



CHAPTER 4.0: COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

An extensive amount of public and agency coordination has occurred throughout all phases of the planning and design process for the I-70/E-470 interchange complex. Public coordination has involved meetings with citizens, property owners, businesses, and developers. These meetings involved telecommunications, written communications, meetings with small groups and homeowners associations, and public meetings.

Agency coordination has been ongoing since the beginning of the EA. Extensive staff meetings have been held with the planning and engineering departments of the jurisdictions along the E-470 corridor. Other agencies that have provided input to the design process include CDOT, utility companies, water and sanitation districts, and the railroads.

Meetings have been held with DRCOG to verify design year traffic forecasts for E-470 and the interchanges and to verify assumptions made for land use changes. Coordination with DRCOG would continue throughout design in order to ensure adequate accommodation of the proposed action in the regional planning process.

4.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

4.1.1 Communication Methods

Several communication methods were used throughout the EA process to inform the public of study progress, issues and upcoming meetings. The E-470 Web site was used with a link to project information and a page for submitting comments and questions. Three newsletters have been issued to date. A fourth newsletter is planned to be issued in conjunction with the public hearing to be held during the public review period, tentatively scheduled for late summer 2006. An initial mailing list was developed using data from the Tax Assessor offices in Adams and Arapahoe Counties. Sign-in sheets at the public meetings were used to augment the mail-

ing list. An initial Scoping Meeting was held on April 30, 2003, with representatives of CDOT, the E-470 Authority, and FHWA. Monthly coordination meetings have been held throughout the planning process with representatives of CDOT, the E-470 Authority, the FHWA, and the City of Aurora. Quarterly meetings were held with the Technical Advisory Committee, including DRCOG, Arapahoe and Adams Counties, the UPRR, DIA, and the District Wildlife Manager for Colorado DOW.

4.1.2 Low-Income and Minority Populations Outreach

Specialized outreach to low-income and minority populations was conducted as part of the public involvement process to gather comments and concerns regarding the proposed action. Outreach included mailings that announced upcoming meetings and described the project process. Distribution of fliers to businesses and residences in the study area occurred prior to every open house. In addition, a Spanish translator attended the public open houses to answer questions and facilitate comments, and project material was translated and available.

4.1.3 Public Meetings

To date, five public meetings have been held to discuss the study process, to detail the Purpose and Need, to describe the development and screening of alternatives, and to receive comments on the Preferred Alternative. The public meetings were held on May 20, 2003; July 14, 2004; February 22, 2005; and October 19, 2005. A public hearing will be held during the public comment period, now anticipated to be held in late summer 2006. An additional meeting with neighborhood groups was held on June 10, 2003. A summary of those meetings and the public comments received are in the following sections.



1 **4.13.1 Public Open House: May 20, 2003**

2 An open house meeting was held on May 20, 2003,
3 from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the E-470 Authority
4 administration office, 22470 East 6th Parkway,
5 Aurora, Colorado. The meeting provided the public
6 an opportunity to learn about the current EA and
7 preliminary engineering study being performed for
8 the Authority of the I-70/Gun Club Road inter-
9 change area. Staff of E-470 Authority, CDOT,
10 FHWA, and the City of Aurora attended the meet-
11 ing. Staff from consultants Parsons Brinckerhoff,
12 Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, and Carter & Burgess also
13 attended.

14 Approximately 25 members of the public attended.
15 Eight people completed comment sheets. Copies of
16 the statement of Purpose and Need were available.

17 Display boards of the study area and environmental
18 survey results, as well as boards illustrating the
19 many concept plans of alternatives were placed
20 around the meeting room. Agency and consultant
21 staff members were available to answer questions
22 and to explain the display material. The following
23 comments were received from the public by staff
24 and are categorized by issue:

25 **Noise**

26 1. Main issues are noise, and development. Desire
27 to have the study compare area noise pre-E-470
28 with the current and future conditions. The
29 noise from E-470 comes across the Coal Creek
30 valley to Thunderbird Estates. Added local traf-
31 fic on Gun Club and excessive speeds (up to
32 100 mph) are also a concern. Truck noise in the
33 late night/early morning hours was very obtru-
34 sive.

35 2. Some persons thought the loop alternate would
36 reduce noise and visual impacts.

37 **Design**

38 3. Concern that the future interchange should pre-
39 serve the current movements including access
40 between E-470 and Colfax west.

41 4. The access road to Gun Club needed to be
42 wider, at least four lanes plus left-turn and right-
43 turn lanes.

44 5. Interested in how future site access would work.
45 Flexibility in site design needed that could shift
46 the south frontage road (relocated Colfax) to
47 pass through the future development to permit
48 buildings to front on both sides of the road.

