

APPENDIX C RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Note: Comments are in original form as submitted.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
1	Lee	I have 1 to 2 trucks between 48 ft. to 53 ft. every week coming from out of state. Since RTD/city planned to one traffic line at E. Exposition Ave. I hope there is enough space for the truck coming in/out to my property from E. Exposition Ave, and west side of Aile. I think it will be needed more wide space for the big trucks. I don't know how wide the street will be. Please inform me those informations (such as how many feet of the street, and how much wide for the entrance from E. Exposition Ave. and west side of Aile of my property.).	<p>Comment noted. Please refer to Appendix A, Sheets TP-020 and TP-021 for design details at this location. The Preferred Alternative will maintain the same driveway access width along the north side of Exposition and right-in-right out turns will continue to be allowed. The median turn lane on Exposition across from the private driveway at 14301 E. Exposition Ave will be closed. This will limit left turns (or east bound travel) directly from this property. Vehicles, including trucks, will need to travel north along the Aurora Town Center Road and make a u-turn or use another Town Center entrance. Coordination will continue with the City of Aurora and the Aurora Town Center owners to provide a median opening on the Aurora Town Center median, which is an option to increase flexibility of access for this business in future phases.</p> <p>Exposition Avenue will be 18 feet wide between the curb and the light rail barrier wall. The entrance width for each of the two properties (14301 E. Exposition Ave and Aurora Town Center Entrance) will be 26 feet – which is the same width as the existing entrance.</p> <p>In the current and proposed design, a truck 45.5' or greater can make the right turn from Exposition to the Aurora Town Center Entrance and into the 14301 E. Exposition Ave driveway. A larger truck (55' or greater) currently cannot make these turns nor will the proposed design accommodate these turns.</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
2	Holmberg	I am really looking forward to the opening of this line. Please keep the parking a reasonable distance from the station. Surface parking is acceptable, preferred unless the market demands more.	Comment noted. For the I-225 Corridor, park-n-Rides are located between 200 to 1,500-feet of station platforms. The Aurora <i>Strategic Parking Plan and Program Study</i> has identified strategies to provide additional or structure parking at some park-n-Ride locations. RTD is committed to monitoring future parking demand and working in partnership with stakeholders and the City to identify parking strategies to meet this demand. To the extent feasible within budget and program constraints, RTD will continue to work cooperatively with the City to address parking related issues.
3	Denson	After attending the public hearing on Jul 22, I found myself wondering about vibration. As owner of A-AAA Key Mini Storage on Colfax & I225 the plans call for an elevated portion of the rail to locate at the rear of our property. It is anticipated we will lose approximately 130 units to the construction. During construction and once in operation, what is the plan for mitigating or hopefully prevent vibration damaging our buildings?	<p>Comment noted. Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) ground-borne vibration impact criteria are based on type of land use and train frequency. Three land-use types or “sensitive receivers” have the potential for vibration impacts that may require mitigation. Because the storage units are not considered a sensitive land use type, there is no impact and no mitigation is proposed.</p> <p>The storage units will experience maximum vibration velocity levels of 60 vibration decibels (VdB) or less. As shown in Figure 3.10.3 (which illustrates the human or structural response to vibration levels) on page 3-123, the approximate threshold for human perception of vibration is at 65 VdB, while minor cosmetic damage to fragile buildings would not occur below 100 VdB. Thus, the vibration at the storage units from light rail operations will be imperceptible and will be well below the most stringent damage threshold.</p> <p>Temporary vibration impacts may result from construction activities and the potential for vibration impact would be greatest at locations near pile driving for bridges. Mitigation to minimize temporary construction impacts to</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			sensitive receivers includes minimizing nighttime construction in neighborhoods, exploring alternative construction methods (e.g. using drilled piles instead of driven piles), and re-routing truck traffic.
4	Bailey	I am looking forward to use the lightrail from Iliff to Nine Mile for work purposes, and ultimately to downtown. I will also use it in the other direction toward the airport. I wish it would be built much sooner rather than later. I am willing to pay more taxes to get it constructed. I plan to retire in about 12 yrs. and were hoping to use it for many years. Thanks for all your diligent work!	Comment noted. RTD is committed to implementing the whole FasTracks program.
5	Schreiber	Make all end of line crossovers near side of platforms, saves time and is much safer for operators. This is the U.S. standard	Comment noted. Crossovers conform to standards and are located as close to the platform as track geometrics allow. The crossovers at Iliff, 13th, and Colfax station platforms are the farthest from the station platform because of curves or steep grade. Therefore, these crossovers have been placed at the closest straight and level track location.
6	Kellogg	I'm looking forward to the final operation of the light-rail and hope that funding can be figured out that will be able to follow it to proceed quickly with no delays. Thank you all for you diligent and hard work!	<p>Comment noted. Additional text has been added under <i>What are the next steps?</i> on page ES-27 to address current funding concerns.</p> <p><u>RTD continues to explore funding and phasing options to proceed with implementation of the FasTracks Program. The opening day for the I-225 Corridor will be scheduled in accordance with the FasTracks financial plan. RTD is committed to implementing the whole FasTracks program.</u> As the engineering design progresses, there are several key issues to be resolved, including:</p> <p>This additional text was also added to Chapter 5 in <i>Section 5.4 Next Steps</i> (p. 5-9).</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
7	Plana	Environmental evaluation report recently released was written before the location of the VA hospital was announced. Report needs to be updated. Noise and vibration would be a big issue. Looking at the maps from the meeting, it looks like the track is far enough back from the hospital that noise and vibration won't be as big of an issue	Comment noted. RTD has been coordinating with the Veterans Administration regarding the development of their property since fall 2007. Neither vibration nor noise impacts are anticipated to the planned facility. Figure 3.10.4 shows the projected vibration levels near the planned VA facility (vacant parcel just west of vibration measurement site V-4). As design progresses, additional Detailed Noise Analysis will be completed to determine if any mitigation is warranted.
8	McHugh	Aurora Street Traffic mitigation for Iliff RTD Park and Ride Station. Make East Harvard and Blackhawk a one-way street for one to one and a half blocks going west bound. This traffic change will mitigate cars exiting the park and ride and cutting through the residential neighborhood by using Harvard/Dillon to Iliff as an exit. Traffic would then have to use Abilene, Anaheim, or Blackhawk to either Iliff or Yale. Cost of this change would be minimal. This would increase safety for the children residing in this area.	Comment noted, however based on traffic analyses this mitigation is not warranted. Vehicles will have direct and convenient access from the park-n-Ride at Blackhawk Street to Iliff Avenue, as opposed to traveling a less direct route by cutting through the neighborhood along Harvard/Dillon to access Iliff. A westbound one-way section along Blackhawk/Harvard would severely restrict movements from the park-n-Ride and would not allow exiting vehicles to access Iliff Avenue via Blackhawk. This configuration would also be inconsistent with driver expectations, as there would be two-way sections on each end of the proposed one-way section. RTD will continue to coordinate with the City of Aurora after opening day to identify any adjustments at the station area and park-n-Ride needed due to traffic impacts. The City of Aurora would be responsible for any changes to roadway configurations within adjacent neighborhoods.
9	Nichols, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation	<i>Entire letter provided in Appendix B</i> Thank you for your correspondence dated and received by our office on July 9 2009 regarding the review of the above-mentioned project After review of the provided information we concur that resource	The original file search included a 1985 inventory form submitted by Sally Pearce for resource 5AM.366. It was identified as a vernacular residence, frame and stucco, with an absence of architectural features and ornamentation. Photographs of the house and ancillary buildings were attached to the form. No historic



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>5AH.388.5/segment of High Line Canal retains integrity and supports the overall eligibility of the entire linear resource 5AH.388 High Line Canal. Resource 5AM.336/2800 Peoria Street has not been fully evaluated for National Register eligibility. We recommend that you complete a site form for this resource in order to fully evaluate whether or not the property is eligible for the National Register. If determined eligible we recommend assessing the potential effects of the project on the property.</p>	<p>information or owner information was provided on the form.</p> <p>Upon additional review by the Project Team, a site form for resource 5AM.366 (2800 Peoria Street) was not prepared because the buildings have been razed. Follow up research concluded that no additional information on the owner or the history of the property is available.</p> <p>A July 2009 search of the Adams County Tax Assessor records for 2800 Peoria Street did not provide any information on this property and no buildings were identified on 2008/2009 aerial photographs or field survey. Coordination with Patricia Schuler at Aurora Parks and Open Space suggested that the buildings at 2800 Peoria Street were more than likely razed between 2000 and 2002 when that portion of the Sand Creek Greenway and Park was developed. Additionally, Jeanne Ramsay, preservation assistant at the Aurora Historic Sites and Preservation Office, reported that the resource 5AM.366 was not on their listing of historic properties nor did she have any information on the buildings or the owners.</p> <p>The text in Section 3.5.1 (p. 3-64) was updated to reflect this updated finding. <u>A residential house was located at 2800 Peoria Street (5AM.366). An inventory form was completed for this property in 1985. Additional research indicated that the house was demolished between 2000 and 2002, and no remnants remain of the structure. No further information was available on the house from either the Aurora Historic Sites and Preservation Office, or from assessor records.</u></p> <p>NRHP Eligibility for resource 5AM.366 has also been updated in Table 3.5.1 <i>Historic Resources within the Study</i></p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			Area (p. 3-65) to: <u>Field Not Eligible (7/1/1985), buildings destroyed per field survey August 2009</u>
10	Aryan	The relationship between parking and the station at 2nd/Abilene is of a concern. Parking is simply too far.	Comment noted. The City of Aurora's approved general development plan for this site calls for Transit Oriented Development directly adjacent to the 2nd/Abilene station platform. Station parking was not included as part of this development plan. Therefore, the proposed park-n-Ride lot was sited on the closest undeveloped land. The relocated sidewalk connection along Ellsworth Avenue and Abilene Street is approximately 1,200 to 1,700 feet from the station platform to the southwest corner and northeast corners of the park-n-Ride. A pedestrian bridge over the High Line Canal and sidewalks are proposed as part of the Abilene Station TOD, which will be approximately 700 to 1,000 feet from the station platform to the farthest corners of the park-n-Ride. (Figure ES.8 or Figure 2.12). RTD does not have a maximum distance for park-n-Ride locations, but they are generally located within ¼ mile (1,320 feet) and sited based on land availability, environmental restrictions, potential for TOD development, bus access, and other factors.
11	Aryan	Routing of tracks along creek and over Colfax	The light rail tracks are proposed to parallel the west side of Toll Gate Creek and cross over Colfax Avenue just west of I-225.
12	Aryan	Raised station over Colfax is visually problem and not user friendly	Comment noted. The Colfax Station platform will be approximately 25 feet above Colfax Avenue, west and horizontally parallel of the existing I-225 structure. Scenic views of the mountains from viewers on the east are already obstructed by the existing I-225 structure. Additionally, the height of the bridge is consistent with the heights of buildings on the Anschutz/ Fitzsimons Medical Campus. The station will include stairs and elevators connecting

