

Appendix B. Public Involvement Program

Appendix B. Public Involvement Program

B.1 May 2005 Public Comment Sheet Summary

In May 2005, a newsletter was mailed to 1,229 property owners adjacent to US 34 from US 287 east to Larimer County Road 3 (hereafter referred to as the US 34 corridor). The newsletter included a Public Comment Sheet and requested that recipients complete and return the postage-paid form. One hundred completed forms were returned, resulting in a response rate of 8.1 percent, which reflects an average response rate for a questionnaire of this nature. The survey results are discussed below. Please note that results reflect the stated opinions of the survey respondents and are not to be interpreted as reflecting the opinions of any other population.¹

B.1.1 Use of the Corridor (first question in questionnaire)

As shown in Exhibit B-1 respondents use the corridor for shopping (76 percent), while 59 percent live in the US 34 corridor (and all of these respondents indicated they own their property, which is as to be expected because the flyer was mailed to only property owners). Fifty percent use the US 34 corridor to commute to work or school, 40 percent own property in the corridor, 35 percent use it for access to recreation, and 23 percent work in the corridor. Twenty-two percent own or operate a business in the US 34 corridor, and 8 percent use it for development activities. The “Other” category received responses including access especially to I-25 and Greeley (5 percent) and driving to schools (2 percent).

**Exhibit B-1. “How do you use the US 34 Corridor (Eisenhower Boulevard)?
(Check all that apply)”
(Out of 100 responses)**

| Purpose | Percent |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Shopping | 76% |
| Live in corridor | 59% |
| Own | 59% |
| Rent | 0% |
| Commuting (work/school) | 50% |
| Own property | 40% |
| Access to recreation | 35% |
| Work in the corridor | 23% |
| Own or operate business | 22% |
| Development activities | 8% |
| Other | 7% |

B.1.2 Concerns about the Corridor (second question in questionnaire)

The greatest concerns respondents have about the US 34 corridor are ease of travel (70 percent), general safety (64 percent), and speed (60 percent). Exhibit B-2 displays the complete list of concerns. The “Other” category received responses that included congestion/bottlenecks at lights (Wal-Mart, movies, outlets);

¹The sampling group was not structured to be unbiased (for example, those who chose to return the survey had enough interest in the project to complete and return the survey or may be older with more time to do so).

speeding; timing lights; safety of I-25/US 34 on and off ramps; noise from traffic; lengthening of electric signal turns; concern for semis on US 34; and suggestion to limit access to US 34.

Respondents stated that these concerns were important to them for the following reasons:

- Safety (11 comments)
- Live/work near US 34 (11 comments)
- Traffic (8 comments)
- Use it everyday (6 comments)
- Wish to maintain rural character/quality of life (5 comments)
- Speeding is a problem (3 comments)
- Hard to get out of driveway (3 comments)

**Exhibit B-2. “What current issues/concerns do you have about US 34?
(Check all that apply)”
(Out of 100 responses)**

| Issue | Percent |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Ease of travel | 70% |
| General safety* | 68% |
| <i>Motorist safety</i> | 43% |
| <i>Pedestrian safety</i> | 37% |
| <i>Bicyclist safety</i> | 34% |
| <i>No group specified</i> | 15% |
| Speed | 60% |
| Access to residence | 56% |
| Access to shopping/restaurants | 48% |
| Environmental (noise, wildlife, etc.) | 43% |
| Access to place of employment | 39% |
| Maintain scenic quality | 35% |
| Visibility of other traffic | 30% |
| Access to schools | 23% |
| Maintaining farmland | 21% |
| Crossing railroad | 4% |
| Other | 17% |

**Because respondents were allowed to select more than one of the safety subgroups, subgroup responses add to more than the total responses for General Safety (68 percent).*

B.1.3 Desired Improvements of the Corridor (third question in questionnaire)

Several respondents want to see better traffic signal timing in the US 34 corridor (67 percent) and more traffic lanes (52 percent). Exhibit B-3 displays the complete list of responses for the categories offered in the survey. The “Other” category received open-ended responses including the following:

- Create a bypass/alternate route (5 comments)
- Improve safety of I-25/34 interchange (4 comments)
- None: we do not need improvements (3 comments)
- Lower speed limit (2 comments)

- Improve access points (2 comments)
- Make 34 limited access and make a frontage road (2 comments)
- "Do not allow left turns from Eisenhower to Jefferson and Washington. It holds up traffic way too much!"
- "Maintain the 100 year old bluespruce trees in median. This is valuable to many people and to considerable wildlife."

