

6.1 PURPOSE AND GOALS OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The intent of the Public Involvement Program (PIP) for this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is to provide an interactive public process with multiple opportunities and forums for people to learn about the project. The process allows the public the opportunity to communicate with their elected officials and the following lead and applicant agencies involved with this FEIS: the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Regional Transportation District (RTD). Therefore, the goal of the PIP is to give people numerous ways to receive information about the project and to provide input throughout the development of the FEIS. The objectives of the program are to:

The goal of the Public Involvement Program is to give people numerous ways to receive information about the project and to provide input throughout the development of the FEIS.

- Keep the public continuously informed about the status of the FEIS and up-to-date on issues and decisions through outreach methods.
- Afford opportunities for the public to provide input to decisions at each stage/milestone of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) process.
- Maintain established coalitions and open discussion regarding transportation decisions.
- Fulfill statutory requirements under NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1501.7 Scoping; 40 CFR 1501.6 Public Involvement; 23 CFR 450.212 Public Involvement; and 23 CFR 771.111 Early Coordination and Public Involvement). For example, 23 CFR 771.111 provides for coordination of public involvement activities with the NEPA process, including “early and continuing opportunities during project development for the public to be involved in the identification of social, economic, and environmental impacts, as well as impacts associated with relocation of individuals, groups, or institutions.” 23 CFR 450.212 states, “Public involvement processes shall be proactive and provide complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for early and continuing involvement.”

The two lead and two applicant agencies are committed to involving the public in all phases of the NEPA process and understand that extensive public involvement is essential to the success of the project. NEPA requires that the public be involved at key points in the process and that decisions are made in the best overall public interest. For this FEIS, that includes ensuring a balanced consideration of the need for a safe and efficient transportation system and analysis of social, environmental, and economic impacts that could occur from implementation of any of the proposed packages, including Package 1. The following factors also helped shape the PIP:

The two lead and two applicant agencies involved with this FEIS are committed to involving the public in all phases of the NEPA process and understand that extensive public involvement is essential to the success of the project.

- The public involvement effort for this FEIS did not start from scratch. An extensive public involvement effort was undertaken during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process from 2003 to 2007 and the *US 36 Major Investment Study* (RTD 2001) process from 1998 to 2001. Stakeholders who had been identified and actively involved during the DEIS and the Major Investment Study (MIS) served as a starting point for the FEIS public involvement process.
- The Mayors and Commissioners Coalition (MCC) worked together in a high level of cooperation and coordination across the jurisdictions within the United States Highway 36 (US 36) corridor. The MCC, formed in 2000 to further the goal of achieving transportation funding for the corridor, includes: City of Boulder, Boulder County, City and County of Broomfield, Town of Superior, City of Louisville, and City of Westminster.

- The locally preferred alternative (LPA), which emerged from the MIS, created broad awareness and support from the general public as well as the MCC. The alternatives in the MIS were brought forward from the planning phase and were incorporated and expanded upon in the DEIS alternatives analysis.
- People in the US 36 corridor tended to be informed, highly organized, politically active, and mobilized.
- The existing RTD bus system in the US 36 corridor represents one of the most successful corridors in the system, especially Route B. Building upon this success by providing more mode choices, including a bikeway, was important to the stakeholders.
- Since the separation of the highway and rail projects (August 2006), the public involvement effort has been modified to focus primarily on the highway and bus rapid transit (BRT) components. Coordination with stakeholders across both projects is important since numerous stakeholders are interested in both projects.
- A partnership of the US 36 Corridor MCC, CDOT, and RTD submitted an Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA) application in 2007 to receive federal funding for congestion mitigation by combining toll, transit, technology, and tele-work options. While the US 36 corridor was not selected, it demonstrated a high level of cooperation between the local jurisdictions and the transportation agencies.

A dynamic Public Involvement Plan was developed in consultation with CDOT and RTD public involvement staff and with the project team. The initial acceptance of the plan by CDOT and RTD was in October 2003, but the plan was updated based on feedback from CDOT and RTD regarding the public involvement approach and activities.

The PIP uses a multi-faceted system to ensure that project information reaches as many people as possible. The system includes maintaining the project mailing list, distributing printed information, placing information on the project website, holding public meetings and hearings, providing presentations or briefings at organizational and group meetings, and encouraging media coverage. Comments received from the public are compiled, organized, and summarized, and given to RTD, CDOT, FHWA, FTA, as well as the consultant team and representatives and staff from local jurisdictions for their review and consideration.

Due to the availability of local funding for commuter rail improvements, CDOT and RTD decided in April 2006 to move forward separately with rail and highway improvements in the US 36 project area. This decision required the packages to be revised so that commuter rail along the BNSF Railway and other elements of the FasTracks program are now included as part of the Package 1 (No Action) because they are considered planned and funded improvements. As a result, public involvement activities related specifically to rail improvements, such as the commuter rail maintenance and layover/storage facility workshops, are not discussed in this FEIS. Instead, these activities will be considered in the Northwest Rail Corridor Project and other studies that may use this facility as part of a proposed action.

6.2 THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The decision making process considered the ideas, perspectives, and needs expressed by the public regarding the:

- Project Purpose and Need statement.
- Goals and objectives for the project.
- Range of alternatives to be considered.
- Environmental analysis, which includes the identification of package impacts so that avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation of those impacts could be proposed and evaluated.
- Refining of alternatives based on technical information gained through the study.
- Recommendation of a Preferred Alternative.

Advisory Committees

A Corridor Governments Committee (CGC) and a Technical Support Committee (TSC) were created with the purpose of providing recommendations and input to the project team in 2004. Elected officials from the jurisdictions in the US 36 corridor comprised the CGC, while staff from the jurisdictions with technical expertise, such as engineering or planning, comprised the TSC. In keeping with the operating protocol agreed upon by the CGC and TSC, committee meetings were open to the public, and a period of time was allotted at the conclusion of each meeting for public comments. The *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009) provides a list of CGC and TSC meetings.

The CGC served as a formal mechanism through which elected public officials could develop a corridor-wide perspective within which to advocate for their local communities' transportation needs. Members of the CGC were responsible for reviewing information, including public input generated during the NEPA process; providing the political perspective of their respective jurisdictions; considering the transportation corridor as a whole; and making recommendations to the project team. Recommendations by the CGC enabled the study to move forward through the evaluation and packaging of alternatives. Following the DEIS public comment period, a Preferred Alternative Committee (PAC) was formed.

