

## 5.0 Response to Public Comments

This section summarizes the public and agency comments that were received during the 33-day public comment period for the Woodmen Road Corridor EA. During the public comment period e-mail messages, letters, public hearing comment forms, oral comments (to the court reporter) and agency letters were received. The vast majority of these were e-mail comments provided through the EA web site. Many of these submittals included multiple comments, and some commenters made multiple submissions.

All public comments in their entirety are contained in the Appendices to this FONSI, except for two letters received from attorneys. Since these two letters are generally longer and more complex than most other submittals, the response to these two letters is provided separately in Section 6.0 of this decision document.

Please note that in response to public comment, changes were made to the Proposed Action. These changes are discussed and summarized in Section 2.1, Changes to the Proposed Action.

### Approach Used to Summarize and Respond to Comments

A majority of the comments received during the public comment period were made by more than one commenter. To avoid repeating the same response as many as a hundred times, the approach used in this section was to group identical or substantially similar comments together and respond to them a single time. For each comment, the names of those who made the comment have been provided, enabling the reader to readily find the exact words and context of the comment in Appendix A.

General comments and corresponding responses are provided first, followed by specific comments germane to particular portions of the EA. Specific comments are presented in the same order as the topics presented in the EA. These topic categories, such as noise and right-of-way, are then separated into smaller categories reflecting similar comments and responses. A number of miscellaneous comments that apply to various EA Sections have been grouped near the end of this section.

A summary of the number of comments received is provided on the next page in Table 5-1. This summary is intended as an overall indicator of interest in various topics. The comments that resulted in a change to the Proposed Action were related to access and as a result were grouped in Section 3, Relocations and Acquisitions where the discussion of access appears in the EA.



**Table 5-1. Summary of Number of Comments per EA Section**

<b>EA Topics</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
General Support	12
General Opposition	17
<b>SECTION 1. Purpose and Need</b>	
Traffic Projections and Analysis	8
<b>SECTION 2. Alternatives Considered</b>	
Bikes/Pedestrians/Transit	15
General Lane, Configurations, and Conditions	12
Interchanges	10
Proposed Action Alternative	13
<b>SECTION 3. Affected Environment, Impacts, and Mitigation</b>	
Traffic Noise	88
Relocations and Acquisitions	141
Environmental Justice	0
Construction Impacts	28
Water Resources and Issues	1
Riparian Ecosystem Wildlife	0
Prairie Ecosystem Wildlife	0
Noxious and Invasive Plant Species	0
Recreational Trails and Natural Area	0
Air Quality	10
Other Resources	0
<b>SECTION 4. Summary of Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts &amp; Mitigation</b>	0
<b>SECTION 5. Public Involvement</b>	
Compliments	4
Criticisms	4
<b>SECTION 6. Wetland Finding</b>	0
<b>SECTION 7. Native American Consultation</b>	0
<b>SECTION 8. References</b>	0
<b>SECTION 9. Agency Correspondence</b>	0
<b>Additional Information on Air Toxics</b>	0
Miscellaneous Comments	31
Issues Not Related to this Project	30

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### General Support

---

**Comment:** There were 12 public comments that were in favor of the Proposed Action. Some of the comments included praise for the project process, thoroughness, and thoughtfulness. Some suggested that the project is long overdue and should be implemented as soon as possible.

**Response:** The environmental decision on the Woodmen Road Corridor's Proposed Action is based on the specific issues involved, and not the number of comments either in support of or opposed to the Proposed Action.

**Submitters:** ( 12 Commenters) G. Steinkirchner, J. Fuller, T. Buckett, J. McDonald, M. Ring, K. Hensley, P. Hosmer, W. Williams, B. Nelson , J. Hackett, L. Guzman, T. Anderson

### General Opposition

---

**Comment:** 17 comments were received that opposed the Proposed Action. Most of these comments were from people who live close to the Woodmen Road and Academy Boulevard intersection. Generally, people opposed to the Proposed Action had specific concerns as well, such as noise or access.

**Response:** The environmental decision on the Woodmen Road Corridor's Proposed Action is based on the specific issues involved and not the number of comments either in favor of or opposed to the Proposed Action.

**Submitters:** ( 16 Commenters) G. Frank, G. Frank, D. Worden, A. Anonymous, G. Montelongo, B. Alexander, D. Smith , R. Povelite, B. Cerjan, D. MacNally, M. Fischer, D. Krohn, F. Dodge, N. Ansted, G. Frank, P. Rasmussen

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Traffic Projections and Analysis

---

**Comment:** Traffic volumes were either over- or under-estimated. Some comments were focused on making sure that new roadways or roadway connections were considered when estimating traffic volumes to 2030.

**Response:** The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) is the metropolitan planning organization for this region. As part of its responsibilities, PPACG has developed a regional traffic model that all transportation projects are required to use as a baseline. This model accounts for projected growth (as determined by the State demographer) and also includes transportation system improvements programmed for the region. In addition, traffic counts were taken to corroborate and refine the traffic data to ensure that appropriate traffic numbers were used in the model. The EA team based its projections on this model and the outputs were reviewed by the City, County and PPACG for their concurrence.

**Submitters:** ( 7 Commenters) L. Grams, J. Klikus, C. Liquor, F. Dodge, N. Ansted, C. Erwin, E. Lind

### Alternatives Considered: Bikes/Pedestrians/Transit

---

**Comment:** There were comments that focused on bicycle, pedestrian, and transit mode accommodation.

**Response:** The Woodmen Road Proposed Action contains both bicycle and pedestrian facilities along its length from Campus Drive to US24. More detailed information can be found concerning these facilities in Section 3.9 of the EA. Transit needs were part of the considerations in the roadway design. The configuration of the road was determined so as not to preclude transit options in the future.

**Submitters:** ( 15 Commenters) K. Dader, J. Haag, C. Hadl, J. Thomas , A. DeVere, D. Horne, A. Willard, J. Jackson, E. Rennels, E. Rennels, C. Hadl, L. Grams, Z. Horak, J. Hillstrom, R. Acosta

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### **Alternatives Considered: General lane, configurations, and conditio**

---

**Comment:** Comments focused on the number of lanes (too few or too many), the placement of the roadway, intersections, medians, ramps and acceleration/deceleration lanes, and roadway operations.