**Exhibit B-3. "What type of improvements on US 34 would be helpful to you?"
(Out of 100 responses)**

| Improvement | Percent |
|------------------------------|---------|
| Better traffic signal timing | 68% |
| More traffic lanes | 53% |
| Bicycle lanes | 18% |
| Pedestrian access | 17% |
| Bus service improvements | 16% |
| More access points | 14% |
| Fewer access points | 13% |
| Other | 23% |

B.1.4 Fourth and Fifth Questions in Questionnaire

The fourth and fifth questions asked if respondents wished to continue to be involved in the study and if respondents were in any special interest groups. Answers to these questions are to be used for future outreach efforts.

B.1.5 Additional Comments

Many respondents provided comments in the space provided at the end of the survey. The comments were organized into four general categories (and several subcategories): Improvements, Safety, Growth and Development, and Miscellaneous.

Specific comments on highway improvements represent the largest category of comments. There were a few comments on additional lanes (including turning lanes), traffic lights, and signal timing. While a few commenters recommended keeping all existing access points open, several other comments suggested limiting access and creating a bypass. Some comments identified possible alternate routes and some suggested improving SH 402. Increased bus service was also suggested to relieve traffic.

Safety was a concern of many respondents. People have concerns regarding a few specific intersections (for example, US 34 and Madison, Mt. View High School, Monroe Avenue) and turning in and out of their properties. The I-25 interchange was cited as a concern for a few. Speeding is also a concern, with people wanting lower speed limits and stronger enforcement. Speeding is a concern in neighborhoods, as is the increased traffic in neighborhoods with drivers cutting through residential areas to avoid traffic on US 34. Biker and pedestrian safety is also a concern, with a few comments suggesting sidewalks, bike lanes, and crossovers.

Many comments discussed issues related to the growth and development experienced in the US 34 corridor. Some do not think improvements to US 34 will be able to keep up with development and relieve the current levels of congestion. One commenter is concerned about impacts on wildlife from development

of the area. A few comments suggested that developers help pay for the increased traffic problems, and a few comments regarded the increased noise levels in the corridor and suggested noise ordinances be put in place and enforced.

Some miscellaneous comments included appreciation for CDOT examining the US 34 corridor. Some expressed discontent that the project is on too slow of a timeline and is already behind an ideal schedule.

The following is a complete list of additional comments submitted in the space provided at the end of the survey. The comments were organized into four general categories (and several subcategories): (I) Improvements; (II) Safety; (III) Growth and Development; and (IV) Miscellaneous.

I. Improvements

A. Additional Lanes

- At least six lanes of traffic are needed to support current growth in area.
- Additional lanes would be helpful but do not want it to look like Hwy 14 going into Fort Collins.
- Start with Hwy 56 four lanes Hwy 402 four lanes all going to I-25.
- Southbound Madison at 34 needs two left turn lanes onto US 34 eastbound because people drive through residential areas trying to avoid the congestion.
- CDOT wastes money on median barriers that need upkeep. Turn lanes in the center are better than barriers.

B. Traffic Lights

- The addition of more stop lights should not be considered as a possible solution to traffic congestion.
- A left turn light would help the flow of traffic on Garfield and Eisenhower like the one on Eisenhower. Garfield has a left turn lane but no light. Concerned about left light because sometimes it takes three to four light changes if you want to go on Eisenhower from north to south.
- "You need traffic signal no closer then 1 mile!"

C. Timing of Lights

- The current timing of the lights does not support smooth traffic flow.
- Better traffic signal timing would be an easy fix that could be done now.

D. Access Points

- "You have been limiting access points, making it harder and harder to get to the business, and it is not working."
- Wishes CDOT would keep access points open.

