction Canceled."

22           MS. GHAI: There's certainly a chorus  
23 against the 27th Avenue hook ramps. And this was the  
24 first time I heard about the point about expanding the  
25 EA scope to go south of Colfax and from Simms --

1 Eldridge all the way to Simms. Thank you.

2 MR. LANNER: My name is Phillip Lanner. I  
3 live on 24th and Beech, so I'm as affected by the 27th  
4 access as anyone. I did just want to speak a little  
5 bit about some of the issues that have been going on.

6 I teach engineering at the School of Mines,  
7 so I have some understanding of engineering, but I'm not  
8 a traffic engineer, and so I don't pretend to understand  
9 the issues as well as the people at CDOT. And I respect  
10 that they probably do understand the issues involved and  
11 they work under the constraints that they have to work  
12 under.

13 And Cabela's job is to make money, and  
14 basically what they want to do is, they want to maximize  
15 the amount of traffic they can get to their -- to  
16 basically what they are going to build there. That's  
17 their job. And that's going to have some effects on the  
18 neighborhood, and that's just a fact.

19 Now my understanding is that before, they  
20 only had two-lane roads up -- coming from Highway 58 and  
21 they changed that; is that correct? Yes. So now it's  
22 four-lane roads. And they have made some changes in the  
23 signage to try to move some traffic further up north.

24 But CDOT still has come to the conclusion  
25 that the 27th Avenue ramps will still be necessary; is

1 that correct? Okay. So, you know, I think that's  
2 probably something that, if Cabela's keeps their plans  
3 the way they are, that's just going to be basically a  
4 force of nature because they can't let traffic back up  
5 on I-70.

6 MS. GHAI: I'm sorry. Clarify that point.

7 MR. LANNER: If the plans are as they are  
8 and Cabela's makes -- does the development the way  
9 they are planning on doing it, then CDOT's concluded  
10 that I-70 at the ramp at 27th will operationally fail.  
11 So they have to fix something there, and their plan is  
12 to do something with that. So really -- the issue  
13 really isn't with CDOT.

14 Really the issue is with Cabela's. Cabela's  
15 has to change their plans in some way if it's true they  
16 haven't changed things enough. Because they have made  
17 some concessions, and that's true. But if the people  
18 who are involved in this -- the people in the  
19 neighborhoods, homeowners associations, and things like  
20 that -- believe that Cabela's has made that concession,  
21 that's what they had going with them. In order to do  
22 that, they need some lobbying power.

23 And Cabela's really -- I respect Cabela's in  
24 that they are a business, and a business' job is to make  
25 money. But if we are going to try to influence Cabela's

1 and change their mind, we need to give them some  
2 economic impetus to do that.

3           The homeowners associations needs to say, If  
4 Cabela's does not do what we feel is necessary, we are  
5 going to picket you for the first two years and cost you  
6 money, which will cost you more money than if you don't  
7 change. And that is what needs to happen if you want  
8 change.

9           MS. GHAI: Thank you. It sounds like you  
10 are saying that, if there were some changes made by  
11 Cabela's in their development plan, then that might  
12 remove the need or the needs leading to the need for the  
13 27th Street hook ramps?

14           MR. LANNER: Absolutely.

15           MS. GHAI: Thank you.

16           Let's make a progress check here. It's 10  
17 to 8:00. There are, if I counted right, 12 people in  
18 line, which is roughly half an hour's worth. This  
19 meeting was originally scheduled to be over at 8:00. I  
20 think that was when it was still planned to be all  
21 open-house style and before there was the addition of  
22 this town hall-style portion.

23           I would like to ask everyone if you'd be  
24 willing to have this meeting go until maybe 8:45, I  
25 think, would probably -- we want to hear you, and I also

1 want to check with the state and federal employees too.  
2 Unlike me, they're not billing by the hour tonight. Are  
3 you okay to stay until 8:45, 9:00? All right. Next,  
4 please.

5 MS. BROWN: Hi. My name is Claudia Brown.  
6 I am a resident of Applewood, and it seems to me that  
7 the EA is fundamentally flawed. And that's because it  
8 compares the improvements to a no-action alternative  
9 which assumes that Cabela's or an equal scale  
10 development will go into the same spot with 3 million  
11 cars a year. That's a false assumption.

12 We need to have a sensitivity analysis done  
13 that shows the comparison to a development that's a  
14 local-based development that doesn't draw regional  
15 traffic to our area. That's one idea.

16 Another idea would be that it's less traffic  
17 because it's not Cabela's, which is only 200-some square  
18 feet out of nearly a million square feet, but it's just  
19 Cabela's traffic numbers. But the problem is that we  
20 don't really know what the impacts are because we have a  
21 false comparison, and because they are using this false  
22 comparison, everything looks great. Therefore we don't  
23 get any real mitigation.

24 And so this EA needs to be revised, and it  
25 needs to be redone with real careful scrutiny of the

1 assumptions that are being made. And that needs to be  
2 done by a government agency, not by FHWA by itself with  
3 Cabela's deciding what to screen out and what to screen  
4 in and what assumptions to provide and what analysis to  
5 show us and what conclusions to pop in at the end.

6           So it's a real problem with the EA, and they  
7 need to fix it. And I think there are solutions. There  
8 are a lot of other alternatives out there, but this EA  
9 isn't going to give us a good analysis of what the  
10 impacts are or what the alternatives are.

11           And I have to say, I really like this town  
12 meeting style. This is much better than the open house  
13 which lets all these dialogues go on in an unaccountable  
14 way and nobody knows what's been said. This is great.  
15 Thanks.

16           MS. GHAI: This was as a result of your  
17 input, actually. But your point earlier was that, if  
18 the no-action alternative did not assume a big regional  
19 major attraction, superstore type of thing, you might  
20 get some very different results.

21           MR. RIBB: My name is Tom Ribb. I'm a  
22 business owner in the City of Wheat Ridge, and I have  
23 lived in this neighborhood for 25 years. I live just  
24 north up on Ward Road. I have driven all these  
25 intersections for the last 25 years.

1           And when I first started driving them, it  
2 was pretty clear to me these were compromises right from  
3 the beginning. I'm no traffic engineer, but I could  
4 tell even 25 years ago these -- in terms of stacking  
5 requirements, in terms of deceleration and acceleration  
6 requirements that you normally get with modern highway  
7 design, they didn't exist.

8           So when I-70 was punched through there, it  
9 was clear there was probably a lot of effort to preserve  
10 neighborhoods, which was a great thing. It's just that  
11 it was pretty obvious it didn't work back then. I think  
12 anybody that looks at it now, it's patently clear it  
13 doesn't work.

14           You can take Cabela's out completely. It's  
15 got to be corrected. I've been coming to all these  
16 meetings and have been around the room and seen the  
17 number of models that you guys have proposed, and I am  
18 really impressed. I have seen other development  
19 projects, but I've never seen anything quite like that.

20           You've put so many alternatives forward, and  
21 I am just here to -- being a resident, to say that I am  
22 in favor of this. I think that this is an excellent  
23 alternative. I know you just studied the living heck  
24 out of it, and I think in terms of -- it's a compromise.  
25 I think we all recognize that.

1           If you could start with a clean sheet of  
2 paper, you certainly wouldn't be doing this, but 32nd --  
3 forget about Cabela's -- it's not working now. It's an  
4 extremely dangerous intersection, and you are going to  
5 have to have some neighborhood impact in order to  
6 correct it because Golden is going to continue to grow.

7           This is a neighborhood -- this is a popular  
8 area, and we're going to continue to increase densities.  
9 We're going to continue to increase traffic.

10           So I would just like to say, I think you  
11 have done a very good job of trying to deal with a very  
12 difficult problem and a problem that should have been  
13 corrected or maybe never put there in the first place if  
14 it had been designed correctly. Thank you.