**Response:** The EA team reviewed several options for roadway, ramp and lane configurations and determined that the Proposed Action was the most efficient, particularly in consideration of retrofitting the roadway into an existing urban condition. The median widths are often set by the number of turning lanes required at intersections and also must comply with City and County standards. The number of lanes and intersection configurations were determined by the need for capacity and adequate level of service for future roadway traffic as determined by the traffic model (see Traffic Projections and Analysis above).

**Submitters:** ( 12 Commenters) J. McDonald, D. Art , C. Erwin , D. Horne, C. Erwin, C. Erwin, B. DeGrush , J. Jackson, F. Dodge, C. Erwin, P. Marten, C. Erwin

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Alternatives Considered: Interchanges

---

**Comment:** There were several comments challenging the need for an interchange at Woodmen Road and Academy Boulevard. Many wanted the intersection to function at-grade. In general, there was a desire to avoid building the interchange even if it meant a lower level of service and additional traffic delays. Also, some people thought it was too expensive to justify the cost

**Response:** The EA Team reviewed more than 10 options for moving traffic at the intersection of Woodmen Road and Academy Boulevard including at-grade options. Because Woodmen Road and Academy Boulevard are principle arterials that will each carry approximately 60,000 cars a day by the year 2030, the at-grade options did not work. Partly, this was due to the number of left-hand turning movements that necessitated too many turning lanes through the intersection and were not desirable for safety reasons. Further, a failure to operate at reasonable levels of service would necessitate opening up roadways through nearby neighborhoods (Brookwood, Yorkshire, and Falcon Estates), an option not acceptable to the neighborhoods. The at-grade intersection also displaced significantly more homes and businesses. In consideration of all these problems, the at-grade intersection options were determined to be unworkable. One of the purposes for conducting an EA is to ensure that taxpayers' dollars are invested efficiently. Roadway projects of this magnitude require significant investment and the Woodmen Road/Academy Boulevard is no exception. Cost conservation measures will be employed during final design and construction to minimize expense.

**Submitters:** ( 9 Commenters) G. Frank, J. Boulter, C. Nauert, C. Nauert, B. Cerjan, G. Frank, A. DeVere, C. Liquor, F. Dodge

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Proposed Action Alternative

---

**Comment:** Comments on the Proposed Action generally centered around adding six lanes all the way to US 24 and eliminating stoplights. In addition, roadway alignment and a left-turn movement from Stinson Road onto Woodmen Road were concerns.

**Response:** The Proposed Action was designed to respond to the conditions projected for 2030. Through the EA process, the concept design for 2030 was developed and 2030 was used as the design year because it is consistent with the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan. The methodology and engineering assumptions used for the traffic study were acceptable to the PPACG. Six lanes from Powers Boulevard to US 24 are not expected to be needed prior to 2030. Roadway alignment along Woodmen Road was carefully studied to minimize the effect of widening on private property while still maintaining a reasonable alignment for the drivers. Cars traveling south on Stinson Road will be able to make a left-hand turn onto Woodmen Road. The Proposed Action allows full movement at this intersection.

**Submitters:** ( 13 Commenters) R. Steed, T. Whittle, T. Skrastins, J. von Ahlefeldt, J. von Ahlefeldt, P. Marten, D. Reeder, S. Scannell, VP, J. Snider, G. Steinkirchner, A. Scheller, D. Slayter, G. Steinkirchner

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Traffic Noise: Noise Wall Locations

---

- Comment:** Increased traffic means increased noise. In addition, if the wall is only on the south side of Woodmen Road near Academy Boulevard, the noise will be reflected to the north side where no walls are planned. Noise walls should be built for all residences.
- Response:** Traffic increases and associated noise was studied extensively and analyzed to the year 2030. This analysis was conducted according to the 2002 CDOT Noise Analysis and Abatement Guidelines. CDOT's noise policy is applied consistently statewide, and is consistent with Federal policy and that of other states. The Noise Abatement Criteria are a balance between desired maximum noise levels, economics, and engineering feasibility. Noise wall locations were determined in accordance with these policies. Woodmen Road, both in the City and the County, is a designated truck route and the City and County both have noise ordinances to minimize noise. Enforcement of these ordinances is the responsibility of respective law enforcement agencies. Noise does reflect off walls, and it can increase noise levels on the opposite side of the roadway. However, the increase in noise due to reflections will not be substantial, as it will likely be 1-2 decibels at the most. The design of these walls does take reflective noise into account.
- Submitters:** ( 20 Commenters) R. Wolfrum, M. Rueffert, R. Childress, D. Art , B. Alexander, K. Madsen, S. Nauert, S. Nauert, S. Nauert, R. Schoerobauer, J. Brennr, T. Sarlo, A. Willard, C. Rueffert, E. Rennels, R. Wolfrum, D. Slayter, C. Nauert, F. Dodge, C. Hadl

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Traffic Noise: Noise Wall Designs

---

**Comment:** The existing walls along Woodmen Road at Yorkshire and Brookwood neighborhoods are not high enough to block the traffic noise.

**Response:** The analysis was conducted per CDOT's noise policy, which is applied consistently statewide and is consistent with Federal policy and that of other states. The analysis showed that the existing wall is providing a substantial noise reduction of at least 5 decibels to the homes. Noise barriers are not judged on the noise levels, but if they provide at least a 5 decibel reduction in overall noise levels. Please note that it is normally only feasible to provide noise reduction to the first floor or ground levels of a property.