To respond to public and jurisdiction comments, the PAC, a 21-member group comprised of agency representatives, elected officials, and technical staff from local jurisdictions, was convened in January 2008. The purpose of the PAC has been to recommend a Preferred Alternative for inclusion in the FEIS. The PAC members represent the following jurisdictions and agencies:

- Adams County
- Boulder County
- Jefferson County
- City and County of Denver
- City and County of Broomfield
- City of Westminster
- City of Louisville
- City of Superior
- City of Boulder
- Federal Highway Administration

- Federal Transit Administration
- Colorado Department of Transportation
- Regional Transportation District
- United States Army Corps of Engineers
- 36 Commuting Solutions

The PAC considered public comments received and evaluated corridor elements, and in July 2008, recommended a multi-modal transportation solution known as the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) to be advanced through the NEPA process. The Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) includes both transit and highway improvements that are responsive to the public and provide long-term transportation benefits. The *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009) provides a list of CGC, TSC, and PAC meetings.

The US 36 Preferred Alternative Committee and the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative)

Comments received during the DEIS comment period identified public and agency interest in minimizing community and environmental impacts and reducing project costs, while providing increased mobility improvements throughout the US 36 corridor. (See the Release of DEIS and Public Comment Period subsection and the DEIS Public Comment Summary subsection for additional details.)

Following a review of public and agency comments, the US 36 PAC participated in a collaborative process to identify a Preferred Alternative. The PAC reviewed and addressed DEIS public comments, evaluated corridor elements, identified a Preferred Alternative, and outlined implementation phases. The PAC recommendations were analyzed in the FEIS.

In July 2008, the PAC agreed on a multi-modal transportation solution known as the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative). The Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) includes both transit and highway improvements, addresses public comments, and provides long-term transportation benefits. (See Section 2.6, Package Descriptions, for detailed package descriptions.)

Analysis and Findings

Following development of the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative), additional analysis was conducted to verify consistency with the project's Purpose and Need, design and safety standards, financial feasibility, and regulatory requirements. The PAC and Transportation Working Groups met to address issues that required further analysis, including the barrier versus buffer-separated managed lanes, BRT, and the west-end lanes. These issues are summarized below.

Barriers versus buffer-separated managed lanes: The PAC recommended the implementation of one new managed lane in both directions that would be buffer-separated to provide greater access to the managed lane and reduce right-of-way (ROW) impacts. Analysis was conducted to evaluate the safety and operational impacts of buffer-separated managed lanes. The results of the analysis validated the PAC recommendation of the operational feasibility and reduction in impact.

BRT: The PAC and a BRT Operations Working Group met, analyzed, and established the BRT elements to be included in the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative). The PAC agreed to a BRT concept which included ramp and side-loading stations supported by parking facilities and local transit services, with specific premium components to support BRT operations. Ramp and side-loading stations were identified as the preferred option because they would reduce costs and impacts, and would potentially provide increased operational flexibility as compared to median stations. Bus service enhancements and optimizations will be developed to serve side-loading stations. Additionally, a BRT Operations Working Group met and outlined the specific components of the BRT service and operations.

West-end lanes: In the west-end of the corridor, between the McCaslin Boulevard interchange and the Foothills Parkway/Table Mesa Drive interchange, concerns were expressed by the City of Boulder and Boulder County regarding traffic impacts resulting from an increase in highway capacity. To address these concerns, the PAC evaluated the extension of climbing lanes on US 36 between McCaslin Boulevard and Table Mesa Drive to bus-only lanes, as well as the use of shoulders for transit during peak travel periods.

Following evaluation of the west-end lanes, the PAC recommendation was to include a bus-only lane to cover the “gap” between the end of the climbing lanes and the beginning of the downstream interchange off-ramps. This bus-only lane would be constructed when and if certain bus-related “triggers” are met and a re-evaluation process conducted. The need for implementing a bus-only continuous auxiliary lane would be based on bus-related measures of effectiveness, with the goal of improving the number of person trips on US 36 and parallel arterials.

6.3 ISSUES TRACKING AND REPORTING

The PIP gives stakeholders many opportunities to provide informed input to the decision makers. The principal goal of public involvement is to ensure that the decision makers take into account the needs of the various publics. Thus, a major effort of the PIP is to track or record, synthesize, and present public comments to the decision makers. In addition, information materials (documents/handouts) were produced that showed the link between public input and the decision-making process and provided answers to frequently asked questions; those documents are available on the project website (www.us36eis.com or www.us36eis.org) and were available at outreach events.

The public involvement program gives stakeholders many opportunities to provide informed input to the decision makers.

The public continues to be encouraged to submit comments on the project. A written comment form was created that solicited basic contact information and prompted issue-specific comments relating to the FEIS. Commenters can return their completed comment forms in person, by mail, or e-mail. Oral comments are also documented by the public involvement team at public and community outreach events and during phone conversations. Another important source for providing comments is the project website where there is an option to “Send a Comment” electronically. Public information materials for the project include contact information: mail, e-mail, website addresses, and phone numbers.

After key milestones, the public involvement team organized comments thematically and summarized them for communication and review at project and committee meetings, public meetings, and for the project website. After public meetings, comments received are immediately recorded and organized in a user-friendly report for presentation to the decision makers. On a regular basis, the public involvement team updates the report with new comments obtained via mail, e-mail, website, and phone.

6.4 PUBLIC MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

A primary focus of the PIP is to provide opportunities for the public to influence decisions at each major milestone of the NEPA process. Meeting locations were recognized venues throughout the corridor and usually accessible by transit. The meeting format was based on the information to be presented. Spanish translation was available at all meetings and hearings. A variety of printed handouts and comment forms was available as well. Elected and other officials from local jurisdictions; representatives from environmental, civic, and neighborhood associations; and individual members of the public were in attendance. Project managers and project team resource specialists, in addition to officials from the lead agencies, were available for interaction with attendees.

Public meetings and hearings were held at the following stages:

- Scoping (November 2003).
- General and Conceptual Alternatives Definition and Evaluation (February 2004 Public Workshops).
- Development and Detailed Evaluation of Transportation Packages (May 2004 Public Workshops).
- Development of the DEIS (October 2004 Public Workshops).
- Preferred Alternative Identification Process (July 2006 Public Workshops).
- DEIS Public Hearings (August and September 2008 Public Hearings).
- Present the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) (April 2009 Public Meetings).

Scoping Process

Scoping, an early stage of the NEPA process, was conducted to determine the issues to be addressed in the DEIS. The scoping process provided an opportunity for both governmental agencies and the public to become involved by reading printed material, attending meetings and workshops, and providing input.

Key-Person Interviews

Key-person interviews were conducted with recognized leaders or small groups within the US 36 corridor. The purpose of conducting the interviews was to identify issues relevant to the DEIS, gather ideas on how to effectively implement the public involvement process, encourage participation, and build relationships with members of the community. The public involvement team compiled an initial list of elected officials and their staffs, representatives of relevant organizations or interest groups, and opinion and business leaders in the US 36 corridor as the basis for these interviews. Information from all the interviews was combined to produce an initial assessment report of public perceptions about the project. The *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009) provides information about the key-person interviews.