15           MS. BERING: Good evening. I am Barbara  
16 Bering, president of the Applewood Valley Association.  
17 And yes, this is the Applewood Valley Association tag  
18 team. There are half a dozen of us or so, and it's  
19 really important because our members number over 1700  
20 homes in the area that you can see over here. We  
21 stretch probably the left-hand two-thirds of this.  
22 This was taken from the top of the hill above Simms,  
23 and this is where we live.

24           In the far distance is Fairmount, but in the  
25 middle is the area of 27th Avenue, and two miles away,



1 just another little arrow over there, is the Cabela's  
2 store. If you are driving from the 27th interchange to  
3 Cabela's, you would have to zigzag two miles to get  
4 there.

5           We want to thank you, CDOT and FHWA, for  
6 making this a real public hearing. Our members needed  
7 to see you directly listening and understanding our  
8 comments and concerns. This is a very high quality  
9 community occupied by people who have made it that way.  
10 That's where they live. That's where they want to stay.  
11 We will not accept impacts from low quality planning.

12           Many of our members could not be here  
13 tonight. Some cannot go out at night to late meetings  
14 or withstand the rigors of a large meeting like this.  
15 They sent their comments along for us to incorporate in  
16 our remarks. They will join a very large chorus of  
17 comments that will be sent to you between now and  
18 December 8.

19           Many others have conflicting obligations.  
20 Schools, meetings, family are really important. And one  
21 of our representatives, Bonnie Malone of the Lakewood  
22 Planning Commission, was here earlier. She really  
23 wanted to stay and hear what all of us had to say and  
24 regrets very much that a meeting called her away.

25           It's true of others. And so, even though

1 this looks like a small crowd to you, we really have to  
2 be here. Too many of our comments and concerns have  
3 disappeared from the planning conducted over the past  
4 two years. Some of what we asked has been accepted and  
5 used, but that's been advantageous to the developers in  
6 Wheat Ridge.

7           Vital comments have disappeared and are  
8 missing from the EA and are missing from the underlying  
9 analysis. Tonight AVA wants you to hear the rest of the  
10 whole story. We will present it in sections delivered  
11 by our board of directors and our committee and everyone  
12 will identify themselves. There are five major points,  
13 and they will tell you what they are as they come along.  
14 Thank you.

15           MS. GHAI: Thank you.

16           MR. SHOENBORN: Thank you for the  
17 opportunity to speak to you tonight. My name is Tom  
18 Shoenborn. I'm also a member of the Applewood Valley  
19 Association, and I live at 21st and Eldridge. I have  
20 been a member -- or a homeowner since 1980.

21           The front door on State Highway 58 must have  
22 at least four full traffic lanes. The plan is backwards  
23 with five lanes south and three lanes north to State  
24 Highway 58.

25           Public comments were submitted for two

1 years, but the EA shows very little evidence of what was  
2 said. The State Highway 58 interchange is the sole  
3 exception. Impacts on residential areas reserve  
4 virtually no identification or analysis of mitigation.

5           The EA is very frustrating to read. The  
6 graphic scale is so small that important features are  
7 not visible. Conclusions are stated, but the data  
8 assumptions and analysis are not presented. Many  
9 statements are the same as made by the development team  
10 in early 2005 in spite of claims of more recent  
11 analysis.

12           The 19,000 vehicles per day model for the  
13 south end of Cabela Drive is like a self-fulfilling  
14 prophecy. If you build it, they will come -- five lanes  
15 south, three lanes north.

16           The EA shows the Ward Road interchange  
17 project delayed as much as 25 years. CDOT does not  
18 intend that delay, but exactly how much was that  
19 factored into the traffic modeling. We all know that  
20 the 32nd interchange is the reliever when I-70 and Ward  
21 Road are in trouble.

22           Now there are a couple of factors here -- I  
23 don't want to run out of time, so I will just get to the  
24 tail end -- we expect to assure that the 19,000-vehicle  
25 loading can be reduced by other measures. For example,

1 southbound on Cabela Drive, if you were to put up a  
2 barrier of some sort, you could prevent that southbound  
3 traffic from turning east on 32nd and then south onto  
4 the existing I-70 link.

5           You can obviously see where the traffic is  
6 going to go. I am not an engineer, but having been here  
7 for 25, 26 years, I have seen traffic develop in the  
8 neighborhood. Thank goodness they put speed bumps on  
9 Eldridge.

10           Some of the other things could be -- if the  
11 Ward Road interchange was built, then the current  
12 traffic that's diverted onto 32nd Avenue could instead  
13 stay on I-70 and be diverted north, which is really a  
14 preferable option for us. And we'll have some  
15 additional comments in our letters to the various  
16 agencies. Thank you very much for your time.

17           MS. GHAI: So it's your point that the  
18 delay on improving the Ward Road interchange will  
19 increase problems at the 32nd Avenue interchange?

20           MR. SHOENBORN: Absolutely. Because Ward  
21 Road would help divert traffic north.

22           MS. GHAI: And you want to see some changes  
23 to prevent the people from going south on Cabela and  
24 then right, east, on 37th?

25           MR. SHOENBORN: Correct. Thank you.

1 MS. BRESSEN: My name is Alena Bressen,  
2 and I live at 2005 Willow Lane. I have been a  
3 resident of Jefferson County for 37 years. I have  
4 been gone for a while, and now I am back in the  
5 community. I also look forward to having some of my  
6 children return to this community.

7 I am a part of the Applewood Valley  
8 Association, and there are some short-term impacts as  
9 well as long-term impacts. After the stores are open  
10 and before the I-70/58 ramps are fully opened and  
11 completed, we would like to ask that there be some  
12 provisions to protect our community from establishment  
13 of using the I-70/32nd as an established access pattern  
14 into Cabela's.

15 Now that will take signage, some serious  
16 signage, some serious work to be sure that people  
17 understand where they're going and don't impact our  
18 communities. And after the ramps are complete, then  
19 people would have established their travel pattern. But  
20 I'm afraid that I will be long gone when some of that is  
21 finished, and I think we should think ahead.

22 Now another constraint should be some of the  
23 signage and planning for Cabela's and accessing leaving  
24 the area onto 32nd and be sure that the signage and that  
25 the southbound -- that there be one lane southbound and

1 one lane northbound in the exit so that people are not  
2 totally just dumping onto 32nd during the time --

3 MS. GHAI: The exit off I-70?

4 MS. BRESSEN: Yes, because people will  
5 come onto 32nd and then be dumping in until they plan  
6 this. So that we should be sure that all the traffic  
7 will be exited and go to 40th or that 44th area where  
8 the area will eventually handle all the traffic.

9 MS. GHAI: Instead of 32nd?

10 MS. BRESSEN: Yes. And I think signage  
11 internal and external is very important. And the  
12 other thing I would like to say is, we are planning  
13 for the future. We are building bridges to the  
14 future. Let's be careful where we direct our traffic.  
15 Thank you.

16 MS. GHAI: So you want to make sure that  
17 the interchange at 58 and the signage -- ensuring that  
18 people use that for Cabela's is done before the  
19 development or before that store opens.

20 MS. BRESSEN: The stores are obviously  
21 going to open before that, before the intersection is  
22 totally done to put them on and off at Highway 58.  
23 Thank you.

24 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

25 MS. McCREA: Thank you again for being

1 here this evening and staying even later than you  
2 anticipated. My name is Jan McCrea from the Applewood  
3 Valley Homeowners Association board, and my remarks  
4 are a continuing story on behalf of our AVA members  
5 with regard to community attributes.

6           Wheat Ridge, prior to somewhat having been  
7 the carnation capital of the world, in 1970, when Wheat  
8 Ridge adopted this name for its first birthdate  
9 celebration, carnation growers were the largest industry  
10 in the area.