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>to both sides of Colfax Avenue. Because of the high traffic volumes on Colfax Avenue, an at-grade crossing was eliminated from further consideration. Figure 2.5 illustrates the crossing locations considered at Colfax Avenue. RTD will continue to coordinate with Aurora's station area planning process to provide an attractive and convenient station platform.</p>
13	Aryan	Overall concerned over not paying attention to city beautification.	Comment noted. RTD is sensitive to the City's aesthetic preferences, but does not have the budget to provide enhancements beyond basic station features.
14	Fishhaber, Public Utilities Commission	<p><i>Entire letter provided in Appendix B</i></p> <p>The PUC has jurisdiction in Colorado to determine all public highway-rail crossing matters including the proper location of crossings and the proper safety measures for highway-rail crossing. The methodology used in the I-225 Corridor DEE is not a methodology that has been approved for use by the PUC nor is it binding on the PUC. Although the DEE may make certain recommendations regarding the proposed number and configuration of highway-rail crossings along the I-225 Corridor the PUC is not bound by these recommendations and may order a different number and/or configuration of crossings than those proposed in the DEE once the application for the crossings has been filed.</p>	<p>RTD understands there is no approved methodology and that safety measures are determined by the PUC on a crossing-by-crossing basis. Additional clarification was added on the following pages:</p> <p>Page ES-23: Upon Project implementation, the LRT would operate adjacent to travel lanes and in the median of roadways, requiring coordination between LRT and vehicular movement. <u>The Project will also include proper safety measures at rail crossings. RTD has proposed crossing treatments for 62 locations, but the ultimate number and/or configuration of crossings will be determined as part of the PUC application process that will be initiated after preliminary engineering.</u></p> <p>Page 2-39: Continued coordination with City of Aurora staff and PUC will refine these crossing treatments to balance safety with LRT and vehicle operations. <u>However, the PUC is not bound by these recommendations and may require a different number and/or configuration of crossings than those proposed by the FasTracks I-225 Team.</u></p> <p>Page 4-20: Table 4.6 summarizes all crossings and the proposed mitigation</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>measures. Figures 4.5 through 4.8 illustrate these 62 crossing locations. <u>The Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has jurisdiction to determine all public highway-rail crossing matters including the proper location of crossings and the proper safety measures for highway-rail crossings. The PUC is not bound by these recommendations and may require a different number and/or configuration of crossings than those proposed in this document once the application for the crossings has been filed.</u></p> <p>Page 4-24: Sentence changed From: The Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has responsibility for the oversight of the safety and security of rail fixed guideway systems, such as the I-225 LRT. To: <u>The PUC has responsibility for all public highway-rail crossing matters, such as the I-225 LRT.</u></p>
15	Fishhaber, Public Utilities Commission	The I225 Corridor DEE is inconsistent in its use of Public Utility Commission and Public Utilities Commission. Please revise the document to consistently use Public Utilities Commission	Utility changed to <u>Utilities</u> in ES, Chapter 1, and Chapter 5
16	Earley	In reviewing the map for the Iliff station, it appears that the yellow line drawn on Yale at Harvard, going west over I-225, onto the Strawberry Heather Ridge property is considered for Fast Tracks to purchase this "Private" property. Please let me know if I'm reading this correctly or not. I am greatly concerned that we (Strawberry Heather Ridge) will be losing some of our property.	The yellow outline displayed on the maps presented at Public Meeting #4 illustrates the anticipated extent of temporary construction impacts. Consistent with previous CDOT environmental and design efforts, the FasTracks I-225 project will include the replacement of the existing Yale Bridge to allow for light rail clearance below the structure. Based on the current design no additional private property will need to be acquired. During construction, there may be temporary use within the yellow outline. RTD will coordinate with affected property owners in advance of construction to obtain temporary construction access. Areas of temporary disturbance will be



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			restored to the original condition and any vegetation that had been removed will be replaced with like-kind vegetation, where feasible.
17	Kwolkoski	Larry: I've reviewed the Draft Environmental Evaluation with respect to noise and vibration. My interest is in the PPS Building under construction on the Fitzsimons campus. I have a few questions and requests for information. I've copied David Towers of HMMH on this as well since I assume he would be the one to respond. 1. One of the noise impacted receivers is R56, which is the library right next door to the PPS Building. I'm referring to Pages 3-120 and 3-121. Can you provide more detailed information on the impact at R56? In particular, I'm interested in the measured ambient sound level and the predicted light rail noise level.	Additional information from the Noise Technical Report was provided via email attachment to requestor, including maps of noise monitoring locations, receptor locations. Existing noise exposure at R56 is 50 dBA, with a total projected noise exposure of 59 dBA (9dB noise exposure increase).
18	Kwolkoski	2. The vibration impact distances given in Table 3.10.4 are much higher at the PPS Building than at receivers V-5 and V-7. The table states that the distances are all at train speeds of 30 mph. Does HMMH know why the distances are so much higher?	Distances are site specific. The projections are based on combining our vibration source (Force Density) data for the RTD vehicle with the vibration propagation (Transfer Mobility) data at the PPS Building. The potential for vibration impacts depends on the level of sensitivity of equipment that may be used in those buildings.
19	Kwolkoski	3. Can HMMH provide a chart of vibration velocity levels at the PPS Building in 1/3 octave bands for a train speed of 30 mph? Was there a reason that you analyzed vibration at a speed of 30 mph at the PPS Building? I understand from RTD that the train speed in that area will be about 20 mph due to the nearby station and the curve.	Additional information from the Vibration Technical Report was provided via email attachment to requestor, including a graph of projected vibration velocity levels at the PPS Building for a LRT speed of 30 mph. For comparative purposes, the tables and graphs were based on a train speed of 30 mph since that represents the maximum speed along Montview. However, the vibration contours reflect the actual speeds by location along the alignment. For a speed of 20 mph near the PPS building, the projected vibration levels would be 3.5 dB lower than at 30 mph, assuming that vibration