Key-person interviews were conducted with recognized leaders or small groups within the US 36 corridor.

Scoping Meetings

Two public scoping meetings were held from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. on:

- November 11, 2003, at the Boulder Public Library (98 registered attendees).
- November 12, 2003, at the Front Range Community College in Westminster (92 registered attendees).

The public scoping meetings provided participants many ways to share ideas, ask questions, raise concerns, and offer suggestions. During the open house portion of each meeting (4:30 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.), attendees could register and sign up for the project mailing/e-mail list, view project information on several display boards, and speak with members of the project team. A formal presentation and facilitated discussion were conducted from about 5:15 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Meeting attendees were asked to submit comments in writing using the printed comment forms. Public input was also recorded during the discussion portion of the facilitated meetings and by members of the project team during the open house portion of the meetings. The project team received and recorded 250 comments from these sources.

An agency scoping meeting was held on October 30, 2003, from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., at the US 36 Transportation Mobility Organization (now known as 36 Commuting Solutions) offices and was followed by a bus tour of the project area. Following a welcome, introductions, and a presentation of the project, discussion was held among the attendees. The purpose of the meeting was to share information about the project, coordinate methodology related to the analysis, and collect comments, questions, and feedback to help define the scope of the study. As a result of the agency scoping meeting, the allocation of assignments among the lead agencies and cooperating agency regarding preparation of the EIS and the identification of key/critical environmental issues was conducted.

Summary of Issues

During the scoping period (August 7, 2003 to December 5, 2003), input (from key-person interviews, scoping meetings, and other sources) was compiled, organized into categories, and summarized. The following concerns emerged:

- Provide multi-modal options.
- Build on data and agreements generated in the MIS and embodied in the LPA.
- Remain within existing ROW or within existing land use plans.
- Connect east/west and north/south routes, activity areas, and other sites.
- Minimize and mitigate community and environmental impacts.
- Incorporate local planning (especially transit station planning) and redevelopment.
- Address current and forecasted demand.
- Phase multi-modal construction.
- Provide reliable financial information and consider tolling as a source of funding.

Scoping Report

At the end of the scoping process, the project team produced a scoping report that contained all forms of public input received during the scoping process and outlined the various outreach efforts used to inform, educate, and encourage public participation in the process. The *Scoping Report* (URS 2003) is available on the project website or can be reviewed at one of the repositories noted in Section 6.5, Continuous Outreach and Communication.

General and Conceptual Alternatives Definition and Evaluation (February 2004 Public Workshops)

Public workshops held at this milestone were designed to (1) demonstrate how public input generated during the scoping process had influenced the alternatives evaluation process thus far; (2) obtain input on the decisions made, the overall direction of the study, and the direction of the project as it moved forward; and (3) provide attendees with information on how to become involved and stay involved during the NEPA process.



Three rounds of public workshops were organized and held from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The workshops provided an open-house period at the beginning and end with a formal welcome, PowerPoint presentation, and facilitated discussion from 5:15 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. These workshops were conducted on:

- February 24, 2004, at the Boulder Public Library (112 registered attendees).
- February 25, 2004, at the DoubleTree Hotel in Westminster (54 registered attendees).
- February 26, 2004, at Monarch High School in Louisville (58 registered attendees).

Informative display boards lined each reception area and were used to visually share information and solicit input from the public. Members of the project team were available throughout the workshops to discuss specific concerns and act as a resource in the information-sharing process.

Summary of Issues

Attendees had several ways to provide input and have their questions or concerns addressed. More than 80 comments were recorded from individuals who participated during the facilitated discussion portion of the workshops. More than 170 comments were received in writing or were recorded by project team members during their conversations with members of the public.



Substantial public support for the direction of the project was expressed as well as concerns related to potential adverse impacts. Comments made in all jurisdictions indicated support for a wide variety of transportation alternatives and packages. The following summarizes the public input:

- US 36 impacts:
 - Property owners near the highway expressed concern about existing and potential increases in highway dust, noise, and safety hazards; resultant property value decline; and the availability of information regarding ROW issues.
 - Residents of Apache Road and Navajo Court in Boulder petitioned for mitigation of noise levels.
- Indirect impacts:
 - Potential indirect impacts identified were land use patterns, wildlife habitat, growth/sprawl, noise and light pollution during construction, and air pollution.
 - Support was expressed for mixed-use development including transit-oriented development at or near transit stations. The Sierra Club recommended a smart-growth land use alternative. They suggested that growth be managed by addressing transportation needs during, not after, the property development process.

- Regional transportation coordination and connectivity:
 - Individuals expressed an interest in coordination between the US 36 corridor project with other regional transportation improvements, especially the Northwest Rail Corridor Project.
 - Individuals suggested examining access to and from proposed transit stations to outlying activity centers (especially downtown Denver, employment centers, and Denver International Airport), adequate parking at transit stations, bus routes to areas inaccessible by other transit options (especially employment centers), the flexibility and frequency of bus/BRT stops, and availability of bike carriers on transit alternatives.
- Multi-modal/transportation alternatives:
 - Using health, environment, and cost-based justifications, many individuals expressed support for a safe, multi-use bikeway. Possible routes for the bikeway were suggested.

Development and Detailed Evaluation of Packages (May 2004 Public Workshops)



Public workshops held at this milestone were designed to (1) introduce and gather input on the five packages, (2) provide preliminary information on impacts associated with each package, and (3) describe the US 36 corridor DEIS decision-making process.

Three public workshops were held from 4:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.:

- May 11, 2004, at the Front Range Community College in Westminster (55 registered attendees).
- May 19, 2004, at the Omni Hotel in Broomfield (52 registered attendees).
- May 20, 2004, at the East Boulder Senior Center (66 registered attendees).



The May workshops used an open-house format to enable in-depth discussion between the project team and members of the public. The open house had separate breakout tables for the Denver/Adams segments,

Westminster/Broomfield segments, and Superior/Louisville and Boulder segments. Additional breakout tables presented information on ROW, environmental issues, the transportation packages, and alternate modes.

Summary of Issues

During the three May workshops, attendees were encouraged to submit written comments. Project team members also recorded comments during discussions with the public. Eighty-two comments were received and recorded. The following summarizes the public input:

- Denver/Adams segments:
 - Concern about property acquisition, property values, and impacts to lifestyle.
- Westminster/Broomfield segments:
 - Concern about noise and potential impacts on property values.
- Superior/Louisville and Boulder segments:
 - Broad support for transit alternatives and for the proposed Boulder Transit Village.