49 6. Concern about potential impacts of Harvest
50 Mile Road in backyards. Would like to make
51 presentation to E-470 Board on traffic and safety
52 ideas, including 6th Parkway, Picadilly, and
53 Harvest.

54 7. Get rid of the traffic signals!

55 8. Not clear from displays if improvements at Pica-
56 dilly and Harvest are being considered.

57 **Construction**

58 9. An area contractor expressed the need for early
59 construction. Says he instructs all his suppliers
60 to use E-470 to insure on-time delivery of mate-
61 rials.

62 10. Need to build the improvements ASAP.

63 **Other**

64 11. There was an underground stage stop west of
65 E-470 in the vicinity of 6th Avenue.

66 12. Flooding occurs adjacent to the New World
67 development west of Picadilly. Picadilly itself
68 has been overtopped in past floods.

69 13. What is in the "hazardous material" sites?

70 14. One person asked how the project would be
71 financed, and was pleased to learn that toll reve-
72 nue bonds were contemplated.

73 15. Take tolls off the 6th Parkway ramps for better
74 Gun Club access.

1 Wildlife

2 16. There is a population of toads that live under-
3 ground south of I-70, west of E-470.

4 17. There is a raptor nest south of Colfax and east of
5 the old motel on Colfax.

6 **4.1.3.2 Meeting with Thunderbird Estates Home-**
7 **owner's Association and New World West**

8 A meeting was held with the Thunderbird Estates
9 Homeowners Association (HOA) and New World
10 West on June 10, 2003, from 7:30 p.m. to 9:00
11 p.m., at the residence of Richard and Bonnie Rader
12 (71 Algonquian Street, Aurora, Colorado). This
13 meeting was part of the regular monthly meeting of
14 the Thunderbird Estates HOA. The meeting was
15 held as a follow-up to the Public Open House held
16 on May 20, 2003, to provide the group with an
17 additional opportunity to learn about the current EA
18 and preliminary engineering study for the I-70/Gun
19 Club Road interchange area. Ken Frantz of the E-
20 470 Authority, Wes Goff of CDOT Region 1, and
21 Jack Tone of Parsons Brinckerhoff attended the
22 meeting.

23 Eight members of the public attended.

24 Handouts of the exhibits showing the study area,
25 environmental survey results, and the Purpose and
26 Need statement were distributed, as well as 8.5 x 11
27 copies of the two latest concept plans. Jack Tone
28 explained the project concept using large-scale
29 drawings, including one showing the potential first
30 stage of construction consisting of the bypass road-
31 way for the E-470 mainlanes and ramp connections
32 from E-470 to the existing I-70/Gun Club inter-
33 change.

34 There was overwhelming support from the group
35 for the first stage of the interchange project to con-
36 struct the flyby roadway for E-470 through traffic to
37 bypass the four traffic signals. All thought this would
38 greatly improve safety and would improve the
39 safety of turning traffic at the I-70 interchange. Some
40 noted that keeping the through traffic moving would
41 also reduce the noise from trucks slowing and accel-
42 erating from the stoplights. In answer to questions, it
43 was noted that about half of the peak period traffic

44 was through traffic, and that the bypass roadway
45 would reduce traffic through the signalized intersec-
46 tions by some 50 percent.

47 The subject of noise is of great concern to the resi-
48 dents. They note that the sound from E-470 south of
49 6th Parkway is very obtrusive, particularly from traf-
50 fic passing over the Coal Creek bridge. Copies of a
51 statement from the Thunderbird Estates HOA dated
52 June 2003 commenting on the EA (see **Appendix B**),
53 as well as a letter from Fred Mould of the Gun Club
54 Estates HOA (see **Appendix B**), were distributed.

55 The two concepts for the ultimate improvements for
56 the E-470/I-70 interchange were discussed. The
57 group felt that the loop alternative was preferable
58 since it would have one fewer level and thus lower
59 noise and visual impacts. The group also favored
60 the retention of connecting ramps between E-470
61 and Colfax west of Picadilly to keep more traffic on
62 E-470 and out of the Gun Club interchange.

63 The group asked if the May 20 meeting had turned
64 up any new facts about the study area. It was noted
65 that the information about the historic underground
66 stage stop was new, although its location is well
67 outside the limits of probable construction. Also,
68 the presence of a raptor nest near the eastbound
69 Colfax off ramp and the presence of large numbers
70 of toads in the area had been brought out. Many of
71 the residents at this meeting confirmed that the
72 toads were quite widespread, particularly along
73 Coal Creek.