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			levels vary in proportion to 20 log (speed).
20	Cardwell	I would fully support an extension of the current Lightrail to pass through Aurora, following the I-225 corridor. I believe that many people would use this facility, and I do think that it is necessary to extend the Lightrail out to the eastern districts.	Comment noted. Thank you for your support of the FasTracks Program.
21	Finch, City and County of Denver	Hi Nancy I will submit City & Co comments this afternoon. But I was wondering what the next step will be since this is an EE rather than an EA. I assume there won't be a FINAL EE document actually reprinted. How will we know how our comments have been addressed? Will there be a FONSI-like document that will document the agreed up Preferred Alternative? Thanks, Janice M. Finch, AICP Principal Planner Denver Public Works - Policy and Planning 201 West Colfax, Dept. 509 Denver, CO 80202 Phone: 720-865-3163 FAX: 720-865-2676 E-mail: janice.finch@denvergov.org	Text has been updated in Executive Summary (pgs. ES-25) to reflect the next steps: <u>Between July 10 and August 10, 2009, the public and agencies provided over 120 comments on the Draft EE. Agency comment letters are included in their entirety in appendix B. Public and agency comments and responses are provided in Appendix C. Where applicable, this Final EE has been updated to reflect these comments.</u> <u>The FINAL EE, including public and agency comments, will be presented to the RTD Board for adoption. Once the Final EE is adopted by the RTD Board of Directors, including mitigation measures, the project may move to final design and construction.</u> This additional text was also added to Chapter 5 in <i>Section 5.4 Next Steps</i> (p. 5-9).
22	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	<i>Entire letter provided in Appendix B</i> Land Use/Economic Considerations/ Right-of-Way- The horizontal alignment and location of the proposed Light Rail Corridor and corresponding tracks will have a direct impact on the Colorado Science + Technology Park at Fitzsimons (CSTP). The presently proposed alignment encroaches significantly onto the southwest quadrant of the CSTP	Comment noted. As part of ongoing coordination with the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority and the City of Aurora, the curve in this location has been tightened to avoid impacts to the planned building site.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>boundary, which seriously inhibits the developability of this area of the CSTP (see attached exhibit). This encroachment could result in significant economic detriment to the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority and to Forest City-Fitzsimons as it compromises a planned building site, as clearly indicated on the exhibit. It is vital that continuing coordination on this alignment take place with the stakeholders representing the CSTP to work towards developing win-win solutions that benefit that light rail corridor and the adjacent land-uses.</p>	
23	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	<p>Public Safety and Security - Because of the volume of crossings and the density of development in and around the Fitzsimons/Anschutz campus, pedestrian, vehicle and train safety at the intersections and at-grade crossings in this area is of great importance to us. Because of the urban character of the campus, we oppose the use of physical barriers and fencing and encourage the ample use of visual and audible safety devices to assure safety in the area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Safety is of paramount concern along the light rail corridor and at all rail crossings. RTD will continue to coordinate with the City of Aurora, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority, and other stakeholders to ensure that barriers and fencing enhance the safety of LRT, vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians.</p> <p>Text was revised in Section 3.8.2.2 (p. 3-98): <u>Right-of-way barriers and fencing will be consistent with RTD’s LRT Design Criteria. Barriers may range from a five-foot concrete wall with a seven-foot chain link fence (at Florida Station) to a 6-inch curb along Montview Boulevard through the Anschutz/Fitzsimons Medical Campus. RTD’s LRT Design Criteria specifies chain link as the standard fencing, however; City of Aurora fence regulations apply to all LRT station areas. Fencing and barrier enhancements may be considered based on site-specific hazard analysis, land use, visual context, City of Aurora regulations, and access needs.</u></p> <p>Additional text was added to Section 3.7.2.2 (p. 3-91) to address barrier and fencing safety: The introduction of LRT and at-grade crossings would introduce the risk for</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>accidents between LRT and pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicle operators which are discussed in Chapter 4. Barriers and fencing, <u>consistent with RTD's design guidelines, will be placed on both sides of the light rail track to reduce the potential for collisions. Crossings of the LRT will only be allowed at intersection controlled, grade crossings.</u></p> <p>Figure 4.8 identifies light rail crossing mitigation within the Anschutz/Fitzsimons Medical Campus, including 16 intersection controlled crossing locations with traffic signals or passive control (e.g., stop sign, flashing beacons, striping). The proposed crossing locations conform to the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority's approved development plan and proposed Montview Boulevard roadway configuration. RTD has proposed safety measures at all rail crossings, however, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC) is not bound by these recommendations and may require a different number and/or configuration of crossings.</p>
24	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Parks, Recreational Facilities and Open Space - While it is anticipated that the Fitzsimons Golf Course will be redeveloped prior to construction of the LRT, if the golf course is still in operation, temporary construction impacts and land use impacts may need to be mitigated for the golf course.	<p>Text was added to pgs. ES-31 and 3-87:</p> <p><u>If LRT is constructed prior to redevelopment, mitigation will be provided for both direct impacts to the recreation area (if required) and temporary construction impacts.</u></p>
25	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Visual and Aesthetic Resources - The proposed use of a barrier consisting of a chain link fence that sits atop a jersey barrier along the rail corridor on the east side of Peoria from Montview Boulevard to 25th Avenue is wholly incompatible with the character of the CSTP. In addition, this treatment would compromise pedestrian accessibility to the campus and	<p>Comment noted. RTD will continue to coordinate with the City of Aurora, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority, and other stakeholders to ensure that barriers and fencing provide for the safety of LRT, vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. This coordination effort included the dedication of an 18' clear zone (tree lawn and sidewalk) on the east side of Peoria Street, to allow for the removal of jersey barrier along the LRT north of Montview Boulevard.</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		would shut the campus off from the community. We are also concerned about this barrier treatment along Fitzsimons Parkway, where it would compromise both aesthetics and access to the open space amenities along Tollgate Creek. In addition, we request that a high level of coordination continue with regard to minimizing the visual impacts of the substations around the campus. We strongly encourage continued coordination with the campus partners on this issue to develop a mutually agreeable solution.	<p>Figure 4.8 proposes the LRT crossing locations at the Colorado Science and Technology Park at Fitzsimons, but the PUC will have final determination on the location and configuration of these crossings. Because of vehicle and train speeds, bicycle and pedestrian crossings will be physically restricted by fencing and/or barriers to the proposed LRT crossing locations (except for the section along Montview Boulevard designated as “downtown street running” with a 6” curb). RTD’s LRT Design Criteria specifies chain link as the standard fencing, however; enhancements may be considered based on site-specific hazard analysis, land use, visual context, City of Aurora regulations, and access needs.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 2.5.2.1, the location of power substations will be developed and refined during preliminary and final engineering processes. RTD is committed to continued coordination with stakeholders to consider reasonable cost effective aesthetic treatment options during design (Tables ES.5 and 3.8.3).</p>
26	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Noise - The potential for track squeal at curves in the track throughout the Fitzsimons/Anschutz Campus is a concern and design solutions which minimize this issue are encouraged.	Comment noted. RTD is committed to completing additional detailed noise analysis at 65 and 90 percent design, or equivalent submittals as part of the design process. If noise impacts due to wheel squeal occur, mitigation will be required.
27	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Vibration and Electro-magnetic Fields/Electro-magnetic Interference - We appreciate the high level of attention and coordination given to the issues of vibration and EMI on the Fitzsimons/Anschutz campus as well as the proposed mitigation measures for EMI issues. Because of the extreme importance of these issues to the success of the campus, we request that as design moves	<p>Comment noted. Since project initiation, RTD has held seven meetings with stakeholders on the Anschutz/Fitzsimons Medical Campus to address EMI issues. In Table 3.10.5, RTD commits to continued coordination with stakeholders within vibration impact areas or who own sensitive equipment.</p> <p>Text was also added to Section 2.5.2.1 (p. 2-38): There would be approximately ten</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		forward the site stakeholders remain continually informed and involved with the development of the mitigation measures for these issues. Of particular concern is the location of the power substations, which needs to be carefully planned to both reduce EMI and to minimize visual impacts.	traction power substations (TPSS) along the corridor. <u>Continued coordination with stakeholders will minimize potential visual impact and electro-magnetic fields / electro-magnetic interference impacts related with TPSS siting.</u>
28	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Utilities - As a rapidly developing area, numerous utilities have been and will continue to be constructed in and around the proposed LRT corridor on the Fitzsimons/Anschutz campus. In addition, many old utilities are being removed and abandoned in this same area. It is very important that as design progresses and immediately prior to any construction on or around the campus that the utility and infrastructure information on file be updated and verified with all applicable utility service providers and property owners, including the University of Colorado, the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority, Forest City - Fitzsimons, and the City of Aurora.	Comment noted. RTD is committed to conducting a detailed field survey and coordinating with utility owners and municipalities prior to construction (Table 3.16.2). Interruptions to utilities will be minimized during construction.
29	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Storm water - The Montview Boulevard corridor has a number of short-range and long range stormwater drainage facilities in place. As the roadway corridor develops over time, accompanying stormwater facilities will continue to be implemented. It will be important for the LRT Design Team to work with the Montview Boulevard Roadway Design Team towards mutually beneficial solutions. The overarching objectives should be to 1) Develop solutions that work in an interim and ultimate condition and that minimize re-building and "throw-away" of recently constructed stormwater	Comment noted. The I-225 Team is assuming that Montview Boulevard and drainage development will occur prior to LRT construction. RTD will continue coordination with FRA and Matrix Design Group to address stormwater management issues.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		facilities; 2) Recognize that the high density/urban nature of the CSTP will require unique approaches to stormwater management, and 3) Respect the stormwater management framework established in the CSTP Infrastructure Master Plan.	
30	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Page 3-164 map 10 # 63. 12635 E. Montview Blvd. Facility is a bioscience lab/office building not a medical clinic as it has been labeled on this page.	Text changed from <u>Medical Clinic</u> to <u>Bioscience lab/office</u> on page 3-164.
31	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Page 3-165 map 10# 66, 2079 Victor Street, (Building 2IS?). This former facility was the Army steam plant that was previously decommissioned by the Army and then demolished by the FRA/Forest City. The entire building footprint area and significant additional area surrounding the building has been environmentally remediated. The address of the old steam plant, building 215, was not 2079 Victor Street. The correct address was 13045 E. Montview Blvd.	Text has been updated on page 3-165 to reflect comment and indicate remediation and correct address: 2079 Victor Street changed to <u>13045 East Montview Boulevard</u> ; incinerator, storage units, old apartments changed to <u>Army Steam Plant</u> ; Fitzsimons redevelopment — historic contamination and remediation changed to <u>Structure was formerly the Army steam plant. It was decommissioned by the Army and then demolished during redevelopment. The building footprint area and surrounding areas have been remediated.</u>
32	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Page 4-6. RTD bus route DM: Fitzsimons Parkway is a City of Aurora public Right-of- Way not a private road\way so an Intergovernmental Agreement may not be necessary to operate a bus route.	Text edited to remove the reference to Fitzsimons Parkway (p. 4-6). Final routing changes will be dependent on an intergovernmental agreement to allow RTD to operate on Fitzsimons Parkway and roads internal to the medical center.
33	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	LRT Plan and Profile map, page TP-041: This map sheet should show the proposed new I-225/Colfax interchange design, which will likely be constructed prior to the proposed LRT construction.	Design detail on other projects was not completely available for the interim preliminary engineering submittal in Appendix A. Appendix A of the Final EE includes the 30 percent preliminary engineering design and detail on other proposed projects including the City of Aurora's I-225/Colfax interchange project (Appendix A: TP-141).



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
34	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	LRT Plan and Profile map, page TP-043: Numerous buildings shown on these diagram/map pages have been previously demolished. Future versions of the LRT Plan & Profile design sheets should be updated to show these actual conditions on the site. as well as ne\l street construction.	Comment noted. Survey for preliminary engineering was developed in early 2008. As design progresses, future survey will be completed to reflect most recent conditions on the ground.
35	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	LRT Plan and Profile map sheets TP-043 thru TP-048 need to be checked to insure they are using the latest design configuration and track geometry) for the new Montview Boulevard Roadway Design developed by Matrix Design Group for FRA and Forest City.	Comment noted. Coordination with Matrix Design Group has been on-going and will continue through future design phases. Track alignment, drainage, and station locations have been coordinated relative to the proposed Montview Boulevard reconstruction provided by Matrix Design Group.
36	Farnham, Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority	Appendix B: We suggest that the Fitzsimons and Anschutz Campus stakeholders also be identified in this appendix.	Appendix B includes agency (public or quasi-public organizations with jurisdiction), but not stakeholder correspondence. Table 5.2 on page 5-3 has been updated to include specific Anschutz/Fitzsimons stakeholders. RTD also maintains a contact list and comment database throughout the course of the entire project from planning to implementation to maintain contact with stakeholders.
37	Callison, City of Aurora	<i>Entire letter provided in Appendix B</i> Peoria-Smith Rail Station: The Peoria-Smith Rail Station serves as a key rail transfer station connecting the I-225 LRT line with the East Corridor Commuter rail line. This station complex needs to be designed and constructed with all the features consistent with a major light rail/commuter rail transfer station. City staff believes the following station elements need to be incorporated into the Peoria-Smith Rail Station: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Platform Access - Due to the 400-ft. distance between the stairs and ramps at each end of the platform, there needs to 	Comment noted. Specific I-225 light rail platform elements will be developed as part of final design, including mid-platform access. Weather protection and other urban design features will be considered to the extent feasible within budget and program constraints. As noted in Section 2.5.2.1, continued coordination with the City of Aurora will refine these elements as design progresses. Text in Section 2.4.3.4 has been expanded to address the I-225 and East Corridor interface (pgs 2-36 and 2-37): <u>Peoria/Smith Station elements beyond the I-225 alignment and station platform will be provided as part of the</u>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>be a mid-platform access point that allows passengers from the northbound I-225 LRT line to directly access the east-bound commuter rail line platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weather Protection - Weather protection is an important station design element. This is a unique transfer facility in the regional rail system in terms of the high level of LRT and commuter rail passenger transfers expected to occur between the two rail lines and the need to accommodate airport travelers with luggage and children. The station setting is in the midst of an open industrial area and exposed to strong winds. Therefore, this station merits additional elements to protect the transit customer. ▪ The length of the platforms should be substantially covered by canopies. Tall windscreens should be incorporated to provide protection from prevailing winds (i.e., glass windscreens). Heating elements (i.e., infrared heaters) should be included to provide passenger comfort since the wait can be as long as 15 minutes. ▪ The design of the canopies should be a functional design that provides weather protection. Glass inserts in the canopies can provide natural light beneath the canopies. ▪ A canopy structure should cover the entire station platform. At a minimum, the eastbound commuter rail platform and the northbound light rail platform should have a single canopy structure that 	<p>East Corridor project. The East Corridor design includes the East Corridor commuter rail alignment, East Corridor station platform, park-n-Ride, and street sections, including the relocation of Smith Street along Moline and 33rd Avenue (which are addressed in the <i>East Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement [EIS]</i>).</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>provides shelter for both platforms. The station platform should be covered where possible, and not interfere with the catenary (examples are Vancouver and Dallas downtown stations).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ramps should be covered by canopies. Without weather protection, these ramps will be slippery and a hazard for transit customers during rain and snow events. ▪ The pedestrian plaza should be enlarged. Relocating a portion of the commuter parking will allow for the creation of a larger pedestrian plaza that should have trees and benches (i.e., area east of the bus transfer facility). ▪ The station design needs to provide a public restroom facility. Creative approaches to providing this needed facility ranging from a RTD constructed and maintained facility to a public-private vendor arrangement need to be fully considered. ▪ A location for public art should be provided since the City of Aurora's public art program can provide a feature artwork. The RTD drivers' restroom facility should be relocated from the central position in the bus turnaround to a location that is not so visually prominent. ▪ All street sections need to meet acceptable City of Aurora urban street standards. 	
38	Callison, City of Aurora	Parking Strategies: The Aurora Strategic Parking Plan and Program Study enhanced and improved the regional travel demand model utilized by the RTD project team with recent	Comment noted. RTD appreciates the City's cooperative and creative approach to meeting future parking demand. RTD is committed to monitoring future parking demand and working in partnership with