11           There were about a dozen major carnation  
12 producers. Now there is only one, and it lies directly  
13 in the path of the relocated I-70 eastbound interchange.  
14 The EA currently says this carnation farm has no  
15 historical significance and thus constitutes no  
16 significant impact from the EA project.

17           This was done by omitting vital facts. This  
18 was done by excluding information offered by the  
19 original farm family owners who have been operating  
20 continuously since 1950. This was done while nearby  
21 properties lauded for representing agricultural history  
22 in the community were fully described and found eligible  
23 to the National Register of Historic Places.

24           This was done by leaving blanks on the state  
25 Office of Archeological and Historic Preservation

1 inventory form where owner information would have shown  
2 the importance in history and integrity of the property.  
3 Why?

4 MS. GHAI: So that carnation grower -- is  
5 that the same as the Novacek --

6 MS. McCREA: Yeah.

7 MS. GHAI: That is contrary to what the EA  
8 draft says -- that actually it's of very important  
9 historical significance, the carnation industry in Wheat  
10 Ridge.

11 MS. McCREA: Absolutely.

12 MS. GALAWAY: Hi. I am Darlene Galaway.  
13 I live at 2110 Applewood Drive, and I am also on the  
14 Applewood Valley Association board. And my remarks  
15 are the continuing story on behalf of the other AVA  
16 members.

17 Regarding the public scoping, what record  
18 exists of the substance of the public scoping process?  
19 Many of our neighbors can see that their comments  
20 disappeared in a file. They had no effect on the EA  
21 content.

22 AVA members have spent thousands of personal  
23 voluntary hours at meetings, reading documents from the  
24 development team, and providing input about our  
25 neighborhood. Except for the SH 58 interchange, none of



1 their effort is reflected in the EA.

2           Residents are rightfully outraged to find  
3 only two paragraphs describing what is predicted to  
4 happen at the end of the new I-70/27th Avenue ramps. If  
5 a problem isn't defined, it can't possibly be solved.  
6 Half an interstate interchange will be moved to our AVA  
7 neighborhood. Except for 11 blocks on Youngfield  
8 containing small local businesses, all of the  
9 surrounding miles of streets are strictly residential.

10           MS. GHAI: It's got a lot of impacts to a  
11 residential area, but you also made a more procedural  
12 point, that you come to a lot of meetings -- and others  
13 have made this point too -- it seems like the comments  
14 have been lost or have been ignored or haven't been put  
15 in the record.

16           And I know a lot of you have been coming to  
17 meetings related to this for a lot of years, so I am  
18 impressed with your tenacity -- and in the case of the  
19 Applewood Valley Association, your organization as well.  
20 So thank you. Next, please.

21           MS. HENDRICKSON: I'm Theresa Hendrickson.  
22 I am also from the Applewood Valley Association, and  
23 my remarks are the continuing story on behalf of my  
24 AVA members.

25           These are the alternatives to the I-70

1 interchange at 27th Avenue. In early 2005 the  
2 development team laid out many alternative packages. We  
3 commented on them both positively and negatively  
4 depending on the components.

5           One year ago the development team showed  
6 three alternatives. One of those could have been very  
7 damaging to the 32nd/Youngfield area. The other two  
8 required a relocation of the eastbound I-70 ramps  
9 southward along Youngfield. We commented very  
10 negatively on the relocation of the I-70 ramps. Our  
11 first objection was about the lodging of the development  
12 traffic patterns. Too much traffic was being sent south  
13 out of the development instead of north.

14           Also the only solutions were heavy  
15 construction solutions. Virtually no thought was  
16 applied to traffic management solutions which would  
17 reduce the load on the immediate area of 32nd and  
18 Youngfield. Then last December, as we were being forced  
19 to evaluate those three options as to Youngfield, two of  
20 those were eliminated.

21           And my husband, who is also an AVA member,  
22 will continue and explain further with a letter.

23           MR. HENDRICKSON: I am Justin Hendrickson,  
24 secretary of the Applewood Valley Association, and my  
25 remarks are continuing the story on behalf of the AVA

1 members. Theresa and I live at 1350 West 23rd Place.  
2 I'll now read a letter into the record. This letter  
3 came from the City of Wheat Ridge file and has not  
4 been revealed in the EA.

5           The letter is addressed from Murray  
6 Wilkening, PC, his law office, addressed to -- dated,  
7 first of all, September 20, 2005, addressed to Tom  
8 Norton, executive director of CDOT; Manny Young, the  
9 city manager of Wheat Ridge; Mike Callahan of Cabela's.  
10 The subject being Cabela's/Wheat Ridge, Colorado,  
11 project.

12           Dear Mr. Norton, Mr. Young and Mr. Callahan.  
13 This letter is sent on behalf of my client, HGM Realty,  
14 LLC. HGM Realty is the owner of the Applewood Tech  
15 Center building located at 2801 Youngfield, Wheat Ridge,  
16 Colorado.

17           Just recently HGM Realty became aware of  
18 adverse or negative information about the property being  
19 presented to the public regarding the proposed Cabela's  
20 development. Specifically hook ramp refinements/options  
21 are being published which show a proposed Interstate 70  
22 ramp running through the property.

23           This information is set forth on the  
24 [www.CabWheatRidge.com](http://www.CabWheatRidge.com) website, the City of Wheat Ridge  
25 website, and apparently was presented at a November 30,

1 2005 public meeting.

2           Darrell Croft of HGM Realty has been in  
3 business in Wheat Ridge for over 30 years. He's in  
4 charge of managing property and is easily available to  
5 address any issues concerning property. However, not  
6 one single person ever bothered to contact him before  
7 publication of the information identifying the taking of  
8 the property and construction of the highway ramp.

9           This information is obviously adverse and  
10 negatively impacts HGM Realty's ability to lease the  
11 property. Not only did Mr. Croft, an honest  
12 businessman, disclose the possibility of taking property  
13 to prospective tenants. Other brokers must disclose the  
14 information to prospective tenants. Brokers will steer  
15 clients away from the property facing an uncertain  
16 future.

17           While the prospect of taking the property  
18 for highway ramps seems absurd based on the other  
19 available options, the prospect alone is enough to cause  
20 continuing damage to the property. Therefore, HGM  
21 Realty requests the following immediate actions:

22           They are requesting that all these parties  
23 and people responsible withdraw this. Make it public  
24 that it's going to be withdrawn, and we accept that this  
25 is going to include any future plans. Mr. Croft

1 appreciates the significant time and effort going into  
2 the Cabela's project.

3 MS. GHAI: I'm sorry. I have to cut you  
4 off. Somebody earlier had said they were misled by  
5 developers, and you alluded to that too. You're saying  
6 there's something on the website that indicates a  
7 different exit than what is now being -- a different  
8 kind of exit or a different location of the ramps than  
9 what's being planned.

10 MR. HENDRICKSON: There were three  
11 proposals for ramps around 27th Avenue, all of which  
12 go through this property, and here's some supporting  
13 documentation.

14 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

15 MR. HENDRICKSON: So the businessman is  
16 concerned he's going to lose tenants for his building.

17 MS. GHAI: And there's impact to just the  
18 prospect of property being taken that is happening now.  
19 Thank you.

20 MR. HENDRICKSON: And there are quite a  
21 few people here that were copied on this letter.

22 MS. GHAI: We'll make sure we get that in  
23 the record. And your wife earlier -- I thought you were  
24 going to be expanding on the same points -- she noted  
25 that the 27th Avenue ramps impacted south instead of

1 north or it seemed like they tended to do that. And  
2 there needs to be more attention to traffic management  
3 solutions that might have less impact on some of those  
4 people.

5 MR. HENDRICKSON: The intent of this  
6 letter is to show how it's going to affect the  
7 property owners at 27th Avenue.