**Submitters:** ( 42 Commenters) R. Steed, P. Moss, R. Wolfrum, K. Van Wyhe, K. Van Wyhe, G. Howe, J. Boulter, R. Childress, B. Angelos, A. Schultz, B. Schultz, M. Dempset, A. Lind, M. Brendon, T. Lorentz, D. Hutchinson, G. Montelongo, R. Steed, C. Armstrong, F. Wolfrum, D. Horne, C. Thompson, C. Thompson, J. Freshman, D. Morris, B. DeGrush , R. Wolfrum, J. Knudson, J. Hackett, K. Seegler, J. Snider, K. Madsen, G. Eastridge, R. Hanes, B. Davis, K. Madsen, J. Madsen, R. DiGiacomo, L. Guzman, R. Wolfrum, R. Tatro, J. Hoyle

### Traffic Noise: Noise Walls not Proposed

---

**Comment:** There are no walls planned to protect Columbine Estates and Falcon Estates from increasing traffic noise.

**Response:** CDOT's noise policy, which is applied consistently statewide and is consistent with Federal policy and that of other states, takes into consideration several factors to determine noise wall locations. These factors include: noise levels, density, cost/benefit, topography, and effectiveness. The noise analysis conducted as part of the EA and measured against criteria showed that noise walls in this location would not be effective, nor would they be reasonable because of low density.

**Submitters:** ( 5 Commenters) L. Bagley-Hoafe, D. Krohn, B. McAlister, G. Halliday, C. Hadl

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### **Traffic Noise: Noise Analysis Methodology**

---

**Comment:** The noise wall analysis cannot be correct. There are places where walls would help, but they are not slated to be built.

**Response:** Noise walls are not intended to eliminate noise, but rather to mitigate it to the degree possible. CDOT's noise policy is applied consistently statewide and is consistent with Federal policy and that of other states. The EA team used prescribed analysis tools and methodology required by CDOT to determine where mitigation would be applied. Noise measurements were taken according to this methodology to calibrate the noise model and noise levels were studied extensively. The model was then adjusted to include future traffic to the year 2030. From this model, homes along Woodmen Road that qualified for noise walls (where noise exceeded 66 decibels or the increase of noise was greater than 10 decibels) were identified. The EA document shows these wall locations on page 50.

**Submitters:** ( 8 Commenters) S. Gunderson, C. Hadl, B. Alexander, A. Scheller, P. Moss, R. Wolfrum, K. Van Wyhe, B. DeGrush

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### **Traffic Noise: Noise Mitigation using Rubberized Asphalt**

---

**Comment:** Rubberized asphalt should be used as a noise mitigation measure.

**Response:** The Arizona and California Departments of Transportation are currently implementing pilot programs intended to demonstrate the effectiveness of quiet pavement strategies and evaluate any changes in their noise mitigation properties over time. At present, knowledge on noise reduction benefits of rubberized asphalt pavement over a long period of time is extremely limited. The pilot programs will collect data and information for at least a five to ten year period and then FHWA will determine if policy changes are warranted. Until then, it is FHWA policy that alternative pavement types are not considered noise mitigation measures. CDOT is currently beginning a long-term research project to examine the noise characteristics of different pavement types and surface textures.

**Submitters:** ( 2 Commenters) S. Rodemer, J. Rice-Jones

### **Traffic Noise: General**

---

**Comment:** The increase in travel lanes and/or the height of the interchange will make traffic noise increase beyond tolerable levels.

**Response:** Noise levels were studied extensively using the prescribed Noise Abatement Criteria as required by CDOT. These studies focused on current noise as well as the noise associated with the interchange and additional lane in the year 2030. Based on these studies, the EA concluded that the proposed noise mitigation measures would provide a substantial noise reduction in accordance with CDOT Policy, which is applied consistently statewide and is consistent with Federal Policy and that of other states.

**Submitters:** ( 11 Commenters) S. Sperry, L. Summers , C. Yarwood, J. Klikus, N. DiCocco, L. Bagley-Hoafe, F. Dodge, G. Frank, J. Hillstrom, C. Armstrong, D. Hutchinson

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Relocations and Acquisitions: Commercial

---

**Comment:** Concerns focused on loss of economic value because of losing parking spaces and signage. Additionally, business owners want to be informed and make suggestions as the final design moves forward.

**Response:** Because Woodmen Road is located (in part) in an urbanized area, relocations and acquisitions of commercial properties in whole or part were unavoidable. The Proposed Action minimized property acquisitions. Where parking lot impacts were unavoidable, parking spaces were counted and compared to city standards and restriping was considered where necessary. This information is in section 3.2 of the EA. The Proposed Action is a conceptual design, and property owners will be involved in the detailed issues relating to their property as the final design evolves.

**Submitters:** ( 5 Commenters) D. Monet, J. Hillstrom, A. Willard, A. Willard, S. Scannell, VP

### Relocations and Acquisitions: Residential

---

**Comment:** When is property acquired and how? How is a change of address handled? If property acquisition is contrary to neighborhood covenants, what happens?

**Response:** Once the environmental process is complete, the acquisition process will begin. Properties identified for total acquisition can be found on page 60 of the EA. The City and County will carry out the acquisitions in accordance with the Uniform Act, Code of Federal Regulations, State Statutes, and CDOT policies and regulations as the project is implemented. More information about this process can be found on page 72 of the EA. More information about anticipated property acquisitions and address changes due to the Proposed Action can be found in Section 3.2 of the EA from pages 55 to 74. Since the project is a public improvement, exceptions are made to neighborhood covenants when necessary.

**Submitters:** ( 9 Commenters) D. Art , D. Art , J. Haag, J. Haag, J. Haag, J. Haag, B. Alexander, D. Gill, G. Frank

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Relocations and Acquisitions: Reminders of Parcels

---

**Comment:** What happens to remainders of parcels purchased as a result of this project?

**Response:** The City or County will decide whether to keep or sell the remainders after project completion.

**Submitters:** ( 5 Commenters) C. Nauert, C. Nauert, S. Nauert, G. Halliday, B. Angelos

### Property Value: Residential Property

---

**Comment:** The value of my home will be decreased because of this project. Our investment and equity is compromised and our home values can only go down if the Proposed Action is implemented. Some owners, not on the acquisition list for the Proposed Action, want to be bought out. Additionally, the access to our neighborhoods will be detrimental to my home value as well.

**Response:** All communities upgrade their roadways periodically as a normal part of their infrastructure care. During these times, there is some disruption that cannot be avoided. If the roadways were not upgraded or repaired, the surrounding community would decline and the traveling public would suffer. The City and the County do projects of this type to improve the community and retain or improve their tax base. Once the implementation is complete, the roadway will operate more smoothly with less delay than it does today.