- Environmental issues:
 - Support for avoiding and minimizing impacts to wildlife habitat and populations, especially for prairie dogs.
 - Support for protecting specific historic properties.
 - Concern about the process and criteria for measuring noise.
 - Support for the direction of the project, yet concerns about potential adverse impacts on property and natural resources.
- Transportation packages:
 - Support for the balance between highway and transit alternatives as represented in the transportation alternatives.
 - Interest in reviewing estimates of potential transit ridership and estimated travel time performance under each package.
- Alternate modes:
 - Substantial support for a bikeway along with specific engineering and design suggestions.

Development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (October 2004 Public Workshops)

Public workshops held at this milestone were designed to (1) present an overview of the packages and a comparison of packages in terms of travel and mobility benefits, environmental impacts, and construction costs; (2) provide an opportunity to learn about the progress of the DEIS and to discuss resource area-specific issues with members of the project team; and (3) gather input regarding package preferences, ideas for improvement or modification, and any other concerns.



Three public workshops were held from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.:

- October 20, 2004, at the Miramonte Lodge in Broomfield (20 registered attendees).
- October 26, 2004, at the Millennium Hotel in Boulder (69 registered attendees).
- October 27, 2004, at the Perl Mack Community Center in North Denver (36 registered attendees).



The October workshops format combined a large group presentation and facilitated discussion with small group/individual discussions for resource area-specific concerns. Informative display boards and maps were used to share current information about environmental impacts, travel times, and transit use. This visual display was organized as follows: Cumulative Effects and Land Use, Noise and Vibration, Historical and Cultural Resources, Parklands, Wetlands, Biological Resources, and Right-of-Way and Relocations.

Summary of Issues

During the October workshops, participants were asked to respond to the following three issues:

1. Given the preliminary DEIS results (benefits, impacts, and costs), what package or packages best meet your needs? Why?
2. How would you improve these packages? What modifications would you make?

3. What issues or concerns do you have as the project moves forward?

Strong support was expressed for Package 4 because of the multi-modal choice.

As a result, the project team received approximately 95 comments, both written and verbal, about the project. Strong support was expressed for Package 4 because of the multi-modal choice. No major comments were received on Package 5. The comments are summarized in the following themes:

- Those who preferred **Package 1** did so because of concerns regarding cost and funding. Some property owners facing acquisition or noise impacts also prefer this package.
- Those who preferred **Package 2** did so because of perceived cost-effectiveness and the potential revenue generation offered by tolling.
- Those who preferred **Package 3** did so because of its ability to provide exclusive lanes for BRT.
- Those who preferred **Package 4** did so because it offers opportunities for attracting increased transit ridership, thus relieving pressure on the highway.
- Positive comments were noted regarding the inclusion of transportation management actions, including a bikeway, in all packages.

Preferred Alternative Identification Process (July 2006 Public Workshops)

Public workshops were held to (1) discuss the separation of the rail and highway projects, (2) to solicit input regarding the evaluation of the packages, and (3) and solicit input regarding the identification of a Preferred Alternative.

Three public workshops were held from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.:

- July 11, 2006, at the Westminster Parks and Recreation Center (164 registered attendees).
- July 12, 2006, at Ranum High School in Denver (117 registered attendees).
- July 13, 2006, at the Spice of Life Event Center in Boulder (76 registered attendees).

The July workshops provided an open-house period at the beginning and end with a formal welcome, PowerPoint presentation, and facilitated discussion from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Informative display boards and maps were used to share current information about the project. Members of the project team were available throughout the workshops to discuss specific concerns and act as a resource in the information-sharing process.

Summary of Issues

The following questions were posed to the public:

1. What are your needs and concerns related to the separation of the rail and highway studies?
2. What issues and suggestions do you have regarding the identification of a preferred highway alternative?

The project team received over 200 comments, both written and verbal, about the project. Strong concern was expressed by stakeholders living in Adams County (Federal Boulevard to Broadway) regarding the proposed highway improvements. The public expressed support for separating the highway and rail studies, especially if the change reduced the time and cost of implementing transportation solutions. The comments are summarized in the following themes:

- Numerous participants expressed support for Package 4 because it includes a separate high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane where BRT can operate.

- When comparing Packages 2 and 4, some participants favored Package 4 over Package 2 because Package 4 provides a new general-purpose lane and access advantages.
- Some members of the public questioned the need for tolling on US 36 when other corridors in the region have been improved without using it.
- Others expressed concerns about Package 2, including the limited number of access points and the impacts on neighborhoods close to the access points, especially in Westminster and Broomfield.
- Participants from the City of Westminster and Adams County expressed considerable concern about the potential acquisition of their property that would result from widening US 36. Given this potential impact, some attendees suggested identifying Package 1 as the Preferred Alternative. Many residents also urged the project team to expedite the decision-making process to provide clarity regarding the status of their homes.

Release of DEIS and Public Comment Period

A Notice of Availability for the US 36 DEIS was published in the *Federal Register* on August 3, 2007. The Notice of Availability included the date and location of the public hearings. The DEIS information was also disseminated in English and Spanish through mail and electronic messages to the project distribution list (9,200 separate contacts), flyers, radio announcements, and newspaper advertisements, as well as postings on the US 36 website. The DEIS was made available to the public on the project website and at the following locations:

DENVER

City of Denver Public Works
Wellington Webb Building,
201 West Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80202

Denver Public Library – Central Library
10 West 14th Avenue Parkway
Denver, CO 80204

ADAMS COUNTY

Adams County Administration Building
450 South 4th Avenue
Brighton, CO 80601

Adams County Library
Perl Mack Branch
7611 Hilltop Circle
Denver, CO 80221

Adams County Transportation Office
12200 Pecos Street, 3rd floor
Westminster, CO 80234

WESTMINSTER

City of Westminster – City Hall
4800 West 92nd Avenue
Westminster, CO 80031

Westminster Public Library
College Hill Branch
3705 West 112th Avenue
Westminster, CO 80031

Westminster Public Library
Irving Street Branch
7392 Irving Street
Westminster, CO 80030

BROOMFIELD

36 Commuting Solutions
350 Interlocken Boulevard, Suite 250
Broomfield, CO 80021

City and County of Broomfield
One DesCombes Drive
Broomfield, CO 80020

Mamie Doud Eisenhower Public Library
3 Community Park Road
Broomfield, CO 80020

SUPERIOR

Town of Superior – Town Hall
124 East Coal Creek Drive
Superior, CO 80027

LONGMONT

Longmont Public Library
409 4th Avenue
Longmont, CO 80501

LOUISVILLE

City of Louisville – City Hall
749 Main Street
Louisville, CO 80027

Louisville Public Library
951 Spruce Street
Louisville, CO 80027

BOULDER COUNTY

Boulder County Clerk and Recorder’s Office –
Boulder
1750 33rd Street
Boulder, CO 80301

Boulder County Clerk and Recorder’s Office –
Louisville
722 Main Street Louisville, CO 80027
Boulder County Transportation Office
2045 13th Street
Boulder, CO 80302

BOULDER

City Hall
1777 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80302

Boulder Public Library
Carnegie Branch
1125 Pine Street
Boulder, CO 80302

Boulder Public Library
George Reynolds Branch
3595 Table Mesa Drive
Boulder, CO 80305

Boulder Public Library – Main
1000 Canyon Boulevard
Boulder, CO 80302

Boulder Public Library
Meadows Branch
4800 Baseline Road
Boulder, CO 80303

The 45-day comment period for the DEIS began August 3, 2007, and concluded September 17, 2007.