8 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

9 MR. WHALEN: My name is Joe Whalen. I  
10 live at 2050 Applewood Drive, and I've lived there  
11 since 1993. During the past two years, residents in  
12 the neighborhoods affected by the development of  
13 Cabela's have repeatedly expressed unease about the  
14 increase in traffic on 32nd Avenue and Youngfield  
15 Street which could result from access to the Cabela's  
16 development.

17 The reply to these worries was that the  
18 southern access from 32nd Avenue was for local and  
19 emergency access only and would have little impact on  
20 local traffic. The front door to Cabela's was to be  
21 from the north at the interchange of Highway 58 and  
22 Cabela's Drive.

23 The recently released environmental  
24 assessment, however, clearly indicates the Cabela Drive  
25 and 32nd Avenue intersection is the intended main access

1 road for the development with over twice the projected  
2 traffic as the access points from the Highway 58  
3 interchange and the 40th Avenue underpass combined.

4           The five-lane design width of Cabela Drive  
5 and 32nd Avenue shown in the environmental assessment  
6 clearly supports this conclusion and shows that it is  
7 intended to handle most, if not all, of the anticipated  
8 increase in traffic to the development from eastbound  
9 I-70 as well as the traffic from northbound C-470 that  
10 feeds into I-70.

11           In order to handle the traffic flow to  
12 Cabela's arriving from eastbound I-70, the environmental  
13 assessment proposes construction hook ramps at 27th  
14 Avenue and Youngfield Street.

15           The additional traffic volume of 19,000  
16 vehicles per day at two large intersections -- at  
17 Youngfield Street and 27th Avenue and at Youngfield  
18 Street and 32nd Avenue -- will greatly increase  
19 congestion on Youngfield Street and 32nd and result in  
20 traffic backups in all directions from that  
21 intersection.

22           In addition, construction of the proposed  
23 hook ramps at 27th Avenue will necessitate displacement  
24 of a number of residences and local businesses. I  
25 believe the solution to the traffic congestion and

1 neighborhood destruction that would result in a proposed  
2 environmental assessment lies in the return to the plan  
3 as originally presented, assuming Cabela Drive's access  
4 to 32nd Avenue is truly necessary for local and  
5 emergency traffic limited to two lanes.

6           Focus traffic to the Cabela's development to  
7 the Highway 58 interchange and discourage access from  
8 32nd Avenue. And, finally, require that the north  
9 access to the development from Highway 58 be in place  
10 before Cabela's or other businesses are allowed to open.

11           And, finally, an earlier speaker made the  
12 comment that the intersection at 32nd and Youngfield is  
13 a very problematic intersection and dangerous. The  
14 addition of Cabela Drive will do nothing but exacerbate  
15 this already dangerous situation.

16           MS. GHAI: Thank you. Several of you have  
17 now made this point about how there are in the plan five  
18 lanes to the south and only three lanes to the north on  
19 Cabela Drive and how it makes it look an awful lot like  
20 the intent is to have the access be from the 32nd Avenue  
21 interchange rather than the 58 -- the State Highway 58  
22 interchange.

23           MR. KEETHAL: Hello. I am Ron Keethal. I  
24 am a Wheat Ridge resident at 3893 Theo Drive. My  
25 family also owns Wheat Ridge Cyclery, and I've been



1 riding my bicycle up and down 32nd Avenue for the past  
2 30 years now.

3           I am in support of the Cabela's project.  
4 Cabela's is a destination business as a high quality  
5 retailer, much like large ski and sport and our bicycle  
6 shops. So I feel it's very important that we support  
7 this project.

8           I am also a board member of Wheat Ridge  
9 20/20 as we look at revitalizing our community at Wheat  
10 Ridge. And I am not for expanding the EA because I fear  
11 that, if we do expand the study as people suggested, we  
12 lose Cabela's and then -- Cabela's is the kind of  
13 business that we are looking for as we try to grow this  
14 community in Wheat Ridge.

15           The engineers have studied 27 alternatives,  
16 and they've put in a lot of hard work, and so I thank  
17 them for their efforts.

18           Just as a cyclist riding through the area, I  
19 would like to request -- and I'm not sure if there are  
20 bike lanes along 32nd; 32nd Avenue is a major east/west  
21 corridor for cyclists coming through Denver to Golden --  
22 so I would request that that intersection is studied  
23 well and on-road bicycle lanes are included in that.

24           And then also down Cabela Drive. I feel  
25 that, if there are on-road bike routes, that cyclists

1 will be able to go through there, and that there is a  
2 good connection to the bike trail. So thank you.

3 MS. GHAI: Thank you. So you want to see  
4 this economic development and Cabela's specifically and  
5 are also looking for bike lanes on 32nd and Cabela to  
6 access some of the trails.

7 MR. KEETHAL: Correct.

8 MR. DELATE: Hi. My name is Brian Delate.  
9 I am a local resident and business owner. I live just  
10 a couple of blocks from 32nd and Youngfield, and I was  
11 actually quoted a couple of years ago, when the very  
12 first traffic plans came out, as being very pleased  
13 that somebody was going to at least attempt to fix the  
14 32nd to Youngfield intersection.

15 With the additions and changes, especially  
16 the underpass on about 40th and the Highway 58  
17 interchange, I am very pleased with the results of this  
18 because it will help to alleviate traffic, putting the  
19 front door up on 58 and moving a lot of the traffic away  
20 from 32nd as well as fixing 32nd.

21 I live just east of I-70, and a couple of  
22 years ago when my son was attending Manning, he was  
23 not -- I would not let him walk or ride his bike to  
24 school because that intersection was so dangerous.

25 With the proposed changes, all that should

1 be much safer so that, when my three younger children  
2 attend Manning, I would be much more confident in  
3 letting them walk through there.

4           So I am very pleased with the 32nd Avenue  
5 stuff. Also the way the traffic has been pushed away  
6 from 32nd and Youngfield towards Highway 58 and then  
7 even building a tunnel underneath 58 to push --  
8 underneath 70 to push more of that traffic through Wheat  
9 Ridge instead of -- since it's Wheat Ridge that's doing  
10 this, I think that's good.

11           MS. GHAI: You say it solves a lot of  
12 long-standing problems and that actually the area around  
13 Manning will actually become more safe. Thanks.

14           MS. FLEMING: Hi. My name is Betty  
15 Fleming. I have lived in the Applewood area for 35  
16 years when my dad transferred us from New York City  
17 because he didn't like the traffic.

18           I've lived at 23rd and Youngfield for the  
19 past 18 years, and I have four small children. We're a  
20 very outdoor family. I didn't prepare anything. I  
21 wrote some things down while I was standing here just to  
22 tell you from a residential point of view what we are  
23 facing and what we are fearing.

24           And the big concern for us is that the 27th  
25 interchange -- because we walk to the store. I have a

1 runner who runs to the park to do her 10 miles every  
2 day. We cycle. We really take advantage of the  
3 Colorado outdoors. And the idea of having an  
4 interchange that looks like it's going to be up to six  
5 lanes wide right -- three blocks away from our house is  
6 not an inviting opportunity.

7           We've watched a lot of growth, obviously,  
8 over 35 years. However, to move that interchange into  
9 the residential area instead of trying to push it away,  
10 I don't understand why that's the option. 32nd and  
11 Youngfield really does need to be improved because of  
12 the traffic, but I was hoping that it wouldn't be in my  
13 backyard.

14           We have a little problem with the noise  
15 level currently because I-70 is very close to our home,  
16 and I anticipate that noise will increase dramatically  
17 having an interchange coming around and looping around  
18 our house, so that's also a concern.

19           And I am worried about my property value  
20 going down. I am worried about safety for my kids. And  
21 I think that's all I jotted down, but I just wanted to  
22 express my opinions. Thank you.