74 In answer to questions, it was noted that the final EA
75 was scheduled to be completed in late 2003 and a
76 public hearing was planned for early 2004.

77 **4.1.3.3 Public Outreach and Public Scoping Meeting**
78 **Open House: July 14, 2004**

79 A public outreach and public scoping meeting open
80 house was held on July 14, 2004, at the E-470
81 Authority administration office, 22470 East 6th
82 Parkway, Aurora, Colorado.



1 Mailing List Development

2 An initial mailing list of approximately 4,650 resi-
3 dences was compiled by using data from the Tax
4 Assessor Offices of Arapahoe County, Adams
5 County, and Strasburg. The boundary and parcel
6 information used to generate the database included
7 the following areas:

- 8 ▶ On the south side of I-70: from Tower Road to
9 the west and Hayesmount Road to the east and
10 from I-70 south to Jewell Road.
- 11 ▶ On the north side of I-70: from Tower Road to
12 the west and Monaghan Road to the east and
13 from I-70 north to 56th Avenue.
- 14 ▶ Strasburg east of the study area.

15 Newsletter

16 A newsletter was mailed on June 15, 2004, to the
17 compiled list announcing the public meeting to be
18 held on July 14, 2004, at the administrative office of
19 the E-470 Authority. The newsletter included a
20 description of the public meeting date, the project
21 study area and project description, the E-470 flyby
22 immediate improvements, the environmental pro-
23 cess and current environmental studies underway,
24 survey information, and a comment sheet. Also
25 included was a Spanish section, which included a
26 description of the study area and comment sheet.
27 The E-470 Web site and project e-mail address was
28 noted as a resource for making comments and add-
29 ing one's name to the mailing list.

30 Public Notifications

31 A follow-up post card announcing the July 14,
32 2004, public meeting was mailed on July 7, 2004,
33 to the 4,650 residents on the mailing list.

34 Legal notices were included in the *Denver Post* and
35 the *Rocky Mountain News* on June 30, 2004, and
36 the *Aurora Sentinel* on July 1, 2004.

37 Public Scoping Meeting - July 14, 2004

38 The Public Scoping Meeting for the EA was held on
39 July 14, 2004, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the E-
40 470 Public Highway Authority administration
41 offices located at 22470 E. 6th Parkway, Aurora,
42 CO. The meeting was conducted in an open house
43 format with a slide presentation given at 6:00 p.m.

44 The slide presentation described the expanded
45 study area, the proposed action, project elements,
46 the environmental process, current environmental
47 studies underway, and project schedule.

48 Approximately 53 citizens attended the open house
49 presentation. During the open house and following
50 the slide presentation, the public was given the
51 opportunity to ask questions and discuss project
52 issues with the consultant team. A Spanish-speaking
53 interpreter was available for people requiring trans-
54 lation services.

55 Attendees were encouraged to submit written com-
56 ments. As of July 30, 2004, a total of 25 comments
57 has been received 6 from the public scoping meet-
58 ing comment sheets, 2 newsletter responses, 5 e-
59 mails and 12 from the project Web site. Those pub-
60 lic comments and comments recorded by consult-
61 ant team members at the public meeting are
62 summarized below.

63 Interchange at Picadilly Road

64 1. Residents north of Smith Road were very sup-
65 portive of a bridge and interchange at Picadilly,
66 while residents near Picadilly Road are not sup-
67 portive of the interchange.

68 2. Need to improve 6th Avenue/Parkway west of
69 E-470 to Picadilly to get to the new Picadilly
70 interchange.

71 3. Concern for increased traffic on Picadilly Road;
72 ultimately Picadilly would need improvements
73 south to handle increased traffic. One resident
74 believes there is less traffic on Picadilly.