During the comment period, three public hearings were held from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on:

- Wednesday, August 29, 2007: The DoubleTree Hotel in Westminster (107 registered attendees).
- Thursday, August 30, 2007: The Broomfield Auditorium (37 registered attendees).
- Thursday, September 6, 2007: East Boulder Community Center (86 registered attendees).

The DEIS public hearings provided participants numerous ways to learn about the project, ask questions, raise concerns, and offer formal comment. Spanish language translation was provided at each public hearing. A transcript of each hearing was produced by a professional stenographer.

DEIS Public Comment Summary

Public comment was solicited and received from a variety of sources including input from the US 36 EIS website, e-mail, written letters, and comments received during public hearings. A total of 214 comments were received. The following is a summary of all comments received during the comment period.



- **Alternative Packages:** Comments received expressed both support and concern for each of the build packages of alternatives, and provided comment on Package 1 (No Action). Numerous members of the public selected elements from each of the build alternatives and proposed a “hybrid” package. Such an alternative was offered by those who felt that transportation improvements are needed above Package 1, but that the current build packages are too large or expensive. In general, the proposed hybrid package was also one with a smaller environmental footprint (or impact) and lower costs than either of the two build packages.
 - **Package 1: No Action** – Support for Package 1 was expressed based on the perception that both build alternatives have unacceptable levels of impact and cost. Most comments expressed a strong desire for transportation improvements beyond Package 1.
 - **Package 2: Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit** – Support for Package 2 was based on its ability to manage the lanes for future congestion. Concerns were expressed with Package 2 due to access limitations and impacts (local streets from drop-ramps) as well as the sentiment that toll lanes do not provide equal access to all.
 - **Package 4: General-Purpose Lanes, High-Occupancy Vehicle, and Bus Rapid Transit** – Support for Package 4 was expressed based on increased access, speed, and the level of service it would provide. Concern was expressed regarding the addition of general-purpose lanes.
- **Property Impacts and Acquisition:** Comments were received regarding property impacts and ROW acquisition, primarily from residents and businesses in Adams County. Comments focused on whether, when, and how properties would be acquired as part of the proposed US 36 widening.
- **Noise:** Numerous noise impact comments were submitted, the majority of which originated from City of Boulder residents who urged additional noise mitigation on US 36 from Table Mesa Drive to Baseline Drive.
- **Environmental Impacts:** Comments were submitted regarding environmental aspects of the project including parks, wetlands, open space, land use, visual impacts, air quality and pollution, environmental justice, and drainage issues. Most comments encouraged the elimination or reduction of such impacts.
- **Design and Operations:** Comments received referred to the design and operations of the build packages, particularly the interchanges and access points.
- **Funding:** Numerous comments highlighted the lack of funding to implement either of the build packages. Comments suggested identifying and implementing phases of improvements to address the funding shortfall.
- **Bikeway:** Numerous comments expressed support for the Denver to Boulder bikeway with suggestions on the alignment. A smaller number of comments did not support the bikeway since it would not reduce congestion on US 36.



- **Public Involvement:** Comments received regarding the public involvement process were primarily from Adams County residents concerned about potential property impacts. The comments urged the project to communicate decisions at the earliest possible time and to provide specifics regarding when the acquisition process would begin.

The full agency and public comments received and responses to comments, including the transcripts of oral comments received at the public hearings, are included in the *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009).

Preferred Alternative Development and Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) Results Public Meetings – April 2009

The focus of the public meetings was to define the Preferred Alternative development process, outline the elements and components of the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative), describe differences between the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) and Package 2 and Package 4, and to solicit public input.



Three public meetings were held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.:

- **Wednesday, April 1, 2009**, at the Westminster Parks and Recreation Center (43 registered attendees)
- **Wednesday, April 8, 2009**, at the Boulder Public Library (93 registered attendees)
- **Thursday, April 9, 2009**, at The Global Leadership Academy in Adams County (493 registered attendees)



The meeting format included an open-house period at the beginning and end with a formal welcome, presentation, and facilitated discussion. The meetings attracted more than 600 registered attendees total and collected approximately 170 public comments. Informative display boards lined each reception area and were used to visually share information and solicit input from the public. Members of the project team were available throughout the workshops to discuss specific concerns and share information. Attendees had several ways to provide input and have their questions or concerns addressed, including one-on-one conversations during the open house, public comment during facilitated discussion, and submission of comments through the website or written forms.

Summary of Issues

While overall public support for the process and for elements in the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) was expressed, concerns about specific elements of the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative) were captured during the facilitated discussion and from the written comments. The following is a summary of public input received:

- **Broadway Access**
 - Hundreds of residents and representatives from businesses, community groups, and local agencies attended the public meetings and expressed opposition to the proposed closure of access to Broadway from US 36 and southbound Interstate (I-25). The Save Your Neighborhood Access (SYNA) Committee presented a range of concerns regarding the proposed closure, including potential negative impacts to public safety, local businesses and the community.
 - Petitions with more than 960 signatures were submitted to the project team requesting that local access to Broadway from both I-25 and US 36 be included in the FEIS, or to remove the interchange from this analysis.
- **Property Acquisition**
 - Owners of properties identified to be acquired as part of the project expressed frustration regarding the overall timeliness of the process and requested clarity around the exact timetable for acquisition. Others expressed gratitude for information provided by the project team.
- **Bus Rapid Transit Stations**
 - There was overall support for the BRT component presented in the Combined Alternative Package (Preferred Alternative). Perceived operational and safety hazards associated with the proposed side-loading BRT stations were expressed due to buses weaving back and forth from the managed lane across the general-purpose lanes and to the side-loading BRT stations. Due to these concerns, support was expressed for median BRT stations.
 - Many suggested the need for buses that use alternative fuels to reduce emissions and environmental impacts to air quality.
- **Noise Mitigation**
 - Boulder residents living between Foothills Parkway/Table Mesa Drive and Baseline Road shared strong interest in extending the noise mitigation treatments all the way to Baseline Road. Some people also requested immediate reduction of the speed limit to reduce current noise levels. Additionally, residents requested an opportunity to improve the aesthetic quality of noise mitigation treatment for areas identified to receive it.
- **US 36 Bikeway**
 - Overall support was expressed for the proposed bikeway alignment. Support was also communicated for building a connected bikeway system during the first phase of construction with grade-separated crossings at major intersections and interchanges.
 - Skepticism was expressed for the bikeway as a transportation alternative in light of the Purpose and Need of the project. Members of the public shared support for implementation of the managed lane as a priority, rather than construction of the bikeway.