23           MS. GHAI: Thank you. Many of you have  
24 very long, deep roots in this neighborhood and are very  
25 worried about the character and how it will change from

1 the semirural nature that it has now.

2 MS. TITLEBAUM: My name is Rhonda  
3 Titlebaum. I am on the board of the Applewood  
4 Property Owners Association. We are not nearly as  
5 organized as the AVA, but our concerns are no less  
6 real.

7 First, let me say thank you to CDOT for  
8 giving us this opportunity to comment publicly and also  
9 for all that you have done to date. It has been a  
10 pleasure to work with you, and we appreciate that our  
11 concerns to a great extent have been recognized.

12 We are still in the process of reviewing the  
13 EA. It's a very big document for those of us that are  
14 laypeople, and so we will submit additional written  
15 comments within the time frame.

16 For tonight I have two what I think are the  
17 most significant comments at this point. One is, we  
18 have talked over the last couple of years a lot about  
19 where these roads should go. This is really our first  
20 chance to discuss environmental impact in the true sense  
21 of the word.

22 And I am real troubled by what -- you heard  
23 one comment before of what I perceive to be sort of a  
24 chicken and egg problem. We have a no-action  
25 alternative that assumes this large regional development

1 and the traffic that will flow from it, and then we have  
2 a proposed action that purports to remedy the  
3 environmental impact of that very development.

4           That seems very disingenuous to me, and I  
5 think is a concern to many people in our neighborhood.  
6 We would like to see a true environmental assessment  
7 that includes with the proposed action that impacted  
8 those additional -- I have heard 20-, I have heard  
9 35,000 cars a day that result strictly from the fact  
10 that this development is regional in its nature.

11           The other issue is also one that's been  
12 mentioned before, and that relates really more to --  
13 it's really addressed more to Wheat Ridge and the  
14 developer than it is to CDOT, but I am hoping that CDOT  
15 can help us out here.

16           We have heard since the beginning that all  
17 of the necessary improvements would be in place before  
18 the store opening, that if it doesn't work for the  
19 neighborhood, it doesn't work for Cabela's. I could  
20 probably go on in that vein.

21           And yet, despite promises that all these  
22 improvements would be completed, because of a  
23 technicality, I think, with respect to whose  
24 jurisdiction is what, the very essential I-70  
25 interchange, I-70/58 interchange completion will not

1 take place until after the store opens.

2           I think that's a travesty. I think that's  
3 an insult to the neighborhood. I would hope that there  
4 would be some environmental assessment of the impact  
5 without completion -- of the store opening without  
6 completion of those missing links.

7           I wonder whether the five-lane proposal for  
8 Cabela Drive is strictly a function of the fact that  
9 there is no way to get to this project from eastbound  
10 I-70 until that connection is built, and therefore  
11 Cabela Drive becomes at least a temporary front door.  
12 Thank you.

13           MS. GHAI: Thanks. So some of the promises  
14 made, some of the concerns for the neighborhood, your  
15 feeling is, are not holding at this point, and you want  
16 to make sure that that 58/I-70 gets done before the  
17 doors open of the store. Thanks.

18           MS. ADAMS: My name is Camelia Adams. I  
19 live at 23rd Place, which is just south of 32nd and  
20 west of Alkire. First of all, I want to point out  
21 that several comments have been made about the EA and  
22 that it was locally produced. I would like to see a  
23 federal EA, please.

24           I would like to see an impact for our entire  
25 community. It is true that half of the world's

1 population now lives in urban and metropolitan areas.  
2 If we are going to create here, as we desire,  
3 tranquility, we're going to have to make sure that this  
4 highway doesn't become main street USA with lots of  
5 off-ramps going to lots of commercial developments.

6           I am appalled that the powers that be in  
7 this community were able to even consider the west side  
8 of I-70 for commercial development. I am appalled that  
9 there was a collusion with Wheat Ridge saying, Oh,  
10 greedy, greedy little Wheat Ridge, look how you can make  
11 so much more money if you can include this in your plan.

12           If this was forty years ago, we might have  
13 been sitting here talking about Times Square or 44th and  
14 Wadsworth. Or you might have been talking about the  
15 development at Lakeside. Anybody remember those?  
16 Anybody ever go to a meeting for those? Look what's  
17 there now. It's dead. It's overrun by gang violence,  
18 for instance, if you want to talk violence.

19           I think that's violence on our community.  
20 There hasn't been proper oversight to any of this  
21 development. It's all been done over the years by  
22 special interest in collusion with small-time  
23 government. Wheat Ridge as a community has lost its  
24 credibility over the years to manage commercial  
25 property.



1           Why do we see them being the instigator of  
2 this commercial development into our open space? And if  
3 you look 40 years down the road, I think we would be  
4 very happy to have this as open space. It helps to  
5 insulate our idyllic community that you may think is  
6 provincial, but we really do love our community and we  
7 want it to be insulated.

8           We want this highway, which is -- it already  
9 bifurcates our community -- we want it to go right on  
10 past. 32nd, yes, we need an improvement there, but only  
11 for the Applewood Center because there is a lot of  
12 traffic there. That is a huge commercial development,  
13 and as a matter of fact, the King Soopers and the huge  
14 liquor store there already are major contributors to the  
15 economy of Wheat Ridge. If it weren't for them, the  
16 rest of Wheat Ridge would have withered and died a long  
17 time ago.

18           I know. I work in that King Soopers, and I  
19 see a lot of faces here that I recognize. So consider  
20 those things before you start doing these incidental  
21 projects. This is a national problem. This is a  
22 problem in New York City. It's a problem in Memphis,  
23 Tennessee. It's a problem here in Denver. So try to  
24 get some kind of a national and state perspective on  
25 what is going on here.

1 MS. GHAI: So you're concerned about the  
2 interest of developers and perhaps local officials --

3 MS. ADAMS: I don't want our community to  
4 look like Wadsworth in 25 or 30, 40 years -- dead,  
5 dead, dead.

6 MS. GHAI: Thank you.

7 MR. SHABOLA: I am Jim Shabola, and I am  
8 with that large liquor store. I am with Applejack  
9 Wine and Spirits. We are very deeply rooted in this  
10 community. We live and breathe Wheat Ridge and  
11 surrounding areas, and I thought it was important that  
12 I comment.

13 I would say that, first of all, that I know  
14 that CDOT has taken a lot of time to try to address all  
15 of the concerns of all the participants, and I know it's  
16 been a very difficult process. I have been caring about  
17 and living the problems of the roads in this section for  
18 almost -- for more than 20 years, and I will tell you  
19 that this has been a problem that has been growing and  
20 festering and had to be addressed.

21 This, for me, is not about Cabela's. This  
22 problem existed long before Cabela's was even a glimmer  
23 in anyone's eyes. I never knew of a Cabela's, and I  
24 knew that there were problems with 32nd and 58 that had  
25 to be addressed.

1           I very much appreciate everyone's concerns  
2 here about 27th and the community. I am concerned about  
3 it. But I also am a realist to know that 32nd and 58  
4 has been a problem for us forever. And CDOT, in  
5 addressing the problem of 32nd and addressing the  
6 problem of 58, has to know -- has looked at all the  
7 alternatives, and this is not necessarily a solution  
8 that everybody is happy with, but I haven't seen a  
9 better solution.

10           And it has nothing to do with Cabela's. It  
11 has nothing to do with any other development. It has to  
12 do with the community we live in now. And, sure, there  
13 could be changes made for this community or that  
14 community, but it's trying to balance it over all the  
15 communities.

16           And I will remind everybody who's concerned  
17 about 27th that, when the 58 and I-70 interchange was  
18 proposed over about 50 years ago, only half of that was  
19 ever done. 50 years later the other half still has not  
20 been done.