Government agencies, such as the City and County, do not purchase property for roadway construction unless it is needed to implement the project. Further, they do not use tax dollars to reimburse homeowners who live adjacent to these roadway improvements and hold a belief that their property value may be affected. The value of any given property is dependent on many forces and one cannot accurately speculate on the impact of the project to property value.

**Submitters:** ( 11 Commenters) D. Art , N. Ryan , G. Montelongo, J. Klikus, R. Schoerobauer, W. Hadl, J. Klikus, J. Knudson, G. Eastridge, B. Davis, L. Bagley-Hoafe

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Property Value: Commercial Property

---

**Comment:** Businesses will suffer during construction and lose revenue. After construction, difficult access will keep business away and business property value will decrease. The economic impacts of construction to both businesses and property will be detrimental to owners. A concern was expressed that the businesses at Woodmen and Academy would suffer and deteriorate because of the interchange like what happened at Circle Drive and Fountain Boulevard when that interchange was constructed a number of years ago.

**Response:** Construction projects often result in delays and inconvenience. We have had comments from people who avoid the area today because of excessive delays and this situation is not good for business. The Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority (PPRTA), voted into action by City and County voters, had Woodmen Road improvements as one of their first priorities. This public vote is in response to continued frustrations with traffic delay and congestion. Not only is congestion frustrating, but it can increase vehicle accidents and emergency response time. When the roadway project is complete, traffic will operate more smoothly to the year 2030 which will be a benefit for businesses. The City is committed to working with both residents and businesses in the vicinity of Woodmen Road and Academy Boulevard to minimize disruption and inconvenience during construction. A Traffic Management Plan will be created during final design as noted on page 92 of the EA document.

**Submitters:** ( 4 Commenters) L. Kirk, F. Dodge, G. Frank, H. Lenz

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Access Modification: Commercial

---

**Comment:** The access to the businesses at Woodmen Valley Shopping Center needs to include an access from Academy Boulevard, both north and southbound. Some business owners are concerned about the effect of putting an access through the King Soopers parking lot to York Road.

**Response:** Because of the intense issues surrounding the access to Brookwood Estates, Yorkshire Estates, and the businesses at Woodmen Valley Shopping Center and on Brookwood Drive, the EA team has conducted a series of meetings with all involved. As a result, the access to the shopping center has been redesigned and includes access from both north and southbound Academy Boulevard to the shopping center. It also incorporates a connection to York Street and its traffic light at Academy Boulevard so that those exiting can go either north or southbound on Academy or straight across to Brookwood Drive. Please see the new drawing of the Brookwood and Yorkshire Estates access in this document that resulted from discussions with the Woodmen Valley Shopping Center and surrounding neighborhoods. A traffic analysis showed that the York Road/ Brookwood Drive/ Academy Boulevard intersection could be configured to operate at level of service B or better with some lane and traffic operations improvements.

The redesign opened up an opportunity to improve the access management and streetscape along York Road, thus improving safety and managing existing undesirable traffic patterns such as using the street for loading and unloading. It also allowed the access to York Road and parking (associated with the businesses along York Road) to be organized and more predictable to passing vehicles and pedestrians. Most of the business owners and residents involved prefer the new access plan to the one shown in the EA. While acknowledging that there is no ideal solution when retrofitting new access into an established urban environment, the current plan works the best of all the alternatives explored.

**Submitters:** ( 6 Commenters) J. McCloskey, L. Doole, K. Acee, J. McCloskey , D. Smith , K. Acee

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### **Access Modification: York/Yorkshire Estates**

---

**Comment:** The York Road area drew several comments that conflicted with each other. They are listed here together because they have one response. The comments were: 1) Do not add more traffic to York Road because it is a strain on the neighborhood; 2) Use York Road as an egress from Woodmen Valley Shopping to Academy Boulevard.

**Response:** The response on page 13 addresses the access plan for York Road. The affected area is east of the residential area and residents should find that the improved safety features and curb and gutters will clearly mark lanes, parking, and turn lanes on York Road and will better manage the additional traffic on the commercial segment of York Road.

**Submitters:** ( 20 Commenters) R. Wolfrum, L. Kirk, J. McCloskey, J. Boulter, B. Angelos, K. Dader, T. Lorentz, F. Wolfrum, J. Brennr, J. Brennr, G. Harris , A. Willard, K. Seegler, P. Rock, B. Cerjan, G. Frank, A. Daniels, G. Cummings, H. Lenz, F. Dodge

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### **Access Modification: Brookwood/Brookwood Estates**

---

**Comment:** Many residents of Brookwood Estates were concerned about accessing Brookwood Drive from Woodmen Road because they could not turn left into their neighborhood from the new ramp along Academy Boulevard as shown in the Proposed Action. Secondly, there was concern about combining the traffic from Crossroad Apartments and Brookwood Estates on Brookwood Drive. Many neighbors thought that this was exacerbated by the traffic from Starbucks (at the corner of Brookwood Drive and Academy Boulevard) interfering with neighborhood and apartment traffic and causing back-ups, delays, and blocking the only access to the neighborhood and the apartments.

**Response:** As mentioned above, there is a redesign of this intersection and new access to Crossroads Apartments that addresses these concerns. Because we are fitting the intersection into a busy established urban area, there is no perfect solution. However, the redesign of the Brookwood and Yorkshire Estates access (available in this document) resolved many of the issues raised. This solution was crafted during many meetings with the Yorkshire and Brookwood neighborhoods as well as Crossroads Apartments and the businesses along Brookwood Drive and York Road. The Woodmen Valley Shopping Center and King Soopers also participated in these meetings.