- **Funding**
 - Numerous members of the public were interested in the availability of funding for US 36 improvements, including how much money was immediately available, whether federal stimulus money will be used, and the role of RTD FasTracks funding.
- **Regional Transportation Coordination and Connectivity**
 - Individuals expressed an interest in understanding how the US 36 project related to other regional transportation improvements, especially the Northwest Rail Corridor Project.

6.5 CONTINUOUS OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION

The public involvement team implemented a strategy of ongoing outreach and communication because only a fraction of the public would likely attend the public meetings and hearings. General outreach activities of the PIP were designed to inform a broad range of the public and provide continuous access to project information through multiple sources. Outreach activities that were implemented recognized the demands of everyday life on the varied members of the public, and efforts were made to “go to the public” and provide easy, user-friendly access to information. The methods of providing access to project information and gathering public input are described below.

Project Mailing/E-mail List

A primary means of keeping the public informed is through mailings to individuals on the project mailing list. The Scoping Booklet, Project Updates, and Project Newsletters, which included notices of public workshops, were sent to individuals on the mailing list. The *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009) contains information about the dates and major communication efforts.

A primary means of keeping the public informed is through mailings to individuals on the project mailing list.

The project mailing list began with approximately 4,800 records provided by RTD from the MIS. Initially, Scoping Booklets were mailed to all complete addresses from the MIS list. As of April 2009, the mailing/e-mail list consists of more than 9,400 records that include mailing (7,012) and e-mail (2,432) address information. Continuous communication has been achieved through dissemination of information to individuals on the list.

The project mailing/e-mail list is continually updated with contacts at federal and state agencies; local jurisdictions’ elected and appointed officials and relevant staff; regional transportation planning entities; citizen advisory groups; community/neighborhood groups; representatives of environmental, civic, and professional organizations; property owners adjacent to the US 36 corridor; people who live and work in the corridor who have expressed interest by attending a public meeting or outreach event; and individuals who contacted the public involvement team with requests to receive project information. In addition, leaders of local interest groups and civic organizations were encouraged to share project communications with their members.

Public Information Materials

As shown in Table 6.5-1, Public Information Materials, a Scoping Booklet (US 36 Mobility Partnership 2003) and Project Updates (February, April, October, and December 2004, February 2005, February, May, and June 2006, February and August 2007, January 2008, and February 2009) were created and distributed to members of the project mailing list, at festivals, and at public/community meetings and hearings. The materials were also placed at known public sites throughout the US 36 project area such as municipal halls, libraries, recreation centers, senior centers, and coffee shops. The informational materials used graphics, an attractive layout, and professional publication format and were translated into Spanish. The materials served as a primary source for up-to-date project information, as well as a notice of upcoming public involvement events, such as public meetings and hearings, and an invitation for milestone-specific and general comments.

Table 6.5-1: Public Information Materials

Printed Material	Summary and Contents			
Scoping Booklet October 2003	<p>Outlined the EIS study, the process (including public involvement) and schedule, and described the preliminary list of alternatives to be evaluated.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 331 1438 510"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 331 997 510"> Scoping announcement Scoping meeting information Project location Project team Project history/EIS process and schedule Preliminary list of alternatives </td> <td data-bbox="1000 331 1438 510"> Public involvement Public involvement goals Project goals Regional challenges What's the purpose of the scoping meetings? </td> </tr> </table>		Scoping announcement Scoping meeting information Project location Project team Project history/EIS process and schedule Preliminary list of alternatives	Public involvement Public involvement goals Project goals Regional challenges What's the purpose of the scoping meetings?
Scoping announcement Scoping meeting information Project location Project team Project history/EIS process and schedule Preliminary list of alternatives	Public involvement Public involvement goals Project goals Regional challenges What's the purpose of the scoping meetings?			
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Update February 2004	<p>Provided basic background information about the EIS study, an alternatives evaluation process update from general to conceptual, and prepared readers for the upcoming public workshops.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 567 1438 714"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 567 997 714"> What is the US 36 corridor EIS? Why are we doing this? What have we heard so far and how has that influenced decisions? Where are we in the process? </td> <td data-bbox="1000 567 1438 714"> What criteria are we using? Contact us Where are we now and what do we need from you? Workshop information </td> </tr> </table>		What is the US 36 corridor EIS? Why are we doing this? What have we heard so far and how has that influenced decisions? Where are we in the process?	What criteria are we using? Contact us Where are we now and what do we need from you? Workshop information
What is the US 36 corridor EIS? Why are we doing this? What have we heard so far and how has that influenced decisions? Where are we in the process?	What criteria are we using? Contact us Where are we now and what do we need from you? Workshop information			
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Update April 2004	<p>Repeated background information and provided process information about the development and evaluation of packages. Presented the package recommendations and invited readers to upcoming public workshops.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 770 1438 972"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 770 997 972"> What is the US 36 corridor EIS? Packages How were packages developed? US 36 corridor EIS package recommendations Transit station planning process How did we get to this point in the EIS? </td> <td data-bbox="1000 770 1438 972"> The evaluation process Detailed alternatives analysis What is the purpose of the May public workshops? How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities Workshop information </td> </tr> </table>		What is the US 36 corridor EIS? Packages How were packages developed? US 36 corridor EIS package recommendations Transit station planning process How did we get to this point in the EIS?	The evaluation process Detailed alternatives analysis What is the purpose of the May public workshops? How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities Workshop information
What is the US 36 corridor EIS? Packages How were packages developed? US 36 corridor EIS package recommendations Transit station planning process How did we get to this point in the EIS?	The evaluation process Detailed alternatives analysis What is the purpose of the May public workshops? How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities Workshop information			
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Update October 2004	<p>Provided a descriptive look at the evaluation process for the US 36 packages. Invited readers to attend the October public workshops and general information about candidate transit stations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 1029 1438 1207"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 1029 997 1207"> Evaluation of US 36 packages Alternatives evaluation process Package descriptions Summary of packages travel times transit use </td> <td data-bbox="1000 1029 1438 1207"> Impacts Costs How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities Workshop information </td> </tr> </table>		Evaluation of US 36 packages Alternatives evaluation process Package descriptions Summary of packages travel times transit use	Impacts Costs How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities Workshop information
Evaluation of US 36 packages Alternatives evaluation process Package descriptions Summary of packages travel times transit use	Impacts Costs How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities Workshop information			
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Update December 2004	<p>Served as a follow-up communication to the October public workshops. Provided a description of the workshops, a summary of public input, and a graphic describing key milestones and opportunities for public input from Winter 2004 to Spring 2006.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 1287 1438 1381"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 1287 997 1381"> Public workshops Thank you What we heard </td> <td data-bbox="1000 1287 1438 1381"> What's next? Project schedule </td> </tr> </table>		Public workshops Thank you What we heard	What's next? Project schedule
Public workshops Thank you What we heard	What's next? Project schedule			
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Update February 2005	<p>Repeated background information and provided substantive information regarding the five packages. Presented the package analysis including package description, travel times, transit use, impacts, and cost. Summarized public meetings.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 1459 1438 1612"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 1459 997 1612"> What is the US 36 corridor EIS? What is next? Package descriptions Candidate transit station locations Public workshops </td> <td data-bbox="1000 1459 1438 1612"> What we heard Package evaluation results project schedule How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities </td> </tr> </table>		What is the US 36 corridor EIS? What is next? Package descriptions Candidate transit station locations Public workshops	What we heard Package evaluation results project schedule How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities
What is the US 36 corridor EIS? What is next? Package descriptions Candidate transit station locations Public workshops	What we heard Package evaluation results project schedule How can you get involved? Ongoing public input opportunities			
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter February 2006	<p>Provided an explanation of the project, package descriptions, and described the process around the release of the DEIS and the comment period.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="423 1669 1438 1845"> <tr> <td data-bbox="423 1669 997 1845"> About the US 36 Corridor EIS What's next? US 36 EIS current project schedule Distribution of the DEIS US 36 DEIS public hearings Package descriptions </td> <td data-bbox="1000 1669 1438 1845"> Candidate transit stations How can you get involved? </td> </tr> </table>		About the US 36 Corridor EIS What's next? US 36 EIS current project schedule Distribution of the DEIS US 36 DEIS public hearings Package descriptions	Candidate transit stations How can you get involved?
About the US 36 Corridor EIS What's next? US 36 EIS current project schedule Distribution of the DEIS US 36 DEIS public hearings Package descriptions	Candidate transit stations How can you get involved?			