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>travel survey data (summer 2008) and identified a higher parking demand beyond the 1800 parking spaces identified in the current FasTracks Program by RTD for year 2015 LRT line opening day. This was done in coordination and consultation with the RTD FasTracks I-225 Project Team and DRCOG/RTD transportation modeling staff. RTD has not disputed the commuter parking demand estimates generated by the city parking study and supports the methodology applied to generate these parking demand estimates. Aurora recognizes RTD's current financial limitations and will work in partnership with RTD and other stakeholders to develop alternative and creative solutions in meeting additional parking demand that is expected to be realized on opening day as well as in future years. One approach to providing parking could through a joint public-private partnership arrangement. It is our desire to have structured parking at appropriate locations such as at the Iliff station on opening day. It is important for RTD to commit to partnering with the city to adequately address LRT customer parking requirements as the project advances through final design and construction. It is key for RTD to have a contingency plan formulated to address parking needs once actual LRT operations start so that any appropriate modifications can be implemented in a reasonable time frame.</p>	<p>stakeholders and the City to identify parking strategies to meet this demand. To the extent feasible within budget and program constraints, RTD will continue to work cooperatively with the City to address parking related issues.</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
39	Callison, City of Aurora	LRT Line and Station Designs: Refinement of specific line and station elements is anticipated to be accomplished over the next several months to an approximate 30% preliminary design level. The Colfax Station situated over Colfax Avenue will need to be designed and constructed with consideration given to this location being a major gateway into the Anschutz/Fitzsimons Medical Campus. City fence regulations apply to all fencing located at LRT station areas. This will require close coordination and approval by city staff when fencing type and location decisions are being made during project final design. City staff will continue to coordinate with RTD throughout the design process to work at ensuring that station designs complement their service areas and are consistent with adjacent development objectives. City staff will remain involved and keep the committee briefed as progress on this occurs and as policy decisions arise.	Comment noted. RTD will continue to work cooperatively with the City of Aurora to address and resolve design refinements within RTD's budget and program constraints. Please refer to response to Comment 12 for the Colfax Station and Comments 23 and 25 for fencing.
40	Callison, City of Aurora	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Connections at Stations: RTD will need to construct bicycle and pedestrian facility connections that provide a continuous link from existing adjacent facilities to station platform and parking areas as part of the LRT project. Adequate bicycle storage facilities at stations need to be provided.	<p>Comment noted. RTD has provided connections between station platforms and associated park-n-Rides. Additionally, RTD may slightly shift or relocate existing sidewalk to provide direct connections from existing adjacent facilities. RTD anticipates that additional connections with existing and future pedestrian facilities will be provided by others as part of TOD development. RTD will continue to coordinate with Aurora not to preclude future trail connections.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.7.2, RTD normally provides a minimum of six dual bicycle lockers and three inverted "U" bicycle racks at transit stations. It is anticipated that RTD will continue to provide bicycle storage at or above these levels at FasTracks stations,</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			based on technical feasibility and public input on design.
41	Callison, City of Aurora	Public Utilities Commission Approval of LRT At-Grade Street Crossings: LRT at-grade crossings such as those recommended at Alameda Parkway, Abilene Street, Sable Boulevard, Fitzsimons Parkway and Peoria Street will need to secure approval by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The general process will involve RTD submitting a request to the commission seeking approval of identified at-grade LRT crossings of streets. The city will need to formally request the at-grade LRT street crossings and coordinate with RTD in the development of the PUC request. This is expected to be initiated later this year, once preliminary engineering and design efforts have advanced. City staff will bring this proposal back to the Transportation and Airport Policy Committee and then on to City Council for approval prior to formal submittal to the PUC.	Comment noted. RTD will continue to work collaboratively with the City to obtain PUC approval.
42	Callison, City of Aurora	Traffic Impacts and Traffic Control Plans: LRT station generated traffic impacts will need to be mitigated by RTD so as to maintain service levels that are acceptable and approved by the city. Detailed traffic control plans crafted to manage traffic during project construction will need to be coordinated with city staff and approved prior to implementation.	Transportation Systems impacts and mitigation have been added to Table ES.5 and clearly identify impacts and commitments (pgs. ES-49 – ES-52). Text was also added to Section 4.5.1.3 to clarify this commitment (p. 4-14): <u>As design progresses, RTD will provide the City of Aurora with applicable traffic warrant studies and design for their review and comment.</u>
43	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-10, Figure ES.7 - Show the sidewalk extending north towards Alameda along the east side of the rail corridor. Again the same thing for Figure 2.11 on Page 2-32.	Sidewalk was extended north to Alameda Avenue in City Center Station graphics (Figures ES.7 and 2.11) in the Draft and Final EE.
44	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-21, Table ES.4 - During our meeting with RTD, RTD indicated they were able to provide the full 200 parking	Current design for the City Center Station accommodates 200 surface parking spaces. Text supporting Figure ES.7; text in Sections 2.4.3.2 (p. 2-32),

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		spaces and meet the City's landscape standards. Therefore, the note below the table indicating only 178 spaces could be provided if the COA standards were followed needs to be eliminated.	and 4.5.1.3 (p. 4-16); and Figures ES.7 and 2.11 have been updated to reflect 200 spaces. Tables ES.4 and 4.5 were edited prior to release of the Draft EE to remove the reference to the City of Aurora's standards.
45	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-27 - The City will need to review and approve all Traffic Control Plans.	Text on page ES-29 was changed to: A Traffic Control Plan will be reviewed and approved by CDOT, <u>Aurora, and Denver</u> for mitigation of temporary construction impacts <u>within their respective right-of-ways.</u>
46	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-30 – The Aurora Police Department needs to be contacted to determine if live feeds are ported to the APD.	Text was changed to (pg 3-93): Video surveillance systems will be capable of transmitting real-time video to RTD via a fiber optic transmission backbone or other suitable transmission network. <u>RTD will also evaluate the feasibility of sharing video with local police departments.</u>
47	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-31, Additional Mitigation – The second bullet states at least one open lane of traffic on affected arterials during construction will be maintained. City policy is to keep all lanes open on arterials during the peak hours, and allow one lane directionally to be closed during non-peak times.	Comment noted. Lane closures will be addressed on a case by case basis in coordination with the City of Aurora as part of the Traffic Control Plans for each phase of construction.
48	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-32, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Mitigation Measures - City fence regulations apply to all fencing located at LRT station areas. This will require close coordination and approval by city staff when fencing /wall type and location decisions are being made during project final design. City staff will continue to coordinate with RTD throughout the design process to work at ensuring that station and track segment designs complement their service areas and are consistent with adjacent development objectives and themes.	Mitigation text in ES-34 and Table 3.8.3 pg. 3-102 was revised to add: <u>RTD will continue to coordinate with the City of Aurora on design features including electrical substations and specific fencing/wall types located within the City's right-of-way and at station areas.</u> Text was revised in Section 3.8.2.2, Right-of-way barriers and fencing will be consistent with RTD's LRT Design Criteria. Barriers may range from a five-foot concrete wall with a seven-foot chain link fence (at Florida Station) to a 6-inch curb <u>along Montview Boulevard</u> through Anschutz/Fitzsimons Medical Campus. RTD's LRT Design Criteria