- 1 4. Concerned that improvements only upgraded in 40
2 the vicinity of the interchange would create 41
3 congestion on the remainder if not improved 42
4 also. Don't just improve near Colfax Avenue. "It 43
5 would be unsafe and irresponsible to do other- 44
6 wise." 45
- 7 5. "I would object to the elimination of access to 46
8 I-70 until and unless access to Picadilly direct 47
9 via 6th Parkway is available and Picadilly is 48
10 improved to handle the traffic with on and off 49
11 ramps available at I-70."
- 12 6. Please address the 11th and Picadilly exit from 50
13 New World West; it is a line-of-sight problem 51
14 both for Picadilly and 11th in both directions. 52
53
15 7. Tower triangle area needs freeway access west- 54
16 bound onto I-70. Tower Road interchange is 55
17 poorly regulated by lights. Need Picadilly inter- 56
18 change to avoid trains at the crossing and what 57
19 has become a traffic nightmare because of soc- 58
20 cer fields at Colfax/Dunkirk. 59
- 21 **Interchange at Harvest Road** 60
- 22 8. Support for Harvest Road interchange to have 61
23 better access to I-70 east. Also better access 62
24 west for mobile home park. 63
- 25 9. More residential development is planned at 64
26 Harvest Road resulting in more need for an 65
27 interchange there than at Picadilly Road. Two 66
28 interchanges are not necessary.
- 29 10. What is the development plan for Harvest Road? 67
- 30 **Elimination of Access to I-70 from Gun Club Road** 68
- 31 11. Residents are concerned about loss of free 69
32 access and added out-of-direction travel in order 70
33 to access I-70 once Gun Club Road access is 71
34 removed. "Make ramps at 6th Parkway toll- 72
35 free!" 73
- 36 12. Several hundred current residents and several 74
37 hundred more in new developments are 75
38 planned. Residents currently use I-70 as the pri- 76
39 mary east-west commuting route. If access is 77
78
79
- eliminated it would push a lot of traffic south 80
onto Jewel and Iliff and greatly slow the com- 81
mute. It would also route a large amount of traf- 82
fic through a residential subdivision with a 30 83
mph speed limit. This is already a very danger- 84
ous road at that location because of the trash 85
haulers that travel that portion of Gun Club. 86
13. Forces residents of Murphy Creek to use E-470 87
toll to access I-70 - "We already pay enough 88
taxes without you subjecting us to toll roads." 89
14. Taking Jewell to cross over Gun Club is very 90
dangerous and there have been several horrible 91
accidents at this intersection and one known 92
fatality. A light should be installed at Jewell 93
immediately to eliminate this dangerous cross- 94
ing. 95
15. A resident of Murphy Creek and a frequent user 96
if E-470 fully supports improving this inter- 97
change. Feels it is important to take Gun Club 98
road south if this interchange remains available. 99
The only users are local to that area. The road 100
also preceded the tollway; those of us who use 101
Gun Club are also some of your best customers 102
because E-470 is at our back doorstep. 103
- 64 **E-470 Immediate Improvements "Fly-By"**
16. Questions regarding how access would work at 104
I-70 when flyby is built. 105
17. A developer in the immediate area representing 106
the development of approximately 3,000 homes 107
supports efforts to improve the transportation 108
network through the construction of the E-470 109
interchange and its associated improvements. 110
18. Interchange looks too complicated. 111
19. Traffic signals at I-70/E-470 are dangerous. Traf- 112
fic queues up past Colfax. 113
20. "While you are studying the flyovers, please 114
consider the current access as folks are proceed- 115
ing east on I-70 and the I-70 bypass (Colfax). 116
Presently as folks are heading east on I-70, 117
speed limit is 70 or 75 mph as they round the 118
119



1 curve over the I-70 bypass, consideration is
2 NOT given to those heading east from Colfax to
3 merge onto I-70. The folks are concentrating on
4 exiting onto E-470 to the south and are not
5 yielding to the merging traffic. I don't know if
6 the current plan would correct the situation, but
7 I'm surprised there haven't been accidents in
8 this area due to the merging problem."

9 **Property Impacts**

- 10 21. Several residents expressed concern for how
11 their properties would be impacted and what
12 direct impacts mean to the owners.
- 13 22. Property owners east of Gun Club wanted to
14 know how the Colfax extension and relocated
15 Gun Club Road would affect their property.
- 16 23. Concern for loss of "rural" setting. Residents
17 expressed the reason for moving to the area was
18 to escape urban areas and now feel the pro-
19 posed interchanges would cause growth near
20 their properties.
- 21 24. Picadilly interchange would affect property
22 owners on Picadilly adversely by their inability
23 to have safe access to their homes and safer lev-
24 els of pollution.
- 25 25. Stephen Bacon of Colorado Interstate Gas was
26 concerned about a gas line monitoring station
27 located at the west edge of the Prologis property
28 near the Picadilly Road alignment tying into
29 Smith Road. They also have a large station
30 located between the Prologis site and the Har-
31 vest Road section line. He stated he has seen
32 drawings of a road connecting the Prologis site
33 to Harvest Road which may (depending on the
34 alignment) cut across interstate right-of-way and
35 possibly some of their buildings and equipment.
- 36 26. Steve Schafhausen of Land Inc. working for East
37 Cherry Creek Water and Sanitation District also
38 has concerns about the alignment of Harvest
39 Road tying into Smith Road at the section line.
40 There are plans to run a major water line along
41 the Harvest Road section line and for a pump

42 station to be built in the vicinity of the Harvest
43 Road section line and Smith Road. Parsons
44 Brinckerhoff is coordinating with him to get
45 plans and documentation for this proposed
46 water line and pump station.