Table 6.5-1: Public Information Materials

Printed Material	Summary and Contents	
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter May 2006	Provided an explanation of the rail and highway project separation, identified the remaining two packages, introduced the Northwest Rail Corridor Project, the US 36 EIS, and detailed the dates/times for upcoming public workshops.	
	US 36 highway and rail studies move forward independently Public meeting to be held in July Northwest Rail Environmental Study Northwest Rail Environmental Study schedule US 36 corridor EIS US 36 package evaluation results	US 36 corridor EIS schedule How can you get involved? Workshop information
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter June 2006	Provided further explanation of the rail and highway project separation, and announced the public meetings to be held in July.	
	US 36 highway and rail studies move forward independently Public meetings to be held in July Northwest Rail environmental study Northwest Rail environmental study schedule Commuter rail technology decision	US 36 highway EIS US 36 EIS schedule How can you get involved? Upcoming public meetings Public meeting topics
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter February 2007	Provided an explanation on how the US 36 EIS was moving forward with focus on the remaining transportation packages (Packages 1, 2, and 4). Communicated the upcoming process for evaluating these packages and what the public should expect.	
	US 36 highway EIS focuses on two remaining transportation packages US 36 highway EIS – where are we now? What is next? - public release of the DEIS, DEIS public hearings, Preferred Alternative DEIS Alternative Packages – what is included in the packages?	What packages will be evaluated in the DEIS? Summary of public input – what have we heard about the highway packages so far? How can you get involved? US 36 EIS revised schedule
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter August 2007	Provided information to the public that the US 36 DEIS was being released. Described the alternative packages that were being evaluated in the DEIS. Provided information about the public hearings. Provided information about how the public could review the US 36 DEIS and how to submit comments.	
	Release of US 36 DEIS – public hearings to be held US 36 DEIS Where are we now? – release of the DEIS Where can you review the DEIS? – DEIS public hearings What is a Preferred Alternative? What is an Urban Partnership Agreement and how does it relate to the US 36 EIS? DEIS Alternative Packages – what is included in the packages? What packages will be evaluated in the DEIS?	US 36 DEIS public hearings Where to review the DEIS How to comment Comment guidelines US 36 EIS schedule
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter January 2008	Provided the public with the information learned through the US 36 DEIS public hearings and comment period. Summarized public comments and communicated what the next steps would be for identifying a Preferred Alternative.	
	Public hearings held and Preferred Alternative to be identified US 36 DEIS released Identifying a Preferred Alternative for the US 36 Corridor FEIS What was heard during the public comment period	Public comments received during the US 36 comment period covered the following issues US 36 EIS schedule
US 36 Corridor EIS Project Newsletter February 2009	Informed the public that a Combined Alternative Package had been identified and is being proposed to be included as the Preferred Alternative in the US 36 Corridor FEIS. Informed the public of upcoming public meetings to present the Combined Alternative Package and discuss impacts and mitigations.	
	US 36 Environmental Impact Statement: Combined Alternative Identified and FEIS to be released About the US 36 Corridor FEIS Public comments received on US 36 DEIS Process to identify a Preferred Alternative	Combined Alternative Package US 36 EIS schedule Next steps – public meetings, US 36 Corridor FEIS, Record of Decision, project construction/ implementation of improvements

Source: US 36 Mobility Partnership, 2009.

Notes:

DEIS = Draft Environmental Impact Statement FEIS = Final Environmental Impact Statement
EIS = Environmental Impact Statement US 36 = United States Highway 36

Post Public Workshop and Hearing Communications

Following most public workshops or hearings, letters that summarized the meetings/hearings were mailed or e-mailed to members of the project mailing/e-mail list to update them about the DEIS. This approach allows for continuous communication about the progress of the project, provides an opportunity for sharing summaries of public input, and invites further comment and involvement.

Project Website

The project website (www.us36eis.com or www.us36eis.org) is an integral part of the public outreach program. It serves as an educational and information-sharing tool, as well as an electronic method for members of the public to send comments, request a speaker, access calendar events and project documents, and view maps and information boards. Key documents and project information are also displayed in Spanish. The website is also important in its ability to provide cost-effective public access to project information and an opportunity for people to comment at their convenience.