**Submitters:** ( 65 Commenters) T. DeVere, G. Howe, P. Ellis , K. Van Wyhe, P. Moss, P. Moss, G. Howe, L. Kirk, A. Daniels, J. Price, A. DeVere, P. Goldenbogen, J. Boulter, B. Angelos, A. Schultz, B. Schultz, B. Schultz, M. Dempset, C. Yarwood, E. Lind, T. Lorentz, G. Montelongo, C. Montelongo, C. Smith, A. DeVere, J. Klikus, R. Steed, C. Armstrong, A. DeVere, K. Madsen, D. Reeder, G. Cummings, P. Goldenboyen, D. Horne, J. Hoyle, C. Thompson, R. Tatro, J. Brennr, J. Brennr, G. Harris , A. Willard, J. Brewer, J. Klikus, J. Klikus, J. Klikus, J. Knudson, K. Seegler, K. Seegler, D. MacNally, K. Madsen, E. Rennels, G. Eastridge, W. Mick, B. Davis, K. Madsen, N. Ansted, J. Madsen, B. Barrett, B. Cerjan, L. Guzman, C. Cates, G. Frank, R. Childress, H. Lenz, F. Dodge

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### **Access Modification: Columbine Estates**

---

**Comment:** There were several comments concerning the closing of Ruth, Gail, and Cindy Places, west of Union Boulevard and north of Woodmen Road, and the need to put new access roads through Columbine Estates and their placement.

**Response:** The closing of Ruth, Gail, and Cindy Places, as shown in the Proposed Action, was necessary for safety reasons. If they were left open, even right-in/right-out, vehicles would be slowing down in the acceleration lane from southbound Union Boulevard to westbound Woodmen Road. Additionally, those turning out of Ruth, Cindy, or Gail Places onto westbound Woodmen Road would be merging into the acceleration lane. This creates unsafe traffic conditions, and therefore the three accesses will be closed. In the Falcon, Columbine, and Yorkshire Estates Neighborhood Master Plan, these three access points are shown as closed (in the future), but no solution for building other access roads is shown. The EA Team examined several options and met with the neighborhood several times as well as providing maps for internal neighborhood meetings. The Proposed Action shows the new access roads that run along the lot lines and provide reasonable access to those residents that need a new route. No matter where the new access roads are put, some residents are affected. This is an issue that has been with Columbine Estates for some time and there is no solution without affects.

**Submitters:** ( 3 Commenters) J. Hackett, D. Krohn, H. Fieberling

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Access Modification: Columbine Estates

---

**Comment:** There were concerns about the access solution for Bell Drive, Stinson Road, and Taos Drive as these roads relate to access between Falcon and Columbine Estates and Woodmen Road.

**Response:** These roadways were studied extensively to determine the safest and most reasonable action to take. The Falcon, Columbine, and Yorkshire Estates Neighborhood Master Plan shows the roadways as reflected in the Proposed Action, and that arrangement works well from a traffic and access viewpoint.

**Submitters:** ( 5 Commenters) R. Cleek, T. Sarlo, J. Hackett, L. Bishop, c. Bishop

### Access Modification: Columbine Estates

---

**Comment:** How wide are the new access roads in Columbine Estates as shown in the Proposed Action?

**Response:** The width of the access roads will be determined during final design. The Proposed Action shows a standard city width for right-of-way of 60' wide. The roadway is within that right-of-way and its width has not yet been determined. The neighborhood has expressed an interest in having the roads as narrow as possible and that will be a consideration during final design.

**Submitters:** ( 2 Commenters) D. Kerbs, M. Paulson

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Access Modification: Columbine Estates

---

**Comment:** Why is access to Woodmen from Pinello Drive allowed while access from Cindy, Ruth, and/or Gail Places is not? When are Cindy, Ruth, and/or Gail Places due to close?

**Response:** One of the goals of the project is to manage access along Woodmen Road more effectively than it is today. This is important because it improves safety for all drivers using the corridor. As a result, access was rerouted wherever possible. On the south side of Woodmen Road, the existing access locations had to be maintained because there were no other choices for access to those residents and properties. Furthermore, the access to Woodmen Road eastbound from Pinello Drive and La Madrina does not create a conflict with an acceleration lane as it does on the north side of Woodmen Road. Therefore, this entrance is safe, while the apparently similar movement on the north side is not safe due to the acceleration lane that will be built when the Union Boulevard/Woodmen Road interchange is built. Please note that the City of Colorado Springs Engineering Department plans to leave Cindy, Ruth, and Gail Places open to Woodmen Road until the Union/Woodmen interchange is built.

**Submitters:** D. Kerbs

### Access Modification: Columbine Estates

---

**Comment:** How far out of my way will I have to go to get to my house using the new access roads for Columbine Estates rather than my current access off of Woodmen Road?

**Response:** You will have access to your home via Stinson and Shrider Roads if traveling from the west, and Union and Shrider if traveling from the east. Depending on which intersection you are traveling from, your access will be up to 1/2 mile longer, which is not unreasonable considering it will certainly be the safer alternative.

**Submitters:** C. Hadl

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Access Modification: Cottonwood Townhomes

---

**Comment:** Will drivers from Cottonwood Townhomes be able to make a left onto Woodmen Road?

**Response:** Yes, the roadway will be designed so that the mentioned movement is accommodated.

**Submitters:** D. Hutchinson

### Access Modification: General

---

**Comment:** Access to Brookwood, Yorkshire, and Falcon Estates does not work well.

**Response:** As described in the response on page 13, the Brookwood and Yorkshire Estates access was modified after the Project Team, business owners, and neighbors worked together to choose the option that, in total, was better for all interested parties. A drawing and description can be found in this document. The access to Falcon Estates was not modified by this project and is beyond the scope of this EA.

**Submitters:** ( 2 Commenters) L. Kirk, E. Rennels

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Access Modification: General

---

**Comment:** Adding additional access roads in Columbine Estates will increase the opportunity for undesirable activity (which occurs now) in a dark and unpopulated area.

**Response:** This is a police enforcement issue. Streets lights could possibly be added during final design if desired.

**Submitters:** ( 2 Commenters) B. McAlister, T. Anderson

### Access Modification: East of Powers

---

**Comment:** Does there need to be an emergency access to the north of Woodmen Road near Black Forest Road in case Black Forest is closed due to an accident? Why is old Woodmen Road not a continuous frontage road so that it is more convenient to inter-neighborhood travel?

**Response:** Alternative access will be available from Tutt Avenue and Marksheffel Road, to the west and east of Black Forest Road, respectively. The discontinuity of the frontage road is intentional, and acts as a traffic calming strategy to protect the neighborhoods. If old Woodmen Road were a continuous frontage road, it would tend to be used as reserve capacity for the new Woodmen Road mainline. This would result in higher volumes and speeds on the frontage road, and would reduce the benefits associated with the frontage road such as safety, noise reduction, and access control.