47 27. What is the impact on Watkins?

48 **Potential Environmental Issues**

- 49 28. Objection to the Picadilly Interchange and I-70 -
50 "Please do not destroy the natural situation of
51 the area. Eagles nest nearby and foxes run
52 through the road and our community."
- 53 29. Increased traffic would mean increased air and
54 noise pollution for the whole New World subdi-
55 vision.
- 56 30. The impact area is the habitat for an endangered
57 toad but also for local fox, coyotes, and prairie
58 dogs. If you have question or would like pic-
59 tures of the flooding or endangered toad, please
60 call.
- 61 31. If the area in the southeast quadrant of the E-
62 470/I-70 interchange develops, would First
63 Creek need to be maintained as an open water
64 feature?
- 65 32. Concern for frequent flooding on Picadilly Road
66 south of Colfax Avenue.

67 **General**

- 68 33. Residents of Thunderbird Estates and Murphy
69 Creek would like to be more involved and
70 informed of the decisions being made and sug-
71 gest that HOA representatives be included in
72 regular meetings and possibly making coordina-
73 tion meeting minutes available to them.
- 74 34. Developer Tom Morrill of HMB Partners inter-
75 ested in coordinating plans for Colfax Avenue
76 relocation in southwest quadrant.
- 77 35. Representative of residential developer was
78 interested in the project schedule, particularly
79 beyond where the posted schedule ended,

- 1 regarding when improvements are going to be
2 constructed.
- 3 36. 26th Avenue needs access to E-470 and a better
4 access to I-70. Completion of an I-70 and Air-
5 park Road interchange would allow a short-cut
6 access to DIA.
- 7 37. When and how would 6th Avenue be con-
8 nected to 6th Parkway?
- 9 38. When would the 6th Parkway extension be con-
10 structed through to SH 30?
- 11 39. One resident was opposed to the City of
12 Aurora's plan to make Picadilly a major arterial,
13 when most of the growth according to a map
14 she carried was shown to the east.
- 15 40. Make sure that the analysis considered all the
16 growth happening east of the primary study area
17 (Watkins and Front Range Airport).
- 18 41. Several individuals asked for copies of the land
19 use plan and growth projections graphics used
20 in the presentation material. Also asked for a
21 copy of the *City of Aurora Comprehensive Plan,*
22 2003 and to be kept informed of when new aer-
23 ials photos are complete.
- 24 **Expressions of Concern**
- 25 42. One resident was disappointed to see who the
26 members of the E-470 Board are and believes
27 the interests that are represented by the Board
28 are obvious. Resident fails to see how the com-
29 munity is represented. "The use of "public
30 informed" is very truthful, but not involved."
- 31 43. A community member asked "why" with
32 regards to having the E-470 and I-70 signalized
33 intersections prior to it even opening and
34 believes it comes down to financial and political
35 issues not the risk of lives.
- 36 44. One person remembered a "guarantee" of free
37 access for those that were directly affected by
38 the E-470 construction at E-470 and I-70 at Gun
39 Club Road.
- 40 45. Safety and frustration of all E-470 users and
41 local traffic at the signals south of I-70.
- 42 46. "Who would benefit from an interchange,
43 developers? Who would benefit from your pro-
44 posals? Not us who live near by. Don't do it!"
- 45 47. "My opinion on E-470 is not a good one. In fact
46 I will never use E-470. It is not set up right, trav-
47 elers who are used to paying a toll on a thruway
48 would pick up their ticket when entering and
49 stop and pay only once when they exit. Who-
50 ever set up all the toll booths every 3 miles or so
51 is an idiot!"
- 52 48. Public meeting attendee wanted to know why
53 more CDOT representatives weren't present.
- 54 **4.1.3.4 Public Open House: February 22, 2005**
- 55 A public open house meeting was held on February
56 22, 2005, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the E-470
57 Authority administration office, 22470 East 6th
58 Parkway, Aurora, Colorado.
- 59 **Overview of Meeting**
- 60 The meeting was conducted in an open house for-
61 mat with slide presentations given at 5:00 p.m. and
62 6:00 p.m.
- 63 The slide presentation described the Purpose and
64 Need, the alternatives development and screening
65 process, status of environmental studies, and project
66 schedule.
- 67 Approximately 60 people attended the open house.
68 During the open house and following the slide pre-
69 sentation, the public was given the opportunity to
70 ask questions and discuss project issues with the
71 consultant team. A Spanish-speaking interpreter was
72 available for people requiring translation services.
- 73 Attendees were also encouraged to submit written
74 comments. As of March 9, 2005, four written com-
75 ments had been received on public meeting com-
76 ment sheets. These comments and comments
77 recorded by consultant team members at the public
78 meeting are summarized below.