Media

Press releases to local newspapers and radio/television stations and paid newspaper advertisements are another important method of sharing project information and announcing upcoming public meetings and hearings. Local media outlets were identified, added to the project mailing list, and sent ongoing project information. Personal contact occurs regularly with transportation reporters of major newspapers. At key milestones, press releases are e-mailed or faxed to dozens of media outlets, although not all provide coverage of the project. The *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009) provides a summary of media coverage.

Local Jurisdiction Websites and Television Stations

The Public Information Officer or similar staff in the cities of Arvada, Boulder, Erie, Louisville, Westminster, Lafayette, Thornton, Northglenn, Federal Heights, the Town of Superior, and the cities and counties of Broomfield and Denver are encouraged to use their respective websites or television stations to share information about the EIS. Most of these jurisdictions advertise the public meetings, hearings, or workshops in some manner.

Interaction at Public Gathering Places



In an ongoing effort to reach the public, the public involvement team attended local festivals and public events where they talked with a variety of stakeholders. These events provided another opportunity to disseminate information, solicit comments, and encourage participation. The goal was to heighten awareness and hear the views of those who had not yet had a chance to participate or had previously chosen not to. This interaction provided an opportunity to test the opinions of groups that were organized around transportation issues in the US 36 corridor by comparing their opinions with the casual or random opinions of the public at large.

Project Telephone Numbers

The project telephone number (303-442-7367) appeared on all communications and provided an easy-to-access means of communication without requiring computer capability, subscription to a newspaper, or attendance at a meeting or workshop. This allowed for an open line of communication between the public, the public involvement team, and ultimately, the decision makers.

A hotline was also made available; however, this method of outreach was the least used and was therefore discontinued after the DEIS public comment period. The hotline was a toll-free telephone number with both English and Spanish recordings of updated project information and suggestions on how to become involved. Spanish-speaking callers were invited to leave a message for the project's Spanish translator if they had any questions, concerns, or wanted to provide a comment.

Targeted Outreach

Using outreach suggestions gathered during the scoping process, the public involvement team conducted targeted outreach in specific neighborhoods of high potential impact and to businesses/organizations in the US 36 corridor likely to be interested in future transportation improvements. The purpose of such outreach was to offer more project information to the potentially affected public, and to ensure a complete capturing of all comments and concerns.

The public involvement team identified and contacted individuals who owned property near the current ROW who had already been involved in the NEPA process (primarily through their expressions of concerns in public comments). These individuals were a starting place for identifying additional interested community organizations or individuals. The public involvement team also contacted major employers, especially those who had employees who submitted comments during the NEPA process. Various civic and community organizations such as Rotary and Optimist clubs, the Chambers of Commerce in the US 36 corridor, historical societies, open-space boards, and colleges/universities were also contacted with the intent of gathering and exchanging project-related information and comments. Additionally, to better understand and reflect the transportation-related issues and concerns of senior citizens and transit-dependent populations in the project area, the public involvement team contacted senior centers, the Colorado Mobility Coalition, and other relevant organizations and advocates/representatives of these community interests.

Of the numerous contacts made during these targeted outreach efforts, more than 100 resulted in small group meetings and interviews. Other successful contacts resulted in attendance at the February, May, and October 2004 public workshops, additions to the project mailing/e-mail list, and additions to the record of public comments. The *Public Involvement Program Technical Report Addendum* (CDR Associates 2009) details all outreach events, meetings and workshops, and interviews.

Environmental Justice Outreach

The US 36 project team conducted focused outreach activities in Adams County/South Westminster near the highway from Broadway to Federal Boulevard in preparation for the Adams County Neighborhood Workshop held in April 2006. The outreach focused on low income and minority populations and businesses, with the goal of engaging the low income and minority populations, and informing community members and businesses about the upcoming public meeting.

The outreach activities were conducted in the following neighborhoods adjacent to the highway: Perl Mack Manor, Valley Vista, Western Hills, Skyline Vista, and Valley View. Three approaches were employed:

1. Mailing of bi-lingual meeting announcements to over 700 property owners adjacent to US 36 using an Adams County parcel property owner list.
2. Outreach to businesses, schools, and neighborhood institutions through door-to-door activities.
3. Phone calls to previously involved stakeholders and jurisdiction contacts.

The project team conducted outreach to businesses by going door-to-door or business-to-business in the impact areas. The majority of the businesses and residents had been previously contacted and invited to participate in public meetings and hearings or join the project mailing list. For this outreach effort, the public involvement team spoke with business staff, managers, or owners and provided flyers for posting where visible to the general public, if permitted by the business. The project team also contacted

stakeholders by telephone and met in person with a small group of Adams County staff in preparation for the Adams County Neighborhood Workshop.

Adams County (April 2006 Neighborhood Workshop)

A neighborhood meeting was held to (1) update Adams County residents (between Federal Boulevard and Broadway) on the status of the US 36 DEIS plans, and (2) discuss potential impacts and means of reducing impacts.

A neighborhood workshop was held from 3:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.:

- April 25, 2006, at Skyline Vista Elementary School in Westminster (87 registered attendees).

The Adams County Workshop used an open-house format to solicit public input. Informative display boards, including property maps, were used to visually display information and solicit public input. Handouts of the materials on the display boards were distributed along with comment cards. Members of the project team interacted with individuals and neighborhood representatives, outlined potential impacts resulting from the highway improvements, and solicited public input.

Summary of Issues

During the workshop, participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. Given the project's current recommendation to move the alignment to the south side of US 36 in order to widen or expand the highway:
 - If the project were to impact parts of the community, such as parks, schools, and businesses – tell us how that might affect you? How will this expanded highway affect where you need to go – to work, to school, to shop, etc.?
2. If the project moves forward with highway widening – what ideas do you have to reduce the impacts during construction?
3. If the project moves forward with highway widening and must acquire property – either the entire property or just part of it – what are your concerns? NOTE: Funding for improvements in the US 36 corridor has not yet been identified. Until this occurs, the project cannot move forward with design or property acquisition.
4. Given the four transportation packages under consideration, which consist of options such as express tolling, BRT, HOV lanes, etc. – what improvements best serve your needs?

The project team received both verbal and written comments about the project. The comments are summarized in the following themes:

- Strong concern was expressed regarding impacts to property values due to plans to widen the highway to the south.
- Interest was expressed in the property acquisition and relocation process, and the need to know when and if property acquisition will take place.
- Strong interest was expressed regarding construction impacts, including noise and dust.
- Residents living on the south side of the highway expressed concerns regarding impacts to the neighborhoods, including an increase in noise from the highway.
- Residents expressed support for a higher sound wall to reduce noise.