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<u>specifies chain link as the standard fencing; however, City of Aurora fence regulations apply to all LRT station areas. Fencing and barrier enhancements may be considered based on site-specific hazard analysis, land use, visual context, City of Aurora regulations, and access needs.</u>
49	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-35 - The hours of construction are in conflict with the City Noise Ordinance (146-1800 through 146-1805)	Comment noted. Generally, daytime construction activities for RTD projects occur between 7am and 7pm. Aurora Code specifies maximum permissible sound levels may occur between the hours of 7am to 5pm and until 9pm for light construction work. RTD will coordinate with the City during final design to incorporate noise ordinance guidelines into the Construction Management Plan. Please note that when construction time is restricted to certain daytime hours, the overall duration of project construction would increase.
50	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES 45 - An erosion control permit will be required for work in the City that is not on CDOT right of way.	Text on ES-47 and Table 3.17.4 pg. 3-185 was updated to include: <u>In construction areas within Aurora, plans must comply with Aurora specifications including City of Aurora Stormwater (Quality) Discharge Permit for Construction Activities.</u>
51	Callison, City of Aurora	Page ES-46, Table ES.5, Floodplains, Direct Impacts - Baranmor Ditch culvert extension needs to be relooked at. Based on the Outfall Systems Plan being prepared by UDFCD the anticipated flow at Peoria and Baranmor Ditch is approximately 1700 cfs. The single existing 72-inch RCP culvert will not be sufficient to convey this flow. The UDFCD's recommendation is for an 18' x 8' box culvert replacement at this location.	No change in text required. Preliminary engineering 30 percent plans will reflect UDFCD's recommendation; however, cost sharing of this enhancement will be determined during on-going coordination based on the timing of both projects. Should the culvert replacement and resize happen before LRT implementation, RTD will match the culvert and extend under the LRT and access road. Actual timing and funding is unknown at this time.
52	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 2-30, Figure 2.9, Iliff Station – Figure should depict a pedestrian facility extending from the Iliff Avenue sidewalk to the station platform area.	This pedestrian facility will be built by others as development occurs. Label on Figure ES.5 pg ES-11 and Figure 2.9 pg. 2-30 has been edited to state: <u>Future Development with pedestrian</u>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p><u>connections</u></p> <p>If RTD develops the station before development occurs, RTD will provide a temporary, standard sidewalk connecting Iliff Avenue and the station platform area. Cooperation from the landowner regarding this temporary use of property would be required.</p>
53	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 2-32, City Center - Figure 2.11 should depict a pedestrian route crossing the LRT tracks on the north side of Centrepont Drive so as to accomplish a crossing of Sable Boulevard.	<p>Comment noted. The pedestrian connection provided by RTD has been updated in Figures ES-12 and 2.11. Pedestrians will continue to use existing sidewalk and cross-walk on the north side of Centrepont Drive. Additional safety measures, such as gates, will be applicable to both vehicles and pedestrians at this intersection and will be finalized as part of the PUC application process.</p>
54	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 2-33, Figure 2.12, 2nd Avenue – Need to represent a more direct pedestrian route linking the northern end of the park-n-Ride lot to the station platform area. Figure should depict an enhanced connection across Abilene Street to the 2nd Avenue underpass as discussed in the text.	<p>This pedestrian facility from the proposed High Line Canal bridge will be built by others as development occurs. Label on Figure ES.10 pg. ES-14 and Figure 2.12 pg. 2-35 has been edited to state: <u>Future Development with pedestrian connections.</u></p> <p>Additionally, a pedestrian connection across the tracks to connect with the existing crosswalk at 2nd was added. Text on page 2-34 was revised to more accurately describe the crossing at 2nd: <u>The project also includes a bicycle and pedestrian crossing of the light rail alignment at the existing crosswalk on Abilene at the 2nd Avenue underpass. As TOD development occurs near this station, this crossing may be upgraded to a signalized intersection by others.</u></p>
55	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 2-37, Figure 2.16 Peoria/Smith Station – The East Corridor commuter rail station platform needs to be depicted as well as pedestrian facilities linking Peoria Street and the commuter parking areas to the platform.	<p>As discussed in response to Comment 37, the East Corridor EIS provides details on the East Corridor alignment, platform, pedestrian connections, and park-n-Ride. The I-225 Corridor EE evaluates the impacts associated with the LRT alignment and LRT station platform only. Figures ES.12 and 2.16 have been updated to show the general location of the East Corridor</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			Alignment and station platform.
56	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-75, Fitzsimons Golf Course – This facility is not located adjacent to Toll Gate Creek Greenway Trail.	Reference to Toll Gate Creek removed from page 3-74.
57	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-99 – Traction power electrical substation locations and screening proposals need to be reviewed by the city. Refinement of LRT track and station area fencing types and locations during final design will need to be reviewed and discussed with the city.	Comment noted. Please refer to responses for Comment 25, 29, and 48.
58	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-138, Direct Impacts, Mitigation Measures - Revise the wording to state replacements will be provided in conformance with the City of Aurora adopted standards and policies. The same revision should be made on Page ES-38 in the Vegetation, Direct Impacts section.	Text on page ES-40 and 3-137: with the City of Aurora's Landscape Ordinance (2004) was replaced with <u>City of Aurora adopted standards and policies.</u>
59	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-144 - What minimization and mitigation measures could be taken to better address wildlife impacts for common animals and their habitats not otherwise classified as Special Status Species?	Text was updated in Section 3.12.3.3 (pgs 3-142 and 3-143), <u>Minimization efforts to avoid help alleviate impacts to riparian and aquatic habitat included spanning Toll Gate Creek and Sand Creek. Common wildlife species that use the riparian corridors for daily or seasonal movements will benefit from the spanned bridge design at Toll Gate Creek and Sand Creek.</u> <u>Additionally, wildlife impacts resulting from the loss of vegetation will be minimized by implementing the mitigation measures described for vegetation in Table 3.12.2.</u> <u>Additions to Tables ES.5 and 3.12.4 include</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Implement mitigation measures for loss of vegetation described in Table 3.12.2.</u> ▪ <u>Spanned bridge design at Toll Gate Creek and Sand Creek will help maintain daily and seasonal movements for wildlife species using the riparian corridors to</u>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<u>travel.</u>
60	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-184, Table 3.17.4 - The ballast within the rail corridor is being proposed to be used as a type of BMP for water quality. It is presently being presented to CDPHE for authorization. Currently it is not acceptable to the City. RTD must work through Joe Wingert in Aurora Water Department on its acceptability. At this time it is not acceptable. The proposed water quality ponds in the Sand Creek Regional Greenway west of Peoria Street and adjacent to Toll Gate Creek (5th bullet Mitigation Measure) will need to be reviewed and approved by the city.	Comment noted. As stated in Table 3.17.4, RTD is committed to working with the City of Aurora to comply with MS4 requirements and will build water ponds as necessary. As part of the MS4 permit process, the City will review and comment on all applicable plans.
61	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-186, Section 3.18.1, third bullet - The Baranmor Ditch was realigned to the west side of Peoria Street, not the east side of the Peoria Street. Also, there is an active Outfall Systems Plan underway with the UDFCD at this time. See Note 3 above.	Text on page 3-186 was changed to state: At present, a project is underway to modify the alignment of the ditch on the east <u>west</u> side of Peoria (YES, 2008). <u>Furthermore, UDFCD is preparing an Outfall Systems Plan.</u>
62	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-189, Table 3.18.1, Section 4, Baranmor Ditch - Same comment as Note 3 above.	Consistent with response to Comments 51 and 61, Text in Table 3.18.1 (p. 3-189) was updated to state: The existing culvert under Peoria Street would likely need to be <u>resized and extended</u> under the proposed track alignment, <u>consistent with UDFCD's Outfall Systems Plan and cost sharing agreements.</u> Text on pg. ES-48, Tables ES.5 and pg. 3-189 Table 3.18.3 updated to state: Baranmor Ditch floodplain-culvert <u>will be designed to safely convey 100 year flow and would result in both increases and decreases in the SHFA.</u>
63	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 3-192, Table 3.18.2, City of Aurora Flood Levels - With the City's new MS4 requirements the City is now looking at utilizing full spectrum volumes. Use one-half	Text on pg. 3-192 in Table 3.18.2 representing the City of Aurora's Major flood level requirements for onsite detention facilities was revised to read 100 year plus no less than one-half

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>of the EURV plus the one hundred year detention volume to obtain the total volume required. If the other method is allowed, the total volume required is the water quality capture volume plus the one hundred year detention volume.</p>	<p>WQCV This update is consistent with Section 6.33 volume and release rates in the City of Aurora's Storm Drainage Design and Technical Criteria (January 2005). RTD has requested a copy of the City's pending updates to its MS4 requirements once they are finalized.</p>
64	Callison, City of Aurora	<p>Page 4-3, Figure 4.1, Preferred Alternative 2035 Operating Plan and Peak Period Frequency - The rail operation plan depicts a year 2035 only. Discussion regarding the 2015 Opening Day operation plan should be provided.</p>	<p>Comment noted. RTD is currently developing the Final I-225 Transit Operations Plan, which will include specific 2015 operations. The Plan is expected to be available Fall 2009. In 2015, this Plan assumes the G line will have a 10 minute headway in peak periods and 15 minute headway in off-peak and the H-line operating every 15 minutes in the peak period. Other details on the 2015 operating plan are currently being developed.</p> <p>The 2035 scenario was fully developed for analysis in this EE as it would provide the maximum potential for impacts (both positive and negative) for evaluation in this non-federally funded environmental document. Potential impacts between Opening Day and 2035 are anticipated to be less than or equal to those projected for 2035.</p> <p>Text was updated in Section 4.2.1.2 (p. 4-3) to state: <u>On Opening Day in 2015, the G line would operate at a 10 minute headway during peak periods.</u> In 2035, the G Line would operate at a 7.5 minute headway in the peak periods <u>and, in 2035, the H-Line would operate every 15 minutes in the peak periods.</u> Together, in 2035, these two lines would provide a combined I-225 Corridor headway of 5 minutes between the Nine Mile and Florida Stations. <u>The H-Line operating plan is expected to be the same in both 2015 and 2035.</u></p> <p><u>Text was updated in ES (p. ES-20) to state:</u></p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			Figure ES.13 identifies the Preferred Alternative Operating Plan for the year 2035. <u>On Opening Day in 2015, the G line would operate at a 10 minute headway during peak periods. In 2035, the G Line would operate at a 7.5 minute headway in the peak periods and the H-Line would operate every 15 minutes in the peak periods. Together, these two lines would provide a combined I-225 Corridor headway of 5 minutes between the Nine Mile and Florida Stations. The H-Line operating plan is expected to be the same in both 2015 and 2035.</u>
65	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-7, Ridership Demand – Discussion regarding the 2015 Opening Day station boardings should be provided.	Comment noted. 2015 Opening Day station boardings are not available. RTD is currently developing the Final I-225 Transit Operations Plan, which will include specific 2015 operations. Please see response to Comment 64.
66	Callison, City of Aurora	<p>Page 4-9, Table 4.3, Mode of Access for Each Station: Preferred Alternative (2035) – This table depicts the modes of access for stations in 2035. Drive access should be provided for the Florida station by 2035.</p> <p>A 55% bus access was shown for the Montview station. Please verify if bus access is provided for this station. The number seems too high. This station is more likely accessed via walk/bike.</p> <p>Figure 4.3, AM Peak Period Travel Times, needs to have the origin and destination specified.</p>	<p>As part of the Preferred Alternative, RTD will not be providing parking at the Florida Station in 2015 or 2035. No drive access is modeled when parking is not provided. RTD is committed to monitoring future parking demand and working in partnership with stakeholders and the City to identify parking strategies to meet future parking demand.</p> <p>Bus access would be provided to the Montview Station via the route 20 and the route 89. Nearly half of the Montview Station activity (45%) is walk/bike. This is far higher than most of the other stations.</p> <p>Title of figure on pages ES-21 and 4-9 was updated to include origin and destination: 2035 AM Peak Period Travel Time Comparison <u>from Florida Station to 18th/California Station</u></p>
67	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-13, Iliff Station - A signalized intersection is proposed at the intersection of Anaheim Street and Harvard	Comment noted. Please refer to response for Comment 42.