**Submitters:** ( 2 Commenters) P. Ciborowsky, A. Havko

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Construction Issues: Commercial

---

**Comment:** During construction, noise, dust, disruption, and detours will cause hardship and interfere with business, including outdoor cafes. Some businesses wanted all construction to take place at night.

**Response:** During construction there will undoubtedly be noise and dust. There are City, County, State, and Federal regulations to manage and limit the effects of noise and dust. As discussed on page 92 of the EA, a traffic management plan will be developed as part of final design, to minimize the disruption and manage the detours safely. Outdoor cafes along the corridor currently experience noise from the roadway. Construction activities throughout the project will concentrate at different locations and times over the course of the project. Therefore, the additional disruption will be temporary in nature as with all construction projects. The construction schedule and times of construction will be suggested by the engineer during final design, but the final construction schedule will be set by the contractor in response to constructing the project efficiently as well as minimizing disruption to both residences and businesses.

**Submitters:** ( 10 Commenters) G. Frank, P. Ellis , L. Kirk, J. Hillstrom, C. Liquor, S. Scannell, VP, F. Dodge, G. Frank, L. Doole, H. Lenz

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Construction Issues: Residential

---

**Comment:** Several residents were concerned about noise and dust during construction as well as construction scheduling. Traffic operations and safety during construction was also a concern.

**Response:** During construction there will undoubtedly be noise and dust. There are City, County, State, and Federal regulations to manage and limit the effects of noise and dust. As discussed on page 92 of the EA, a traffic management plan will be developed as part of final design, to minimize the disruption and manage the detours safely. Construction activities throughout the project will concentrate at different locations and times over the course of the project. Therefore, the additional disruption will be temporary in nature as with all construction projects. The construction schedule and times of construction will be suggested by the engineer during final design, but the final construction schedule will be set by the contractor in response to constructing the project efficiently as well as minimizing disruption to both residences and businesses.

**Submitters:** ( 10 Commenters) G. Frank, J. Haag, S. Nauert, D. Horne, J. Freshman, N. DiCocco, G. Frank, C. Hadl, A. DeVere, G. Frank

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Construction Issues: General

---

**Comment:** How will buses operate during construction? How will traffic be rerouted? Can the area by Mountain Springs Church at Black Forest Road and Woodmen Road be done first as the two-lane road is dangerous. Will access roads be built first?

**Response:** Metro Transit, which operates the buses, has been involved in the EA from the onset. They will continue to coordinate as construction phasing and details are completed during final design. Likewise, the Traffic Management Plan will be developed during final design. The City and County will work together to minimize inconvenience for the traveling public throughout the length of the project. Woodmen Road at Black Forest Road is planned to be four lanes in the Proposed Action. The construction schedule will be suggested by the engineer during final design, but the final construction schedule will be set by the contractor in response to constructing the project efficiently as well as minimizing disruption to both residences and businesses. Logical phasing of the project will include many considerations such as cost, traffic management during construction, season, and contractor crew scheduling.

**Submitters:** ( 8 Commenters) A. Daniels, D. Art , J. Haag, S. Wear , J. Boulter, Z. Horak, J. Haag, J. Hillstrom

### Water Resources and Issues

---

**Comment:** Will erosion control measures be implemented?

**Response:** Erosion control measures will be implemented during construction. This is required as part of the compliance with the Colorado Discharge Permit System Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permits held separately by the City of Colorado Springs and El Paso County. See pages 125 through 128 of the EA for additional information. Details of the implementation will be developed during the final design and construction processes.

**Submitters:** A. Scheller

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Air Quality

---

**Comment:** Will air quality be worse with the Proposed Action because of the overpass and increased traffic? Will there be an effort to make the air quality better than it is today?

**Response:** The Pikes Peak Area Council of Government monitors air quality throughout the community and projects future air quality based on a number of factors including new or widened roadways and expanded development. Woodmen Road improvements have already been considered in future projections. "Hot-spot" modeling that was completed (see Section 3.10 of the EA) shows that the Proposed Action actually improves air quality along Woodmen Road because the added lanes increase capacity, thus reducing idling time during traffic delays. No Air Quality standards will be violated as a result of this project, and emission controls that will continue to be implemented will assist in improving air quality over time.

**Submitters:** ( 10 Commenters) C. Nauert, C. Nauert, R. Steed, S. Nauert, S. Nauert, S. Nauert, N. DiCocco, L. Bagley-Hoafe, R. DiGiacomo, B. Angelos

### Public Involvement: Compliments

---

**Comment:** There were some comments complimenting the public involvement process.

**Response:** The Woodmen Road public process was designed to include all in the public involvement. There were four large public meetings as well as many smaller group and individual meetings during the course of the EA. An evaluation of the public comments can be found on page 225 of the EA document.

**Submitters:** ( 4 Commenters) M. Dempset, R. Acosta, T. Anderson, H. Lenz

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Public Involvement: Criticism

---

**Comment:** Some people gave up on the public involvement during the EA process and therefore did not attend the public hearing. One person did not feel that they were treated respectfully at the public hearing. Why were the drawings at the public hearing displayed in such a crowded part of the auditorium? Someone on the project team suggested driving on private property to access Starbucks. This is not right.

**Response:** The public process included over 900 attendees at the four public meetings and the public hearing. Additionally, there were many small group and individual meetings, phone conversations, newsletters, and a website with over 50,000 hits. Newsletters, postcards, and notices were sent out periodically throughout the project to over 1,600 addresses resulting in over 100,000 mailings. While some citizens may have chosen not to attend a particular meeting, there was ample opportunity for comment and discussion. The project team makes every effort to be respectful and understands that this is a highly emotionally charged project. It is unfortunate when any citizen feels disrespected and it should not happen. The drawings were arranged as part of the larger exhibit in a chronological order, similar to all other public workshops. Over 300 people attended the Public Hearing and were keenly interested in the exhibits, which resulted in crowding around the maps. It is not appropriate to drive across private property to access Starbucks and it is not part of the Proposed Action, which provides public access to Starbucks.