21           So my hope is that, even though CDOT has to  
22 put it on -- because I think CDOT is mandated to have it  
23 there -- my hope is that 50 years from now, we will all  
24 be sitting here saying, That never happened. So, again,  
25 I give kudos to CDOT. I understand the problems you are

1 under, but realistically it's a mess where we are now  
2 and it has to be addressed because, if it is not  
3 addressed now the way that CDOT has proposed, it's going  
4 to get worse and worse. Thank you.

5 MS. GHAI: Thank you. You feel that the  
6 solutions that they have come up with are just pragmatic  
7 and probably the best possible -- or the least bad, I  
8 suppose, given the long-term problems. Thank you.

9 MS. PIERCE: My name is Shirley Pierce.  
10 I've lived in the Applewood area for 42 years, and I  
11 am a member of the Applewood Valley Association. The  
12 Applewood Valley Association gave these remarks at the  
13 Jefferson County Commissioners public meeting  
14 April 27, '06 at the Marriott.

15 We feel strongly about this. This is not in  
16 the EA. The Applewood Valley Association was formed in  
17 1956, years before I-70 came through here. The whole  
18 valley was settled, and then the wall was built with one  
19 hole providing circulation for our community.

20 Although there is a barrier, we still  
21 function as a village, but we must use 32nd Avenue to  
22 connect people, homes, schools, churches, emergency  
23 equipment, parks, shopping, and services.

24 Youngfield is our Applewood main street and  
25 provides commercial needs at a community level. Please

1 note the shopping center parking lot is nearly full  
2 during high traffic volume hours. For those reasons,  
3 the 32nd Avenue interchange on I-70 was designed for  
4 local purposes.

5           Regional functions were provided at Ward  
6 Road and Colfax. No one should be surprised at our  
7 determination to protect the integrity of our  
8 neighborhood. We succeeded in campaigning to have the  
9 external traffic served by direct freeway interchange.

10           The front door on Highway 58 is a fine  
11 solution so long as it is not defeated by misguided  
12 directional signing both on and off-site and a high  
13 capacity Cabela Drive connecting to 32nd.

14           MS. GHAI: Thank you. So your emphasis is  
15 on 32nd as really a local road. 32nd is really the  
16 local -- has local importance as connecting the parts of  
17 the community east and west of I-70.

18           MR. NOVACHEK: I am Gerald Novacek. We're  
19 the family that runs the greenhouse there at 27th and  
20 Youngfield. I guess you guys have heard me talk  
21 before. We've still got problems, don't we?

22           You've got a lot done. You've made some  
23 improvements, but from what I am still hearing, along  
24 with myself and my family, we've still got a problem at  
25 27th there. Nobody wants it. And they think there are

1 still some alternatives there to do.

2           Do you guys realize that I just heard on the  
3 business news this last week, Cabela's in every state  
4 that they have been in so far is the number one tourist  
5 attraction in that state. Do you realize that, when  
6 they come to Colorado, it's probably going to be again  
7 close to the number one tourist attraction here.

8           Do all of us really realize and understand  
9 really the impact that this business is going to bring  
10 to our community here? And I realize Cabela's is a fine  
11 organization and they do a nice job, not only for  
12 sportsmen, but for just people that like to go there and  
13 to view their exhibits and see the things that they do.  
14 It's just phenomenal.

15           But the traffic these people bring in is  
16 just going to be unreal, I think, for our neighborhood,  
17 and it's probably like that baby that maybe nobody  
18 wanted, you know, but you realize you are going to have.  
19 That may be the way it is here now, and that's why we're  
20 solving these problems.

21           Have any of you as parents had several  
22 children and maybe one more comes along a little later  
23 on? Your refrigerator is too small. Your car is too  
24 small. Your house is too small. That's where we are at  
25 right here. So we're trying to solve these problems

1 with somebody that's coming in.

2           And we all love that extra baby that's going  
3 to come along, just like Cabela's. We are going to love  
4 them, but there is some problems here that we have to  
5 address to take care of this. And I think part of them  
6 is, we have to protect these communities up here that  
7 we're involved in and a lot of these other people that  
8 got up and spoke tonight too.

9           So I would just like to thank CDOT for  
10 giving us the opportunity to stand up here and talk to  
11 you. I'd like to thank the mayor for his facility here  
12 that we can use, and I guess I would like to have you  
13 guys go back once again and say, We need to look at a  
14 few more of these refinements here because, I tell you,  
15 I think we are just really up against something here  
16 that's bigger than what we really think. Thank you very  
17 much.

18           MS. GHAI: Wheat Ridge is getting knocked  
19 up, huh? I couldn't resist. I'm sorry.

20           MR. VILACHICO: My name is John Vilachico,  
21 and I have a long history from when I was born in this  
22 community. I was raised at the foot of Table Mountain  
23 in Fairmount and went to Wheat Ridge High School.  
24 Graduated there in '85. Have been all over the world,  
25 and my wife and I decided to bring the businesses that

1 we had started right back here to Wheat Ridge.

2           First and foremost, I want to speak only for  
3 a second about Cabela's coming here. I think it's an  
4 absolutely wonderful opportunity for the community. But  
5 regardless of that, this property is going to be  
6 developed. It has been leveled out. It was commercial  
7 from its beginning.

8           In fact, it was industrial as a mine, as a  
9 gravel pit. You can barely get more industrial than  
10 that. It was useless for decades, and now it's been  
11 developed into a property that, if it becomes available  
12 for sale, especially the corner property that Cabela's  
13 currently owns, someone else will move in quickly.

14           So there is not a question of the property  
15 being developed. It's, I guess, a question of whether  
16 it will be developed this year or several years down the  
17 road after another study.

18           I would like to thank CDOT for all of its  
19 hard work and also thank the Federal Highway  
20 Administration for coming here and giving people a  
21 chance to talk. I think there have been many, many  
22 different proposals put forward, but what has to be  
23 taken care of is the fact that this area is growing.

24           It is growing faster than the highways can  
25 contain the traffic. Virtually everybody in this room



1 has complained about traffic problems, and I grew up  
2 with traffic problems and became aware of them at 16.

3           The highway intersection at Highway 58 has  
4 never fed this community properly. It's always only  
5 been able to put traffic in half the directions that it  
6 was supposed to. It's critical that Highway 58 be  
7 completed.

8           What I also like about this proposal is that  
9 it feeds the majority of traffic for this development  
10 off an already developed four-lane highway, which is  
11 Highway 58. That's for the lead-in signs for tourists.  
12 And no matter how many tourists come, they're probably  
13 going to be coming east off of I-70.

14           And they will be directed onto Highway 58.  
15 There is a very adequate interchange off of Highway 58  
16 to feed people coming and going from the project, and  
17 then the feed-in to I-70 at 32nd Avenue actually  
18 isolates 32nd Avenue from the majority of the traffic.

19           This also provides relief for thousands of  
20 Coors workers that currently use 32nd Avenue and 44th  
21 Avenue to exit their jobs every day, and I am talking  
22 thousands of people. So it provides better access to  
23 the highways, and I hope that people realize that these  
24 two lanes here are a double flyover bridge that allows  
25 people to get onto the highway.

1 MS. GHAI: Thank you. Procedurally we are  
2 at a quarter to 9:00, and so I think what we have time  
3 to do is hear from the three folks who are standing now.  
4 I know some of you have decided to get up in the middle  
5 of things here, but I think we're going to stop it with  
6 the gentleman who's last in line right now and then turn  
7 it over to Pam Hutton and/or others to do a little  
8 wrap-up, and then we will fold things up for the night.

9 MS. PLATTEN: Hello. My name is Jennifer  
10 Platten. I live in the Applewood community. I am  
11 very grateful for Mr. Novacek for speaking so gently  
12 to us because this is obviously a subject of great  
13 tension for everybody, none more so probably than his  
14 family and his health.