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		Avenue on opening day. A warrant study showing this intersection will indeed meet warrants on opening day is required and will need to be approved by the city.	
68	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-13, 13th Avenue and Colfax Stations, Future Toll Gate Creek Trail – The future Toll Gate Creek trail link from the 13th Avenue Station to the Colfax Station and north to an eventual connection to the existing Sand Creek Trail is a key element in the city trail system. All efforts need to be made in identifying an appropriate trail alignment that is not precluded by the preferred LRT alignment and can be constructed in the future within a reasonable cost and meets safety and constructability standards. This will require continued coordination with the RTD project team and city staff.	Comment noted. RTD will continue to coordinate with Aurora not to preclude future trail connections.
69	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-14, Figure 4.4 – The Iliff Station exploded graphic needs to be modified to accurately depict the location of the station platform so as to be consistent with the Planned LRT Station symbol represented in the legend and used to identify platform locations at other stations.	Legend on page 4-14 has been updated to reflect station platforms and park-n-Ride locations.
70	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-15, City Center Station – First bullet, a signalized intersection is proposed at the intersection of Blackhawk St. and Exposition Ave. on opening day. A warrant study showing this intersection will indeed meet warrants on opening day is required and will need to be approved by the city. The 4th bullet states right turn lanes will be needed by 2015 at Alameda Blvd. and Sable Blvd. for eastbound and westbound traffic. Is RTD planning to install these, and if so, how does it coincide with city programmed	<p>Comment noted. Please refer to response for Comment 42. The right turn lanes are needed due to RTD related traffic so should be installed by RTD. When these lanes are installed and if their installation coincides with the Aurora left turn improvements will need to be decided based on discussions with/between RTD and Aurora. From a cost and construction standpoint, it would make sense to complete the improvements at the same time through continued RTD and City cooperation.</p> <p>The EE traffic analysis assumed the left turn lanes were in by 2015 No</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		dual left turn project for the north/south movements?	Action and that the right turn lanes were installed as part of the Preferred Alternative by 2015.
71	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-16, 13th Avenue Station, First bullet, a signalized intersection is proposed at the intersection of Sable Blvd. and 13th Avenue on opening day. A warrant study showing this intersection will indeed meet warrants on opening day is required and will need to be approved by the city.	Comment noted. Please refer to response for Comment 42.
72	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-17, Colfax Station - The statement regarding the I-225/Colfax interchange reconstruction including the installation of traffic signals at the 17th Place/Fitzsimons Parkway intersection being complete prior to the LRT opening in year 2015 needs to be modified. The interchange expansion project funding strategy objective is to secure sufficient funding to complete the interchange by the year 2015 time frame. This funding strategy is based on the availability of future federal funds appropriated in FY 2010, approval of a new federal transportation authorization bill and subsequent funding appropriation approval, and funding through the next cycle of the DRCOG TIP process. Phase II of the project, which has funding programmed, will establish either a partial or full 17th Place/Fitzsimons Parkway signalized intersection (depending on construction bids) is scheduled to be completed in the spring 2011 time frame.	Text on page 4-17 was changed to state: The Colfax Avenue Station would be a grade separated station located just to the west of the I-225/Colfax Avenue interchange. <u>There is no parking proposed for this station. Prior to Opening Day of the Preferred Alternative in 2015, the Just north of the Colfax Station, the City's I-225/Colfax interchange reconstruction project will be implemented with phased construction based on funding availability. reconstructed which will include the installation of traffic signals at the 17th Place/Fitzsimons Parkway and Montview Boulevard/Fitzsimons Parkway intersections. Phase II of the project, which has funding programmed, will establish either a partial or full 17th Place/Fitzsimons Parkway signalized intersection (depending on construction bids) and is scheduled to be completed in the spring 2011 time frame. There is no parking proposed for this station.</u>
73	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-17, Peoria/Smith Station – A signalized intersection is proposed at the intersection of Peoria St. and Baranmor Parkway on opening day. A warrant study showing this intersection will indeed meet warrants on opening day is required and will need to be	Comment noted. Please refer to response for Comment 42.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		approved by the city.	
74	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-22, Figure 4.8, LRT Crossing Mitigation Measures Section 4 - A right-in/right-out access on the east side of Peoria at approximately 25th Avenue is proposed to be closed. This access does not currently exist, but is part of the approved GDP for the Forest City development. All stakeholders need to collaborate in developing an acceptable solution that supports campus ingress-egress and is compatible with future LRT operations.	Comment noted. Please refer to response for Comment 14. RTD will continue to coordinate with stakeholders, Aurora, and the PUC to address safety and access at LRT crossings.
75	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-24, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities – RTD will need to construct bicycle and pedestrian facility connections that provide a continuous link from existing and programmed adjacent facilities to station platform and parking areas as part of the LRT project. Adequate bicycle storage facilities at stations need to be provided.	Comment noted. Please refer to response for Comment 40.
76	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-25, Montview Station - A proposed city project being presented for council action is providing bike lane sharrows pavement markings and signage on Montview Boulevard between the western city limits and Peoria Street.	The following update was made on page 4-25: According to this plan, a bike route on Montview Boulevard may not be developed due to cross-section design and off-street parking issues. was replaced with: <u>The City is considering a signed and shared bicycle lane along Montview Boulevard west of Peoria Street.</u>
77	Callison, City of Aurora	Page 4-26, Construction Mitigation & Traffic Control Plans – All traffic control plans will need to be coordinated so as to provide continuous access to retail and service businesses particularly during peak sales times.	Comment noted. As stated in Table 3.2.5 Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Where possible business access closure will be limited to times outside of normal operating hours.
78	Finch, City and County of Denver	Nanci and Mary Keith -- Attached are the comments and suggestions from the City and County of Denver on the I-225 Light Rail Transit Environmental Evaluation (EE) (July 10, 2009). We look forward to continuing to	Comment noted. RTD appreciates the City and County of Denver's continued coordination on this project.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>working with the I-225 team in finalizing the EE and proceeding with design and construction on the project. Thanks, Janice M. Finch, AICP Principal Planner Denver Public Works - Policy and Planning 201 West Colfax, Dept. 509 Denver, CO 80202 Phone: 720-865-3163 FAX: 720-865-2676 E-mail: janice.finch@denvergov.org See Attached file</p>	
79	Finch, City and County of Denver	<p><i>Entire letter provided in Appendix B</i></p> <p>MAJOR COMMENT - OPENING DAY DATA NEEDED: In each Chapter, this Envir Eval should emphasize Opening Day rather than just 2035. Otherwise, it is difficult to evaluate the positive and negative impacts that will be experienced immediately as opposed to 20 years later, especially with regard to contrasting existing bus service with Opening Day rail service. Is there budget to provide everything projected for 2035? Give a schedule of improvements as they would be phased over time, if known, and how they would be funded.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to Comment 64.</p> <p>RTD is currently developing the Final I-225 Transit Operations Plan, which will include specific 2015 operations. The Plan is expected to be available Fall 2009.</p> <p>Currently, there is not adequate budget to implement the entire corridor by 2015. As noted in response to Comment 6, RTD has been exploring alternative funding and phasing options to proceed with implementation of the FasTracks Program. At this time, the schedule for phasing and implementation is uncertain but RTD is committed to implementing the whole FasTracks program</p>
80	Finch, City and County of Denver	<p>MAJOR COMMENT - PARKING - The additional parking needs / demand at especially the Nine-Mile station -- as well as Dayton and others on the G line - both for Opening Day and for 2035 - should be addressed. Isn't the Nine-Mile Station already at capacity, and didn't early I-225 analysis show major parking needs generated by the opening of I-225 light rail extension? How will the additional parking be provided - with what funding source?</p>	<p>The Iliff park-n-Ride will provide some relief for parking demand at the Nine Mile station. Text was added to page 4-12</p> <p><u>Currently, parking demand at Nine Mile Station exceeds the available parking supply. Construction of the planned I-225 LRT and five parking areas along the corridor will greatly reduce parking demand at the Nine Mile Station. By 2035 the planned I-225 LRT is expected to reduce parking demand at Nine Mile station by about 1,000 vehicles. At that time parking supply at Nine Mile Station should be adequate to the meet the</u></p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p><u>demand.</u></p> <p>As indicated in Table ES.4, by 2035, ridership projections indicate that 2,100 additional parking spaces will be needed for LRT riders, in addition to the 1,800 spaces provided under the Preferred Alternative for Opening Day. Subsequent to opening the I-225 LRT, RTD will monitor the station area parking demand and work in partnership with stakeholders to identify parking strategies to meet this demand. Strategies could include enhancing alternate mode access and looking for opportunities to share parking with adjacent land uses. Additional strategies have been identified in the Aurora Strategic Parking Plan and Program Study, which identified the need for a total of 3,300 to 4,400 parking spaces on Opening Day (2015). RTD is committed to coordinating its parking plans with the City of Aurora. Please also refer to response to Comment 38.</p>
81	Finch, City and County of Denver	Consider changing Acronym List to a combination Glossary list so key terms like No Action, Build, Preferred, and other technical terms can be defined.	A Glossary was added after the Acronym List
82	Finch, City and County of Denver	Please continue to submit the EE and any engineering plans to CCD Public Works for our review. In particular, coordination will be needed between construction of Martin Luther King Boulevard as part of the Stapleton redevelopment and the I-225 Corridor work. The Denver Parks & Rec Department will need to be consulted along with the Park Creek Metro District on the open space impacts.	Comment noted. RTD is committed to coordinating with Denver, Aurora, and CDOT on all applicable plans as design progresses. Appendix B includes minutes from coordination with the Park Creek Metro District and mitigation measures note that an easement agreement will be established with the Park Creek Metro District prior to construction (Table 3.6.6).
83	Finch, City and County of Denver	Explain what the "Build Alternative" means, and perhaps add to Acronym List.	Comment noted. The Initial Build Alternative is described in the Glossary and in Section 2.3.1.3.