**Submitters:** ( 4 Commenters) H. Lenz, A. Willard, G. Frank, D. Morris

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:East/West Mobility Study

---

**Comment:** Implement other parts of the East/West Mobility Study.

**Response:** In fact, many parts of the East/West Mobility Study are underway such as the Austin Bluffs/Union Boulevard Interchange and the Austin Bluffs/Nevada Avenue Interchange. Projects cannot reasonably all be started at once, but rather must be scheduled in consideration of timing and funding. Woodmen Road has had funding approved since the late 1990s and was therefore ahead of some of the other corridors noted in the East/West Mobility Study. The City has never intended to have this be the sole east/west corridor because other sections of the City must also be served and plans are underway to implement them. Many of these corridor projects will be funded by the PPRTA.

**Submitters:** ( 3 Commenters) J. Boulter, G. Howe, G. Howe

### Miscellaneous Comments:Urban Forest

---

**Comment:** Consider the environmental impact on the mature “urban forest” in the Brookwood and Yorkshire neighborhoods.

**Response:** The proposed project will not impact the mature trees that inhabit the Brookwood and Yorkshire neighborhoods south of the wall that separates them from Woodmen Road with one exception. The house just east of the Crossroads Apartments, 1737 Wildwood Drive, will be acquired for a new road. Additionally, any trees north of the wall could be removed as part of the roadway construction, which is generally expanded to the north of Woodmen Road. The decision to remove trees will be made as part of the Final Design process. These trees will be evaluated by the City Forester to determine if they can be relocated.

**Submitters:** B. Schultz

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Construction Traffic Lane Closures

---

**Comment:** Be careful not to cause congestion by closing lanes on Woodmen Road when other nearby projects are also closing lanes.

**Response:** The City and County are aware that the many roadway construction projects in the area need to be coordinated. CDOT holds weekly coordination meetings to minimize the issues that arise from construction on I-25 and nearby projects.

**Submitters:** A. Willard

### Miscellaneous Comments:Large Trucks on York Road

---

**Comment:** Large trucks using York Road will make it unsafe.

**Response:** It is anticipated that there will be more trucks traveling between Academy Boulevard and Earl Drive. However, the Proposed Action will address safety by providing better definition for:

- access,
- loading and unloading,
- parking,
- vehicular movement, and
- pedestrian movement.

This will be accomplished by adding curb, sidewalk, and on-street parking areas. These changes will better accommodate both vehicular and pedestrian movement.

**Submitters:** F. Wolfrum

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Public Comments Review

---

**Comment:** Where can I read public comments made during the public comment period?

**Response:** All comments are included in this document and all are addressed. We have grouped some comments, where that was logical, and answered others individually. This document is organized so that everyone who made a comment can find a response.

**Submitters:** B. Morgan

### Miscellaneous Comments:Cost Estimate

---

**Comment:** The cost estimate, \$98 million, is not enough to complete this project.

**Response:** The cost estimate is given in 2003 dollars. At the conceptual level of the Proposed Action, the cost estimate is intended to be a marker for funding requests. When the detailed design is done, the cost estimates will be reevaluated and adjusted. This is in response to construction costs, timing, phasing, and other issues that arise as the project is initiated.

**Submitters:** J. Hackett

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Gate at Prince Drive

---

**Comment:** Replace the gate at the north end of Prince Drive.

**Response:** This and the drainage issues along the Yorkshire Estates wall will be evaluated in final design with input from City Engineering and the Fire Department.

**Submitters:** ( 3 Commenters) R. Wolfrum, R. Wolfrum, D. Krohn

### Miscellaneous Comments:Acquire Apartments

---

**Comment:** Acquire the apartments at the southeast corner of Woodmen and Academy so that access to Brookwood Estates can be improved.

**Response:** The apartment complex has over 180 units that are home to many people. It is not necessary to acquire this property to construct the Proposed Action.

**Submitters:** ( 2 Commenters) J. Brennr, J. Brewer

### Miscellaneous Comments:Widening to the North

---

**Comment:** Can Woodmen Road be widened to the north, thus avoiding demolition at Cottonwood Creek Townhomes?

**Response:** The Proposed Action widens Woodmen Road, in that area, to the north and does not demolish any units in the Cottonwood Creek Townhomes.

**Submitters:** S. Wear

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Business Signage

---

**Comment:** Can the project provide marquee signage for the businesses near King Soopers since visibility will be lessened as a result of the Proposed Action?

**Response:** Private business signage is typically not considered a good use of tax monies set aside for roadway construction and such cost is generally the business owner's responsibility. Federal funds definitely cannot be used for private business signage. However, this situation has been discussed with City Engineering and discussion and resolution of these issues will be decided during final design due to the detailed nature.

**Submitters:** H. Lenz

### Miscellaneous Comments:Light Pollution

---

**Comment:** Light pollution will be detrimental to the health of residents of Falcon Estates.

**Response:** Lighting will be determined during final design and will be consistent with City standards in this area.

**Submitters:** L. Bagley-Hoafe

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Falcon School District 49

---

**Comment:** Falcon School District 49 had a number of questions which include:1) What is the construction schedule, which we need to know to keep our school buses' schedule timely? 2) Will the cul-de-sacs on the frontage roads be large enough to turn school buses around? 3) The buses on Golden Sage road need a larger access. 4) Falcon School District wants a stop sign on the frontage road at their driveway access. 5) Can the bike path be placed on the south side of the frontage road?

**Response:** 1) The construction schedule is not known at this time. Affected property owners, including businesses and residents, will be consulted and informed with respect to construction schedule, closures and detours. 2) The need for a larger turning radius to accommodate buses at Golden Sage Road was identified and larger radii will be incorporated into design plans for the Proposed Action. 3) Approved development plans for property immediately adjacent to the Falcon School District 49 facility include a new roadway. The new road will provide for School District 49 access to Bent Grass Meadows Drive, which will accommodate school buses better than the Golden Sage Road access. 4) A stop sign will be investigated during final design. 5) No. Placement of the bicycle lane between the frontage road and mainline will not be considered for safety reasons.