15 So I just want to let everybody know that  
16 that's the -- those are the people that are being  
17 threatened to be kicked out of this neighborhood. You  
18 might reconsider. They're probably some of our best  
19 people here.

20 I don't like the proposal. I don't like the  
21 highway changes that are proposed, and I certainly don't  
22 like Cabela's. I'm not a sportsman. I never will be.  
23 Guns are used for two things, injuring and killing.  
24 That's it. You can say it's protecting, but you have to  
25 injure and kill to protect. So let me lay that on the

1 line, so you'll know I have no sympathy whatsoever for  
2 any difficulties they might face in relocating here.

3 I'm also not a fan of pollution. I'm also  
4 not a fan of an increased energy burden to our  
5 community. I mentioned in the last Wheat Ridge city  
6 meeting that this is a vision that lacks vision. It's  
7 not even taking into account the burden that we have on  
8 our energy supply right now. It's not taking into  
9 account the global warming that we are suffering from.  
10 It's bringing RVs here, not Priuses, but RVs.

11 And 35,000 of them is creating a lot of  
12 heat, a lot of pollution, and, frankly, I don't think  
13 that it's a mindset that needs to be cultivated any  
14 longer. I don't think that we need to exploit American  
15 ignorances and vices any longer for the profit of a few  
16 large developers.

17 I feel very strongly about this. I don't  
18 know what the legalities of it are, but knowing that all  
19 of our property values will be diminished and our  
20 quality of lives will be diminished, I know that  
21 ethically that, as individuals who are in a position to  
22 make a decision about this, you have personal  
23 responsibility.

24 If it were my decision and I were looking  
25 down 10 years -- 3 years, 10 years, 30 years, I would

1 say, What do I want to be for my grandchildren? What do  
2 I want to be for these other people's grandchildren? Do  
3 I want a world that's more polluted, more noisy, more  
4 chaotic and less cohesive? Or do I want something like  
5 the Wheat Ridge Rec Center that brings people together,  
6 that gives them an opportunity to recreate together?

7           So I thank you for your time in considering  
8 this. There is no concise summary I can say. Please go  
9 back to the drawing board. We are creative human  
10 beings. We can put people into outer space. There is a  
11 solution to this that will fit many more needs than the  
12 solution that is proposed here. This solution fits the  
13 monetary needs of some people, but not most. Thank you.

14           MS. GHAI: So you're saying there are  
15 larger local problems in terms of firearms, pollution  
16 from automobiles, and the interests of businesses and  
17 developers of our communities.

18           MR. PALOTKA: My name is Arnold Palotka.  
19 I live in the neighborhood. I am going to start at  
20 the T&A truck stop. There's a much needed change. It  
21 has been anticipated for at least two years when I  
22 have talked to the manager of the station.

23           And he said, We are going to move one of the  
24 entrances over eastward on 44th. So that change is very  
25 nice. The interchange at 58 is a completion of

1 something that must have been on the drawing board about  
2 20 years ago when they built I-70. It is a much needed  
3 interchange. The flyovers to 58 are needed. But as you  
4 come south on Youngfield, the alignments of the street  
5 and I-70 are a pipe dream. I would suggest you get  
6 somebody with a transom out there to find out exactly  
7 where you stand on those designs.

8           The 32nd Street interchange is only about 15  
9 to 20 feet away from the edge of the highway. So if you  
10 are going to try to put -- I would say about a 20-foot  
11 drop -- and if you are going to put an interchange in  
12 there, you will have to realign either the highway  
13 further west or Youngfield further east.

14           You show the 38th Street entrance closed, so  
15 you must be anticipating putting a new entrance  
16 somewhere about 32nd. The 27th Street interchange of  
17 Youngfield and 27th is only about 40 to 50 -- I estimate  
18 60 feet from the highway embankment to 27th.

19           It's a pipe dream. Leave that alone. Leave  
20 the entrance -- or exit from I-70 to Youngfield which  
21 comes out at Taco Bell, leave that alone. Don't try to  
22 use the 27th because there is no 27th Street west of  
23 Youngfield. There is no alley there.

24           MS. GHAI: I have to cut you off, but it  
25 sounds like you're pleased with the proposed changes at

1 Ward and 44th and at State Highway 58. But when it  
2 comes down to the 32nd interchange, it's all wrong, and  
3 you are saying, leave the Taco Bell ramp as it is.

4 MR. PALOTKA: They have a traffic signal  
5 right now that, if you are coming off I-70 onto 32nd  
6 Street, if you come down that ramp, the timing is such  
7 that only three vehicles can get off the ramp. It's a  
8 congested area.

9 MR. VAN FLEET: My name is Henry  
10 Van Fleet. I live at 2267 Zinnia Street. I have  
11 lived there for 44 years. In my previous -- I am  
12 retired now -- previously I was a deputy city engineer  
13 for the City of Denver Public Works. Prior to that I  
14 was a principal engineer for Stearns & Rogers that  
15 built highways and roadways and railroads all over the  
16 world. Prior to that I taught engineering courses at  
17 the University of Colorado.

18 I can look at this and say there are  
19 problems here. It's poorly laid out. You've put a lot  
20 of traffic on I-70 into the suburbs, into the  
21 neighborhoods, and this is not good.

22 I also suggested before putting an  
23 interchange at the 40th tunnel. They say it can't be  
24 built. It can be built there if we use the methods that  
25 were used on T-REX and use modern thinking, not fill and

1 backfill and such like that. There is room. It can go  
2 in there.

3           By putting the interchange at 40th, the  
4 destination to Cabela's can be achieved. Virtually  
5 100 percent of the traffic on I-70 that is destined for  
6 there can reach there. And we can also put an  
7 interchange by extending that across Youngfield and  
8 putting on and off-ramps on Youngfield to that  
9 interchange, urban interchange, which would lead from  
10 Youngfield onto I-70.

11           It would eliminate the need to go through  
12 Novaceks entirely. A lot of the improvements could be  
13 dropped on here. By removing the light at the on and  
14 off-ramps at I-70 westbound there, you are going to have  
15 a big increase in a stacking area. There is a need for  
16 improving 32nd Street, but the Cabela Drive could be  
17 eliminated from this entirely, which would eliminate the  
18 traffic going into the neighborhood area entirely.

19           One hundred percent of the destination  
20 traffic that is going to Cabela's could go to Cabela's  
21 without any interference at all, and we don't have to  
22 interrupt Novacek. We don't have to go 22nd. We can  
23 put an on and off-ramp, an urban type, at 40th.

24           Fortieth Avenue is going to have a tunnel in  
25 there. This is going to be hazardous and dangerous,

1 very dangerous. The entire grade -- or elevation at  
2 40th Avenue is going to be below Youngfield. As you go  
3 east on that tunnel, you are going to have to climb out  
4 of that grade onto Youngfield and turn right. That area  
5 there is below ground. It is going to be -- the north  
6 side is going to receive a lot of weather. It's going  
7 to be slippery, icy, a high maintenance. It's going to  
8 be accident-prone.

9           As you come out of that tunnel and turn  
10 right, you are going to go up a 5 percent grade, and  
11 that is going to be hazardous. There's going to be a  
12 lot of people, a lot of accidents.

13           MS. GHAI: I have to cut you off. Thank  
14 you very much.

15           You're saying a much better solution would  
16 be an urban interchange at 40th and that there are  
17 serious problems with the tunnel at 40th in the plans as  
18 well as with other aspects of the 32nd Avenue  
19 interchange as planned.

20           I know that many of you, as I said, have  
21 been coming to a lot, a lot, a lot of these sessions  
22 over several years now. I am sure many of you have  
23 participation fatigue. I know that some of you have  
24 said some of your concerns seem to have been listened  
25 to. A lot of you have said it seems like a lot's been



1 ignored. And I know that's frustrating when you are  
2 putting a lot of your evenings and your personal time  
3 keeping up all of this and reading the studies.