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
84	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page ES-14 -- The paragraph, "What is the No-Action Alternative?" should be moved to before Pages ES-5 or ES-6 in which the Build Alternatives and Preferred Alternatives are discussed, especially since the No-Action alternative is mentioned in Table ES.1 on p. ES-6, and is referenced in subsequent sections before the Preferred Alternative reference. See p. ES-14.	The No-Action Alternative description has been moved to page ES-3.
85	Finch, City and County of Denver	Provide a brief explanation how the numbers of parking spaces on Opening Day and in the year 2030 (or 2035) were derived since they are included in the Station layouts, or at least refer to Section ES.5, pp. ES-20 to ES-21, and any other appropriate section in Chapter 4 where detailed analysis is shown. This could be done by moving the first paragraph on p. ES-13 forward before the station diagram - otherwise it appears out of place and after the fact. Note that the station Figures show 2030 and Table ES.4 and the table in Chapter 4 says 2035 . Should be consistent. Why no parking for 3 of the stations - Florida, Colfax, and Montview - even by 2035?? Can the model really be showing that no one wants to park at these, or is this budget-driven only?	<p>Paragraph on p.ES-13 moved to page ES-9.</p> <p>Parking will be provided at the Peoria/Smith Station as part of the East Corridor project, which has a horizon year of 2030. (Figure ES.12) The I-225 project planning horizon is 2035 as reflected in Tables ES.4 and 4.5, but no additional parking is budgeted for Peoria/Smith as part of this project.</p> <p>Based on budget and land use/station area plans, Florida, Colfax, and Montview Stations are not proposed to provide parking in 2015 or 2035. The model was designed to not allow this as an option, so total parking demand would be allocated to a location consistent with station area plans.</p>
86	Finch, City and County of Denver	Figure ES.12 Peoria/Smith Station - Diagram should show the East Corridor line and the Station Platform for the East Corridor, and illustrate the cross platform transfer. The diagram should identify the specific elements of the tracks and the station platforms that would be funded by each of the corridor. Why will all the future Parking be provided by the East Corridor, when some will be generated by I-225?	<p>Please refer to response for Comment 37. Figures ES.12 and 2.16 have been revised to show the conceptual location of the East Corridor alignment and station platform.</p> <p>East Corridor, including the Peoria/Smith Commuter Rail station platform, park-n-Ride, and other associated station area improvements may be constructed prior to the I-225 Corridor. The East Corridor EIS provides impacts and mitigation associated with these improvements. Due to the timing of construction, the</p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>East Corridor has been responsible for the environmental clearance and will construct the park-n-Ride and Smith Road relocation. However, this construction will be funded jointly by both corridors and parking will be shared.</p>
87	Finch, City and County of Denver	<p>In paragraph before Table ES.2, change "five" to "seven" Key Environmental Resources because that is how many are designated as "Yes" in Table ES.2 and discussed on pp. ES-15 and ES-17. Retitle Table ES.2 since it is really about summarizing the key impacts - the current title and the "No" in the 2nd column implies that some of the resources were not evaluated.</p>	<p>In Section ES.4 (page ES-16), the following updates to the paragraph were made to address this comment:</p> <p>Impacts and mitigation for all resources evaluated in the EE are presented in Table ES. 5, which is located at the end of this Executive Summary. <u>Table ES.2 lists all of the resources that were considered during the Environmental Evaluation process. Resources that would require specific mitigation measures and have been identified as a major public or project stakeholder concern are indicated as resulting in key environmental resource impacts. The five. The seven key environmental resources are highlighted in Table ES.2 are also discussed in detail on the following pages. Table ES.2. These resources either would require specific mitigation as a result of the project, or they have been identified as a major public or project stakeholder concern.</u></p> <p>These updates to the text should make the title of the table more appropriate.</p>
88	Finch, City and County of Denver	<p>Shouldn't the ridership, Travel Times, and the Rail Operations Plan for Opening Day be presented first rather than just the 2035 numbers presented in Figure ES.14 and Table ES.3? Doesn't achieving the 2035 numbers require additional parking, train vehicles or train sets, and operating costs not currently included in the costing and available funding under the FasTracks program?</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 64. Text was added to page 4-3: <u>RTD is currently developing the Final I-225 Transit Operations Plan, which will include the planned bus and LRT operations for Opening Day in 2015. The Plan is expected to be available Fall 2009. Evaluation of the bus and LRT operations in 2035 is included in this EE to account for the maximum potential impacts (both positive and negative) in this non-federally funded document. Impacts on Opening Day are anticipated to be less than or equal to those projected for 2035.</u></p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
89	Finch, City and County of Denver	The Executive Summary, page ES-18, and Chapter 4, page 4-3, both include diagrams with a 40 th & 40 th endpoint for rail. This station designation has been defunct since early 2008 and the location should be corrected.	The Figure has been adjusted to remove the 40th/40th endpoint.
90	Finch, City and County of Denver	The Executive Summary, page ES-20, and Chapter 4, page 4-1, state that the Peoria/Smith Road station is to be constructed as part of the east Corridor project. The East Corridor Administrative Draft Final Environmental Impact Statement, however, does not reflect that assertion and does not show details of the LRT components on the station diagram. The LRT station at Peoria/Smith Road should be identified and impacts analyzed as part of the I-225 EE.	Text was on pg. ES-22 and pg. 4-1 revised to, The LRT extension would have eight new stations (including the Peoria/Smith Station, which is to be constructed as part of the East Corridor project) and would be supported by a network of 31 local and regional bus routes and by bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Five of the eight stations would provide parking (including the Peoria/Smith Station park-n-Ride, which is to be constructed as part of the East Corridor project). The impacts of the I-225 LRT alignment and station platform have been identified and analyzed as part of this EE. This clarification has been provided in other locations in the document as noted in response to Comment 50.
91	Finch, City and County of Denver	Temporary Construction Impacts - Mitigation Measures. In addition to CDOT, the EE should state that the Traffic Control Plan should also be reviewed by City and County of Denver in order for Denver staff to ensure maintenance of traffic flow on Peoria Street, Smith Road, 37th Avenue, and Martin Luther King Blvd (extended to Peoria), Colfax Avenue, and other roadways which serve Denver residents.	Text was revised on pg. 3-48 to state: A Traffic Control Plan will be reviewed and approved by CDOT, <u>Aurora, and Denver</u> for mitigation of temporary construction impacts <u>within their respective right-of-ways</u> .
92	Finch, City and County of Denver	Figure 3.1.1 – Existing Land Use (page 3-8) – Land use in Denver north of Peoria/Smith station is Industrial, not Office/Retail. Office/Retail is OK in figure 3.1.2 for Future Land Use, however (according to Denver Comprehensive Plan - Blueprint Denver, 2002)	Figure on pg. 3-8 was revised to reflect existing industrial uses.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
93	Finch, City and County of Denver	Figure 3.1.3 – Zoning north of Peoria/Smith is Industrial, except for on Peoria itself, which is Office/Retail. Source should be City and County of Denver 2009 (not 2000)	Figure on pg. 3-10 was revised to reflect existing industrial zoning and source revised to reflect 2009
94	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 3-12. List Blueprint Denver (2002 - supplement to Denver Comprehensive Plan 2000) and Denver TOD Strategic Plan (2008) – both of which address TOD and Peoria/Smith in more detail than Comp Plan 2000	<p>Blueprint Denver (2002) and Denver TOD Strategic Plan (2006) were both added to the table showing policies that relate to the FasTracks I-225 Corridor. Specific details also added to the table on pg. 3-12 are summarized below:</p> <p><u>Blueprint Denver:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Directs growth to Areas of Change (which includes locations around transit stations) while preserving the character of Areas of Stability (such as stable residential neighborhoods).</u> ▪ <u>Encourages implementation of multi-modal streets that accommodate public transportation, pedestrians, bicycles, and private vehicles.</u> ▪ <u>Encourages mixed-use development in areas such as downtown and around rapid transit stations (e.g., TOD).</u> <p><u>Denver TOD Strategic Plan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Sets priorities for where city resources should be directed in the short-, mid-, and long-terms.</u> ▪ <u>Identifies effective implementation tools, policies, and strategies to facilitate TOD where appropriate.</u> ▪ <u>Ensures close coordination among City departments, staff, and others in the planning and implementation of TOD.</u>
95	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 3-15. Table 3.1.2. Peoria/Smith Station. Table says “infill and redevelopment east of Peoria with mixed-use office and mixed-use housing”... isn’t this planned for West of Peoria? North of the station is planned for Employment (office and light industrial), according to Blueprint Denver (2002)	Sentence updated on pg. 3-15 to read: Per station area plans, infill and redevelopment east west of Peoria with mixed-use office and mixed-use housing



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
96	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 3-46. Section 4. Paragraph that starts "Access from the Peoria/Smith Station would serve residents in the Morris Heights neighborhood..." This station is also the closest station to the Montbello neighborhood, Green Valley Ranch and to the east side of the Stapleton Neighborhood. Many of these residents will likely access the station by car or bus, but these neighborhoods still deserve mentioning.	Text revised on pg. 3-46 to read: Access from the Peoria/Smith Station would serve residents in the Morris Heights, <u>Montbello, Green Valley Ranch, and Stapleton</u> neighborhoods. <u>It would also</u> provide access to the remaining businesses along Peoria and the Aurora Service Center.
97	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 3-109. "The anticipated traffic reduction due to FasTracks ridership system-wide would slightly lower future automobile carbon dioxide emissions (RTD, 2007), and would be offset by anticipated traffic reduction due to FasTracks ridership, thereby reducing impacts of global warming." Comment: The anticipated traffic reduction due to ridership will be offset by anticipated traffic reduction due to ridership? Quite circular reasoning here!	Text on pg. 3-108 removed from sentence for clarity: The anticipated traffic reduction due to FasTracks ridership system-wide would slightly lower future automobile carbon dioxide emissions (RTD, 2007), and would be offset by anticipated traffic reduction due to FasTracks ridership, thereby reducing impacts of global warming.
98	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 3-109, next paragraph: "One of the main strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is to provide choices for travel so that options other than single occupant vehicle (SOV) travel are available. The I-225 LRT would provide a transit travel option that does not currently exist. In addition, RTD has committed to using the cleanest fuels that are reasonable, available, and practical in order to reduce all greenhouse gases, including nitrous oxides, a contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. Also, at transit stations, the I-225 LRT would support TOD development which has been found to reduce travel, and consequently, greenhouse emissions. Feeder bus service will be provided to encourage access by that mode	Bus service proposed as part of the Preferred Alternative is summarized in Table 4.2. As discussed, in Chapter 4 the bus transit network included in the Preferred Alternative would improve on the No-Action Alternative transit network in the Project Study Area by reallocating resources to create new routes and modify existing routes to serve the new LRT line. RTD is not providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities beyond the immediate station area; however, RTD is committed to not precluding future connections by others. Major planned Denver connections include a bicycle/pedestrian facility as part of the Martin Luther King Boulevard extension.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>rather than by an SOV.” Comment: Use stronger language about feeder bus service, because in several cases it is not only going to be provided, but service will be increased. Also, rather than focusing just on feeder bus service to stations, it seems just as important to mention that RTD supports plans to improve access to the stations by bicycle and by foot.</p>	
99	Finch, City and County of Denver	<p>The chapter should specifically address the comparison of bus vs. rail access to DIA to and from the Denver Tech Center in terms of travel time and frequency, currently, at Opening Day. The discussion should include analysis of skip stop, limited stop, and express service to DIA, and if not being provided, justify why not. Currently, the skyRide AT Arapahoe/DIA Service to DIA only has 5 stops.</p>	<p>Information has been incorporated into the text regarding trips to DIA. Existing modeled information was included and the following text was added to page 4-5:</p> <p><u>As described earlier, the I-225 LRT line would provide a connection to the planned East Corridor rail line to DIA at the Peoria/Smith Station. From the existing County Line Station, transit patrons could take the I-225 LRT to the East Corridor commuter rail or take the AT bus to access DIA. Either option would take approximately 75 minutes during the peak periods. However, the I-225 LRT would be more reliable and more frequent than the bus service.</u></p> <p><u>A comparison of both the I-225 LRT and AT bus available for accessing DIA from the southern metro area is described below:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>G-Line to DIA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>88 trips daily between 4:00 AM and 2:00 AM</u> ▪ <u>Requires a transfer at the Peoria/Smith Station</u> ▪ <u>76 minute travel time</u> ▪ <u>Reliable at any time of day, even rush hour</u> • <u>AT Bus to DIA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>18 trips daily between 4:00 AM and 9:00 PM</u> ▪ <u>One seat ride to DIA</u> ▪ <u>72 minute travel time during the peak hours</u> ▪ <u>Reliability impacted by congestion and weather</u>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			Skip stop, limited stop, and express LRT service to DIA would require an additional LRT track, which is cost prohibitive.
100	Finch, City and County of Denver	Chapter 4, the Transportation chapter, and Appendix A do not include the connection of Martin Luther King Boulevard from Stapleton to Fitzsimons Parkway at Peoria Street. This Martin Luther King-Fitzsimons connection is planned for and has been approved in engineering construction documents as part of the Stapleton redevelopment. It will be a 4-lane median-divided arterial with turn lanes and some parking. Construction is pending environmental remediation. As this segment is approved and close to construction in relation to the timeline of the I-225 corridor construction, it should be included in the EE. Grade separation of the light rail over the future Martin Luther King Boulevard just west of Peoria should be considered and is strongly preferred by CCD Public Works.	<p>The Martin Luther King Boulevard extension to Fitzsimons Parkway was assumed in the EE in traffic analysis, as other major cumulative actions (Table 3.0.1), and in design. Appendix A of the Final EE includes the 30 percent preliminary engineering design and detail on other proposed projects including the Martin Luther King Boulevard extension (Appendix A: TP-150).</p> <p>Table 3.0.1 has been updated with additional information on Martin Luther King Boulevard under the project's description: Roadway extension to Peoria Street, <u>4-lane median-divided arterial with turn lanes and some parking</u></p> <p>The light rail crossing at the future Martin Luther King Boulevard is current proposed at grade, the final crossing treatment would require PUC approval. Text was added to page 4-24 to address Denver's concerns with signal timing and intersection delay:</p> <p>LRT vehicles typically cross through intersections during green phases for vehicular traffic that runs parallel to the tracks. The analysis anticipated signal timing to accommodate LRT, but no signal preemption. This assumption minimizes vehicular delay, but increases overall LRT travel times. Signal timing will be addressed in coordination with the City of Aurora <u>and City and County of Denver</u> during final design on a case-by-case basis to provide an appropriate balance between vehicular and LRT travel times.</p> <p>Intersection analysis shows that from a LOS standpoint, with the Martin Luther</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>King Parkway extension and a LRT at grade crossing across the west leg, this intersection would operate at LOS D in the AM and LOS C in the PM by 2015 and LOS E in both the AM and PM by 2035. This analysis does not assume any signal preemption and the LOS and delay for 2035 with the Preferred Alternative in place were nearly the same as the 2035 No Action condition for this intersection. In addition, the LOS at 25th and Peoria is expected to be B or better in 2035.</p> <p>Per continued coordination with Denver, future traffic analysis in this area will consider the effect of emergency vehicle preemption on signal timing for both vehicles and LRT.</p>
101	Finch, City and County of Denver	Why are "additional mitigation measures" that may be needed to "maintain adequate LOS in 2035" with addition of parking spaces at the stations - including Peoria/Smith Station - not part of the project and may need to be built by "stakeholders or other parties"?	A portion of the additional demand is associated with planned TOD development at station areas. Consistent with meeting additional parking demand, RTD is committed to working cooperatively with Aurora and developers to address parking and station area traffic impacts that may be experienced beyond Opening Day.
102	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 4-4. The EE should address to what extent G/H service will be coordinated with East Corridor service and feeder bus service, especially during peak hours.	The following text has been incorporated on page 4-4: Since some existing routes parallel the LRT line or segments of other routes, they could be realigned or removed from service within the Preferred Alternative bus network plan based on needs as determined by RTD Operations. <u>Bus schedules will be coordinated with the LRT and East Corridor Commuter Rail schedules to facilitate timed transfers and maintain competitive travel times for users when possible. In addition, Nine Mile Station and the City Center Station are identified as FastConnects transfer points that will be designed to support efficient connections for transferring passengers, minimizing passenger wait times and creating a seamless transit network.</u> Access-a-Ride, RTD's complementary paratransit service will continue to be provided