1 **Summary of Written Comments**

- 2 1. Concern that noise walls were promised by Mr.
3 Delozier along E-470 from 6th Parkway to Coal
4 Creek; prefers Alternative 9; wants to see all
5 Gun Club construction vehicles use the flyby;
6 wants to see all construction vehicles during
7 Picadilly and Harvest Mile Roads interchange
8 construction on I-70; construct emergency
9 access only from Colfax and Gun Club at I-70
10 eastbound.
- 11 2. Same noise wall comment as above; restrict all
12 construction traffic from Gun Club between I-70
13 and Mississippi; wants to see a citizen participa-
14 tion committee on this project; wants to know
15 ambient noise prior to the construction of E-
16 470; wants a written response to written com-
17 ment.
- 18 3. Stresses that Mr. Delozier promised them a
19 noise wall if they supported the flyover; would
20 like the promise fulfilled.
- 21 4. Owns property north of I-70 at proposed Har-
22 vest Road interchange location; wants to know
23 if the right-of-way for a waterline can be put in
24 the roadway right-of-way; wants to know who
25 would acquire right-of-way and fund construc-
26 tion; would there be any access restrictions on
27 adjacent properties?
- 28 5. Concerns regarding impacts to the New World
29 West development from the Picadilly/Colfax
30 interchange, including wetlands near frontage
31 road and Picadilly; unsafe exits from 11th Ave-
32 nue and homes south of 11th Avenue; disrup-
33 tion to wildlife including hawks and prairie
34 dogs; concerned about Picadilly Road becom-
35 ing a truck route; concerned about noise and air
36 pollution because of height of flyby.

37 **Follow-up to Date on Written Comments**

38 Written responses were provided to the above par-
39 ties.

40 **Summary of Verbal Comments**

41 **Picadilly**

- 42 1. Study team needs to address how Picadilly Road
43 and Colfax Avenue would be configured when
44 the land in the southwest quadrant of I-70 and E-
45 470 (Horizon City Center) is developed.
- 46 2. What improvements could be made to Picadilly
47 Road immediately adjacent to the New World
48 West residential subdivision?
- 49 3. Questions/complaints about plans to widen Pic-
50 adilly to the south, and making it a major arte-
51 rial. These people were more focused on
52 Picadilly Road itself as opposed to the inter-
53 change.
- 54 4. Concerned that Picadilly Road must be
55 improved because it is narrow and it floods; res-
56 ident did not comment much on the inter-
57 change alternatives.
- 58 5. A resident that lived on Picadilly Road was con-
59 cerned about added traffic to substandard road-
60 way with vertical curve deficiencies. Also
61 concerned with existing drainage problems near
62 Picadilly Road.
- 63 6. Improving 6th Parkway and Picadilly Road with
64 a new I-70 interchange would be a good alter-
65 nate to Gun Club Road interchange.
- 66 7. Residents of New World West (along Picadilly
67 Road south of Colfax) had concerns with a new
68 interchange going in at Picadilly Road and not
69 getting the proper/needed improvements to the
70 existing Picadilly Road along their develop-
71 ment. The main issue is that there is very little
72 sight distance with the existing profile of the
73 road and a major increase in traffic would make
74 an already unsafe condition worse.

75 **Design**

- 76 8. A few people agreed that the combined Gun
77 Club/E-470 interchange would be very com-