**Submitters:** Z. Horak

### Miscellaneous Comments:North Widening of Woodmen near I-25

---

**Comment:** How far north is Woodmen Road going to be widened between Carl's Jr. and Wag-n-Wash?

**Response:** The Proposed Action Alternative, shown in Figure 2-5 of the EA, is a conceptual drawing. In this area of the project, the edge of road will be up to approximately 40 feet further north than existing edge of road.

**Submitters:** G. Halliday

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Long Range Plan

---

**Comment:** Can I get more detailed information about the proposal? What is the long-range expansion plan? How do I open DWF files on the Web site?

**Response:** The Proposed Action is a conceptual plan and the final design, which cannot occur until the environmental process is concluded, will contain the more detailed information for this project. This EA is a long-range plan and has approximately a 20 year planning horizon, which is standard for transportation projects. All of the Proposed Action graphics and drawings are also in a PDF file format, which most computer users can easily access.

**Submitters:** C. Bobbitt

### Miscellaneous Comments:Mature Trees

---

**Comment:** Can existing mature trees be saved?

**Response:** Existing landscape will be evaluated to determine health, longevity, and preservation ability. Based on this assessment, trees will either be part of the new landscape, removed and planted elsewhere, or removed. That determination will be made as part of the final design phase.

**Submitters:** ( 3 Commenters) G. Halliday, B. Alexander, A. Scheller

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Water Issues

---

**Comment:** Is there a plan for surface drainage, run-off, and other water issues? I am particularly concerned about the Brookwood Estates and Woodland Hills Village. Are our water aquifers and water resources being protected as part of this project?

**Response:** There are very few existing drainage facilities on the western portion of the project area and this Proposed Action is an opportunity to correct that. Extensive analysis and identification of drainage issues and solutions will be developed during final design. During the EA, potential solutions were identified and examined. Water resources and quality were extensively studied as part of the environmental process. As a result of many comments early in the project about wells in the area, this issue was identified at the beginning of the project. All water resources will be evaluated during final design and throughout the construction period.

**Submitters:** ( 3 Commenters) R. Steed, N. Ansted, J. Freshman

### Miscellaneous Comments:Replatting

---

**Comment:** Who pays for replatting the lots where there are partial property acquisitions?

**Response:** New property boundaries are developed as part of the project and property owners are not responsible for these costs.

**Submitters:** D. Krohn

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Fencing on Access Roads

---

**Comment:** Will there be fencing on the new access roads in Columbine Estates?

**Response:** Fencing is a final design issue and has not yet been discussed. However, typically, if a fence is removed during implementation, it is replaced.

**Submitters:** B. Alexander

### Miscellaneous Comments:Academy Boulevard Traffic

---

**Comment:** The Woodmen Road project needs to take into account the effect it will have on Academy Boulevard.

**Response:** The Woodmen Road Corridor was designed in consideration of Academy Boulevard as well as all the other cross-streets and the surrounding traffic patterns.

**Submitters:** S. Nauert

### Miscellaneous Comments:Frontage Roads

---

**Comment:** Is the frontage road a safe distance from my house?

**Response:** All frontage roads and other aspects of the design of Woodmen Road will meet current safety standards.

**Submitters:** D. Art

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Miscellaneous Comments:Economic Impact to Businesses

---

**Comment:** Hardships to local businesses should be studied. Local businesses should be reimbursed for lost business.

**Response:** Business hardship is not reimbursed during construction; however, during construction access to businesses will be maintained. Business access is maintained throughout the construction period and while construction causes delay and in some cases avoidance of an area, customers can still access the business. As a matter of practicality and budget, reimbursement is not possible. Once the construction is complete, the roadway improvement increases the ease of access which potentially increases business, depending on the business.

**Submitters:** G. Frank

### Miscellaneous Comments:Mapping Question

---

**Comment:** Figure 1-4 shows a shopping center on the northwest corner of Woodmen Road and Union Boulevard. Is this the City's intention?

**Response:** The box is not intended to show a future shopping center. Rather, it represents the general location of the existing shopping center at the southwest corner of Briargate Boulevard and Union Boulevard. The northwest corner of Woodmen Road and Union Boulevard is residential land.

**Submitters:** D. Krohn

## PUBLIC COMMENT RESPONSE REVIEW

### Issues Not Related to this Project

---

- Comment:** There were several comments that were beyond the scope of this project and therefore cannot be responded to. They include:
- Preserve right-of-way for a future freeway.
  - Link Constitution Avenue to I-25.
  - Connect Columbine Estates to the City water and sewer system.
  - Describe plan for Woodmen Road and Banning Lewis Parkway
  - Windows of my home rattle from passing trucks.
  - Connect other roads such as Stapleton Road prior to construction of Woodmen Road.
  - The spending of the \$5 million dollars from Rosenbaum and Dean's development.
  - Improve the Shrider and Goddard intersections where they intersect Academy Boulevard.
  - Improve connections to I-25 at the Woodmen Road and the Academy Boulevard exits.
  - Should have added lanes to improvements between Markscheffel and US 24 in 2004 when the Safety Project was done.
  - Improve roadways throughout the community so that traffic flows more easily. Otherwise the community cannot attract businesses to sustain growth.
  - Make a better logical connection between City Planning and Permitting (former NAPA building).
  - The exit off of I-25 to Woodmen Boulevard causes back-ups.
  - Program the traffic signals better.
  - Cottonwood Creek Trail and Academy Boulevard Crossing is not noted in the EA.
  - Poor construction on original wall at Yorkshire Estates
  - Fix the spelling of Woodmen Road at US 24, it currently reads "Woodman".

**Response:** These issues were not included in the Woodmen Road Improvements Project because they are outside the project limits or beyond the scope of the project.

**Submitters:** ( 29 Commenters) P. Ellis , K. McGuire, C. Meyer, P. Rasmussen, T. Skrastins, C. Curry, J. von Ahlefeldt, J. Thomas , S. Nauert, C. Nauert, H. Lenz, D. Morris, B. Alexander, E. Rennels, B. McAlister, F. Dodge, E. Burcham, E. Bilot, R. Wolfrum, G. Frank, J. McDonald, A. Anonymous, C. Nauert, A. Havko, C. Erwin, M. Rueffert, B. Alexander, E. Rennels, D. Krohn