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>within a ¼-mile distance from all fixed route buses services.</p> <p>Both East Corridor and I-225 are planned to have 15 minute peak and off-peak headways at the Peoria/Smith Station. Timed transfers are a goal of RTD and at a maximum patrons would wait no more than 15 minutes for the next train.</p>
103	Finch, City and County of Denver	<p>On page 4-4, why will the AT Arapahoe County/DIA route not be changed or eliminated? Why won't the # 20 route change to connect to the Anschutz/Fitzsimons Station. Provide maps which show the new, re-routed, and eliminated bus routes and services. See East Corridor EIS and Technical Appendices as an example and ensure consistency with that bus routing. Add in the AT sky Ride Service, on the Table 4.2 as well as local routes like 20 and 105, and indicate how bus service will be extended to through Stapleton on the Martin Luther King Blvd Extension across Peoria to the Anschutz/Fitzsimons stations.</p>	<p>Text has been added to Table 4.2 on pg. 4-6 for the AT, as such: <u>As part of the No-Action alternative, this service would be rerouted along E-470 and would have a southern terminus of C-470 and Lucent Blvd. Please also refer to response to Comment 99.</u></p> <p>Fall 2009, the Final I-225 Corridor Transit Operations Plan will be available for review. This Plan will include figures illustrating the Existing (2009), 2035 No-Action and 2035 Build bus networks.</p> <p>As noted in Table 4.2, the No-Action and Build Alternatives include a new bus route, Route 89 which will connect the Montview Station with Stapleton, extending along the Martin Luther King Boulevard extension. Route 20 will continue to travel east-west along Montview Boulevard and will serve the Montview Station.</p> <p>Route 105, Havana Crosstown, does not have any transfer points with the I-225 LRT and is not included in Table 4.2. This route will be reconfigured with the southern terminus at the Village Center LRT station and the northern terminus at the Central Park CRT station.</p> <p>Prior to LRT Opening Day, the proposed bus networks will be reevaluated, including a public involvement process, to ensure consistency with demand and travel patterns associated with the East Corridor and other new development.</p>



Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
104	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 4-6. What analysis led to the elimination of the 47X? Is this standard practice, or is there not enough projected demand to warrant an express bus and train service? Please discuss to what extent G/H and east corridor service will be coordinated with feeder bus service, especially during peak hours.	47X would directly compete for ridership with the East Corridor; therefore, it is standard practice to reroute redundant bus service when a rail line is built to more effectively use limited resources. See response and text for Comment 102 for G/H coordination. Specific scheduling is not available at this time.
105	Finch, City and County of Denver	Station Boardings - Indicate how much of the Peoria Station boardings are due to East Corridor vs. I-225.	Comment noted. As shown in Table 4.3, an estimated 59% of boardings at Peoria/Smith LRT are from a transfer from the East Corridor. However, this 59% does not include the reverse direction of people boarding the East Corridor and going elsewhere. Rail transfers from I-225 to the East Corridor would be reported in the East Corridor EIS.
106	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 4-9. Table 4.3. With 0% walk/bike share projected for Peoria/Smith station, this table apparently doesn't take into consideration any future TOD development. This seems like a very conservative assumption and quite unrealistic that the land adjacent to the station will stay vacant/underutilized through 2035. Also, what about people traveling on LRT or commuter rail to this area for work? If ped/bike infrastructure is improved in the future (as it should be) riders can take the train and walk/bike to work from the station.	Comment noted. This mode of access is low relative to the improvements identified in the City of Aurora's Station Area Plan. However, this TOD plan was developed concurrent with the EE process and is not reflected in the adopted DRCOG land use assumptions used in the model. It is assumed that TOD and pedestrian/bicycle improvements will increase multi-modal access to this station platform and overall boardings. City of Aurora and City and County of Denver planning efforts may identify future bicycle and pedestrian facilities that could be implemented by the City or developers to increase multi-modal connectivity to the stations. RTD anticipates that additional connections with existing and future pedestrian facilities will be provided by others as part of TOD development. RTD will continue to coordinate with the Cities not to preclude future trail connections.
107	Finch, City and County of Denver	Address how the following statement in the Purpose and Need section 1.5.4, p. 1-10 has been accommodated in the concept design for the Peoria-	Comment noted. The envelope for a grade separation (over or under) has been preserved. Alignment location was coordinated with "Preliminary Peoria Street Grade-Separate Crossing

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>Smith station and rail alignment along Peoria between 33rd and Smith Road: "Plans for the I-225 LRT project should also preserve the opportunity for a future grade separation of the roadway from the rail at the intersection of Smith Road and Peoria Street. This would assist with managing the traffic flow and accommodated heavy volumes through the intersection." What assumptions were made about the future grade separation design "so as to not preclude"? Length, width, overpass or underpass, etc.?</p> <p>Section 4.7, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, page 4-25, Peoria/Smith Station, implies an "overpass" was assumed. Since this is an important issue for future traffic flow on Peoria Street for both Aurora and Denver, as identified in many meetings throughout the process, the EE should be more explicit. Show a diagram of what "footprint" was assumed, even if it indicates future funding by others.</p>	<p>Analysis" study developed for the City of Aurora by Hartwig & Associates, August 21, 2008. This study was provided to the City and County of Denver via email.</p> <p>Text in Section 2.4.3.4 was revised to provide detail on the assumed "footprint" (p. 2-36):</p> <p>North of 33rd Avenue (which becomes part of the Smith Road realignment developed by the FasTracks East Corridor project), the alignment shifts west to allow for a future grade separation structure (by others) for Peoria Street and the rail lines north of Smith Road. <u>This potential grade separation was evaluated as part of Aurora's station area planning process and considered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Peoria Street Underpass:</u> Peoria Street traveling under the rail alignments (existing UP rail and proposed East Corridor commuter rail) utilizing a 5 percent grade with approximately 200 feet of tunnel and 1,000 feet of walls on the north and south approaches. ▪ <u>Peoria Street Expanded Underpass:</u> similar to Peoria Street Underpass option, except includes lowering 37th Avenue to meet Peoria Street at the bottom grade, which would require an additional 1,800 feet of walls on both sides of 37th Avenue. ▪ <u>Peoria Street Overpass:</u> Peoria Street traveling over the rail alignments utilizing a 5 percent grade with approximately 200 feet of bridge and 1,400 feet of walls on the north and south approaches. <p><u>From 33rd Avenue north, the eastern edge of the LRT alignment was placed between 20 to 80 feet west of the western edge of Peoria Street. This envelope would allow for the implementation of any of the grade separation options.</u></p>

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>Text on page 4-25 was updated to state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peoria/Smith Station - No regional or local trails are planned to connect to the station. An on-street bike lane system is being considered by the City as part of their station area planning efforts <u>with 30th Avenue and Nome Street serving as the primary routes.</u> With the realignment of Smith Road (part of the East Corridor project) and potential <u>overpass grade separation</u> of the <u>UP and Commuter Rail tracks (by others)</u> at Peoria Street, bike lanes <u>or other pedestrian connections</u> may be added.
108	Finch, City and County of Denver	Page 4-25. Peoria/Smith Station Bicycle and Pedestrian access. There is no mention of how pedestrians will access the station. Will sidewalks be built from Peoria to the platform?	Please see response to Comment 107. The I-225 project includes the I-225 LRT alignment and station platform. The East Corridor DEIS would identify any proposed sidewalks from the platform to Peoria, such as sidewalks along the relocated Smith Road on 33rd.
109	Turnquist	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft I-225 Light Rail Transit Environmental Evaluation, July 10, 2009. The University of Colorado Denver would like to express its appreciation for the professional and thorough manner in which this study was conducted. The University has been afforded every opportunity to participate and contribute to the development of this plan. Numerous meetings were attended by RTD staff and consultants to collect the information necessary to fully understand and address the issues on the University's campus, including the impact of vibration and electromagnetic interference on critical research equipment. We look forward to continuing our</p>	Comment noted. RTD appreciates the continued cooperation of project stakeholders such as the University of Colorado Denver.

Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
		relationship with RTD as we coordinate the development of the Anschutz Medical Campus with that of the light rail line.	
110	Watkins, City of Aurora Planning Department	<p>Entire letter provided in Appendix B</p> <p>We firmly object to the design of the "barrier" proposed to be used along the LRT corridor in some locations, namely the chain link fence that sits atop a jersey barrier. This is not the type of design solution that we would like to see along Exposition Avenue, Sable Boulevard, and Peoria Street. These streets will serve major employment centers, and jersey barriers should not be part of the design solution for these important areas.</p>	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comment 48.