- plex; agreed with screening out these alternatives.
9. A couple of people were anxious to see more detail on what the Picadilly and Harvest Road interchanges would look like.
10. A couple of people from Thunderbird Estates were worried that the No-Action Alternative would prevail and Gun Club interchange would remain.
11. Why not move E-470 back to the original plan in a more easterly location?
12. The existing “left on green arrow only” at the westbound I-70 on-ramp at E-470 causes back-ups on northbound E-470 past the Colfax/Gun Club intersection. Traffic on westbound Gun Club Road wishing to go to westbound I-70 cannot get into the back-ups lanes of E-470 and have to either sit in the other E-470 through lanes before forcing themselves into the leftmost lane or must wait through many traffic cycles before finding a slight gap to slip into. The citizen says a local law enforcement officer said there has not been a decrease in the number of accidents at the westbound on-ramp intersection. Citizen suggested two options. First option: return the signal configuration to what was there before to allow left turns to the westbound on-ramp on regular green lights. Second option: the E-470 Authority should allow free access on the northbound E-470 ramp at 6th Parkway to allow motorists plenty of time to get into the leftmost E-470 lane.
13. Discussions with Fire Department - concerned about lack of access to I-70 at Gun Club Road. If Harvest Road access is provided, it would maintain existing response times. Wants to maintain South Frontage Road between Powhatan and Harvest Roads.
- Other**
14. Needed clarification of the need of the proposed improvements.
15. Wants study team to be aware of the large amount of underground toads that are in the area.
16. There is a serious problem with flooding in the area around E-470 south of the interstate; it does not appear that the FEMA floodplain boundaries are correct.
17. Dialogue dealing with questions about noise and the NEPA process in general.
18. Did not understand what we mean by “safety” as a need. This was explained but perhaps there are others for whom this is not clear. (Study team may want to think about a different description in the future.)
19. Two gentlemen who are out-of-town developers were concerned about how a developer would be able to pay for the bridge over I-70 on Harvest Road. They had other questions as to who would pay for each part of the project.
20. Owners of the former motel on Colfax were concerned about potential loss of property and having embankment for relocated Picadilly Road blocking the view of the mountains. They are considering proposals for redevelopment of the property.
21. If I-70/Gun Club ramps are closed, take the tolls off the 6th Parkway ramps.
22. On eastbound I-70 approaching the Colfax exit, the existing signing causes 20 to 30 vehicles per day to inadvertently exit at Colfax thinking its I-70; these vehicles then make a U-turn on Colfax to get back to eastbound I-70. The citizen states that one sign shows “Toll Road” ahead in the same area as the sign indicating to exit for Business Route 70.
23. The movement from eastbound Colfax to southbound Gun Club Road is difficult/time-consuming during heavy traffic. Trucks often sit in the middle of eastbound Colfax lane to make a left turn onto northbound E-470. They need to either wait through four or five signal cycles in



1 this lane or use the right, free-flow lane and try
2 to immediately cross the multiple southbound E-
3 470 lanes to get to the E-470 left-turn lane to
4 westbound I-70. Citizen suggests that we figure
5 out a way to keep the left-turning trucks from
6 the eastbound Colfax center lane. Also com-
7 mented same as verbal comment #20.

8 Follow-up To Date on Verbal Comments

- 9 ▶ Comment 12: Jim Bemelen discussed this with
10 Ken DePinto (CDOT Region 1 Traffic Opera-
11 tions Engineer). Ken said there were numerous
12 broadside accidents at the on-ramp intersection
13 prior to modifying the signal, which is what
14 prompted the change. Ken would look at the
15 accident data at the westbound on-ramp inter-
16 section as well as the section of E-470 between
17 Colfax and the westbound on ramp. Ken would
18 also look at the signal timing to see if there is
19 anything can be done to provide more "gaps"
20 for the citizen's desired traffic maneuver.
- 21 ▶ Comment 22: Jim Bemelen discussed this with
22 Ken DePinto (CDOT Region 1 Traffic Opera-
23 tions Engineer) who would look at the signing
24 to see if a modification is prudent.
- 25 ▶ Comment 23: Jim Bemelen discussed this with
26 Ken DePinto (CDOT Region 1 Traffic Opera-
27 tions Engineer) who would take a look to see if
28 something can be done such as adding a thru/
29 right overhead sign or pavement arrow. Either
30 Ken or Jim would contact commentator with the
31 findings.

32 4.1.3.5 Public Open House Meeting: October 19, 33 2005

34 A public open house meeting was held on October
35 19, 2005, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the E-470
36 Authority administrative offices, 22470 East 6th
37 Parkway, Aurora, Colorado.

38 Overview of Meeting

39 The meeting was conducted in an open house for-
40 mat with brief presentations given at 5:00 p.m. and
41 6:00 p.m.

42 The presentation described the Purpose and Need,
43 the alternatives development and screening process,
44 status of environmental studies, and project sched-
45 ule. The early implementation of Ramp H from
46 northbound E-470 to westbound I-70 was also dis-
47 cussed.

48 Approximately 25 citizens attended the open house.
49 During the open house and during the presentation,
50 the public was given the opportunity to ask ques-
51 tions and discuss project issues with the consultant
52 team.

53 Attendees were also encouraged to submit written
54 comments. As of November 10, 2005, only one
55 written comment had been received on public
56 meeting comment sheets. Three letters were
57 received. These comments and comments recorded
58 by consultant team members at the public meeting
59 are summarized below.