4 I know that the folks from CDOT and FHWA as  
5 well as others involved -- Cabela's, the City of Wheat  
6 Ridge, Jeffco -- have been very interested to hear your  
7 comments. I know that they think about them a lot.  
8 They are considering them a lot. And so I would like to  
9 give them a chance to sort of say anything they want to  
10 say really, but just to give some indication of an  
11 understanding of some of the key themes this evening.

12 While they are scribbling their notes  
13 together -- they are already done. Pam looks ready. I  
14 just want to commend all of you for the manner of making  
15 your remarks. You all came very prepared. A lot of you  
16 had written comments. They were impassioned and at the  
17 same time courteous. And so I really commend you for  
18 what you have done here this evening. I will now turn  
19 it over to Pam.

20 MS. HUTTON: First of all, I just want to  
21 thank you very much for coming tonight and sharing your  
22 comments with us. I heard a lot of concern about our  
23 not taking your comments or your comments disappearing.  
24 A couple of things I want to say to that is that we have  
25 recorded all of your comments.

1           They weren't published with the EA. We  
2 don't typically publish them with an EA. You will find  
3 them in the documents that are released with the  
4 decision document if we are able to release the decision  
5 document if FHWA agrees to approve something in the  
6 future. So you will see those, and I hope you will take  
7 note that your comments are there, and I also hope that  
8 you will take note that we have tried our best to  
9 respond to all of those things.

10           I heard a lot of good comments tonight. I  
11 would like to say that, Mr. Novacek, you are a  
12 gentleman's gentleman, and I have enjoyed talking to you  
13 on the phone during this project. I enjoy the comments  
14 that you give us, and I have taken them to heart, and I  
15 do think about them often.

16           We do have the FHWA here tonight, and our  
17 division administrator did whisper to me -- FHWA is the  
18 Federal Highway Administration -- the documents that we  
19 prepare here and the documents that have been released  
20 to you for consideration were really prepared for them  
21 and for their consideration. It is the Federal Highway  
22 Administration that ultimately makes the decision about  
23 whether or not any improvement will be made.

24           We try to act as their agent. We try to  
25 review all the documents. We try to prepare documents.

1 That is done in accordance with those federal  
2 regulations that they provide to us.

3           At any rate, they were good enough to be  
4 here tonight. We often have the company of them during  
5 the day, but it is very, very rare -- and I was  
6 extremely pleased that our division administrator would  
7 spend this much time with us here tonight. And he would  
8 like to make a comment, so I am going to turn it over to  
9 David Nicol.

10           MR. NICOL: I would like to -- I also asked  
11 Pam to thank you all for coming out here and staying at  
12 this late hour and also for being very courteous, not  
13 only to folks sitting up here, but to each other as you  
14 stood in line and said what you wanted to say. There  
15 were some differences of opinion, and everyone was  
16 courteous and respectful of those.

17           I would like to say that this issue that's  
18 trying to be resolved here, as you all know -- you all  
19 live here. This is not just to fix what's being caused  
20 by the development. This is to fix problems which exist  
21 right now. And it's a difficult job for CDOT and for  
22 Wheat Ridge to come up with, as someone mentioned, a  
23 compromise solution to fix what was a compromise  
24 solution to start with.

25           And so our concern on the federal side is

1 not only to satisfy the needs of the community, but to  
2 make this work and to assure the safety of the  
3 interstate system which we have been charged with  
4 assuring.

5           That's a difficult situation here with  
6 Youngfield so close and the tight interchange, that we  
7 are limited to what can be done. We are working hard at  
8 it.

9           And if you have any further suggestions,  
10 please submit comments. The comment period extends  
11 until December 8. I would encourage you, if you have  
12 any particular solutions -- and I know some of you have  
13 probably submitted them already and some of you may feel  
14 that they were ignored -- but if you have anything, a  
15 solution, please submit that also.

16           Identifying the problem is just half of the  
17 battle. Identifying the solution is the other half.  
18 But thank you all for coming out here.

19           MS. HUTTON: Thank you, David, for being  
20 here. I can't tell you how much it means to us to have  
21 you here.

22           And I think he said it very well, that there  
23 isn't a solution here to this problem that is going to  
24 make everybody happy all the time. I can tell you that  
25 CDOT is not entirely happy with this solution, and Wheat

1 Ridge isn't entirely happy with this solution.  
2 Jefferson County isn't entirely happy with this  
3 solution. We certainly heard that you are not entirely  
4 happy with this solution.

5           We felt like we needed to find a compromise,  
6 and we have taken your comments. I wrote as much as I  
7 could on this piece of paper even though the court  
8 reporter is here. We will consider all that you have  
9 said tonight, and we will try to prepare a decision  
10 document that is not only acceptable to FHWA, but at  
11 least, if it's not acceptable to you, you will at least  
12 understand our thinking about why we propose what we do  
13 and that you will see that we have considered your  
14 comments.

15           I am disappointed that so many people think  
16 that their comments have been lost or ignored or have  
17 been thrown away because we have worked so hard to take  
18 the time that's needed to take to listen to all of you.  
19 So please look for all of that in the document that you  
20 will see after this is done.

21           One more thing. We came to realize today  
22 after meeting with CCBNC -- at 6:30 this morning they  
23 were up representing you at a meeting -- that the  
24 technical appendices that go along that back up --  
25 that's the data, the modeling -- that back up the

1 document that you have been reviewing were not included  
2 with the CD, and we are committed to making sure that  
3 you have those to review.

4           I think that is all that I have to say other  
5 than to thank you so much for coming tonight and giving  
6 us your comments. Please submit not only your comments  
7 about what you don't like but what might work better for  
8 you by December 8 so we can get this rolling again.

9 Thank you.

10       (WHEREUPON, the hearing concluded at 9:04 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF COLORADO)

2 ) SS. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 COUNTY OF DENVER )

4 I, Denise A. Freeman, do hereby certify  
5 that I am a Registered Professional Reporter and  
6 Notary Public within the state of Colorado.

7 I further certify that this hearing was  
8 taken in shorthand by me at the time and place herein  
9 set forth and was thereafter reduced to typewritten  
10 form, and that the foregoing constitutes a true and  
11 correct transcript.

12 In witness whereof, I have affixed my  
13 signature this 21st day of November, 2006.



14 *Denise Freeman*

15 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO

16 Denise A. Freeman  
17 Registered Professional Reporter  
18 and Notary Public  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1

88

2

3 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO  
4 2170 South Parker Road, Suite 263  
5 Denver, Colorado 80231

6

November 21, 2006

7 MR. KEVIN R. MADDOUX  
8 Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
9 6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600  
10 Centennial, Colorado 80111

11

12 Re: I-70/32nd Avenue Interchange Environmental  
13 Assessment, Public Hearing

14 Dear Mr. Maddoux:

15 Enclosed is the original transcript of the  
16 above-referenced public hearing:

17

18 \_\_\_ Previously filed. Forwarding signature page  
19 and any amendment sheets.

20 \_\_\_ Signed, no changes.

21 \_\_\_ Signed, with changes; copy attached.

22 \_\_\_ X No signature required.

23 \_\_\_ Signature waived.

24 \_\_\_ Forwarding original transcript unsigned;  
25 signature pages and/or amendments will be forwarded  
if received.

\_\_\_ Original exhibits included in ongoing notebook  
and will be filed with counsel at conclusion of  
discovery.

\_\_\_ Case settled.

\_\_\_ Reading and signing not requested pursuant to CRCP  
Rule 30(e).

26

Enclosures: (As above noted)

27

PATTERSON REPORTING &amp; VIDEO