60 Summary of the Written Comments

- 61 1. Letter filed at the October 19th meeting
62 expressed concerns about noise from E-470 and
63 Gun Club Road traffic, danger from traffic using
64 Gun Club to reach I-70 to avoid tolls on E-470,
65 heavy truck traffic on Gun Club, and noise from
66 "jake brakes." Letter also noted concern that the
67 City of Aurora was planning to improve Gun
68 Club Road as a result of the flyby improvement.
- 69 2. Letter was identical to that above.
- 70 3. Comment sheet noted a primary concern about
71 Picadilly Road being widened to six lanes. They
72 are concerned about the new interchange caus-
73 ing increased traffic on Picadilly. Also con-
74 cerned about flooding west of Picadilly. Safe
75 access to their driveway from Picadilly should
76 be addressed.
- 77 4. Expressed support for the I-70/E-470 inter-
78 change and also requested that Tower Road be
79 extended from Colfax south to 6th Avenue to
80 ease traffic on Airport Boulevard.

- 1 5. Follow-up letter dated October 30, 2005, with
2 questions on the 1601 process and traffic
3 impacts on Gun Club Road. Requested by
4 phone a copy of information on the “non-com-
5 pete” provisions of any E-470 agreements with
6 Aurora and Arapahoe County.

7 **Follow-up on Written Comments**

8 Written responses were provided to all of the above
9 parties.

10 **Summary of Verbal Comments**

11 **Traffic**

- 12 1. Concerned about the dangers of high-speed traf-
13 fic on Gun Club Road with the addition of the E-
14 470 flyby.
- 15 2. Concerned about truck traffic on Picadilly, espe-
16 cially dump trucks, and wants to know if it is
17 going to become a designated truck route.
- 18 3. Expressed concern over the traffic from the I-70
19 eastbound exit at Gun Club turning onto Colfax
20 Avenue and the long wait time because people
21 do not know what lane they should be in.
- 22 4. Concern about if additional stop lights would be
23 installed.
- 24 5. There is a signal north of I-70 at E. 19th Avenue
25 that has cameras for detecting traffic. A car is not
26 noticed in the left-turn lane, only the right lane.
- 27 6. Wants to know if a gas station has been planned
28 in the study area. He wants to know how a pos-
29 sible gas station would affect planning and bot-
30 tlenecking.
- 31 7. Concern was expressed over bottlenecking
32 coming onto Picadilly from 6th Avenue.

33 **Design**

- 34 8. Concerned about Picadilly Road being six lanes.
35 Said that the citizens thought it was only going
36 to be four lanes.

- 37 9. Concerned that Picadilly is not part of the
38 impact area. Resident was not aware that Pica-
39 dilly would be six lanes.
- 40 10. Someone wanted to know how far south Har-
41 vest Road would extend, specifically if it would
42 intersect the landfill.
- 43 11. Someone wanted to know if the jog of Missis-
44 sippi was being moved or changed.

45 **Other**

- 46 12. Expressed concern about the signing from east-
47 bound I-70 to W. Colfax. Say that traffic thinks
48 that continuing along the mainline would put
49 them onto E-470 so traffic exits onto W. Colfax.
50 Expressed the same comment at the last meeting
51 but nothing was done.
- 52 13. What would Harvest Road service? Who would
53 pay for the construction of Harvest Road?
- 54 14. Concerned that there is a wetland at Picadilly
55 and the frontage road and that the wetland
56 would be paved over.
- 57 15. Concerned about noise levels and wants to
58 make sure that they would be studied. Espe-
59 cially concerned about the noise from E-470
60 and compared it to the tire noise from I-225.
- 61 16. What would the speed limit be on Harvest and
62 Picadilly?

63 **Follow-up on Verbal Comments**

64 Comment 3: Jim Bemelen discussed this with Ken
65 DePinto (CDOT Region 1 Traffic Operations Engi-
66 neer). Ken looked at the signing last spring, but did
67 not agree there was a problem. However, he re-
68 investigated the signing and did not see that a modi-
69 fication was prudent.

70 Comment 5: CDOT Traffic Operations personnel
71 found a faulty video card in the signal controller
72 and reprogrammed the detection zones. The prob-
73 lem has been corrected.



1 4.2 AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

2 Agency coordination has been continuous through-
3 out the EA process. Monthly coordination meetings
4 have been held with planning and engineering staff
5 at CDOT, the E-470 Authority, the FHWA, and the
6 City of Aurora. Quarterly meetings have also been
7 held with a Technical Advisory Committee com-
8 prised of DRCOG, Arapahoe and Adams Counties,
9 the UPRR, DIA, and the District Wildlife Manager
10 for Colorado DOW. Additional coordination meet-
11 ings have been held with staff of the EPA.

12 4.3 REMAINING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

13 A fourth newsletter is planned for fall 2006. A pub-
14 lic comment period for the final EA is scheduled for
15 November 2006. A public hearing would be held
16 during the public comment period.