E. Bypass

- Concerned that there are too many access points to support the current speed limit.
- "This section of 34 is a prime candidate for a higher speed blvd., flanked by slower, local lanes (like the stretch of S. College in Ft. Collins between Drake and Prospect)."
- "I personally have no problem with 34 but I do feel the powers that be are deliberately trying to jam 34 and I haven't figured out why but I do feel we can be better served with a bypass and I love this bally-ho we can't do it. Think about it are you really futuristic in your tunnel vision."
- An additional road could be located parallel to US 34.
- An additional road could be located one-half to one mile south of US 34.

F. Alternative Routes

- Would like a highway connecting Loveland with towns to the south and west such as a highway going south to Boulder from west Loveland. Would like this highway to avoid all the little towns and would be willing to pay a toll.
- Needs to be another road available to go east and west to take the pressure off Eisenhower.
- Wishes there was a convenient alternative route.

G. SH 402

- Should also address SH 402 needs.
- If 402 was improved, it would take traffic off 34.

H. Buses

- If RTD had an additional bus route from Fort Collins to Loveland that went southbound to Longmont, it would ease early morning problems.
- Concerned that I-25 and 34 are not adequate to handle the volume of commuters who work in Denver and live in Loveland. Believes we need good public transportation to Denver and Cheyenne.
- Interested when public transportation will be available from north I-25 to Denver.

I. Miscellaneous Improvements

- "I think the east side of 287 needs more improvement going north and going to Fort Collins to ease main congestion coming from I-25 into Loveland (around Northern Lakes) Boyd and the western lake (Colsons excavating Road)."
- Wishes the fruit stand on the south side by Mtn. View High School would be destroyed because it has caused numerous accidents in the westbound lanes because there is no turn lane there.

II. Safety

A. General Safety

- Safety of turning in and out of her property.
- Concerned about easing the flow of traffic without turning US 34 into a speedway and a very unsafe road to cross.
- Safety of the corridor due to the fact she sees an accident in this corridor at least once a week during the morning rush hour.
- Safety at the intersection of US 34 and Madison.
- Safety of the access for the Mtn. View High School.
- Safety at Monroe school on Monroe Ave. because there is no turn light to go north, south, east, or west, and the people are taking too many chances when turning there.

B. I-25 Interchange

- Hwy 34 and I-25 interchange needs work - now!
- Concerned about the safety of the interchange at 34 and I-25 (exits 257 A and B).
- The I-25 - 34 interchange should be high priority.
- Access to I-25 needs to be moved.

C. Speeding

- Concerned about cars speeding. She does not think cars should drive 40 mph between 287 and Monroe.
- Concerned with safety due to speeding drivers.
- Speed limit needs to be reduced in this corridor with the additional traffic and the high school.
- Needs to be police enforcement to prevent speeding.
- Wishes CDOT would slow traffic to 50 mph or less.
- Speed limit is not being followed in the residential areas.

D. Neighborhood Safety

- Concerned about the congestion in this area because many cars are cutting through the residential neighborhoods to avoid traffic and intersections.
- Concerned about safety in the residential areas. Believes there are not enough lanes to handle the volume of traffic and so drivers are cutting through residential areas at dangerous speeds.

E. Bikes and Pedestrians

- Separate bike and pedestrian sidewalks from car lanes.
- Want to be able to cross Eisenhower on or at the Denver intersection to walk to Wal-Mart.
- Crossovers would help traffic flow and deplete some traffic. Concerned for the safety of pedestrians trying to cross 34.

III. Growth and Development

A. Development (General)

- 34 needs to be changed due to the new businesses and the hospital.
- With all the development, Loveland will become a large metropolis eventually.
- There are too many businesses and developments locating to US 34.
- Does not believe that this project will reduce the congestion due to the fact it is still being developed.
- Avoids using US 34 if at all possible because he believes it has become a complete traffic jam all day long.
- Wishes Loveland would stop building so many homes so quickly on the west side of town so people would not have to drive across town to get to work.
- Wishes more people could work in Loveland and not have to commute to another city for work.
- Some of the additional tax income should be used to improve the streets because numerous homes are added each year to the tax rolls.
- Concerned with all the damage to the wildlife due to the development of this area.

B. Developers Should Pay

- "Make the developer out east pay for the increased traffic! Quit giving incentives for more development!"
- "Developers should have footed a big part of the cost or all! If development can't pay for itself and costs the town more money and decline in quality of a small town life then why have it!!!"

C. Noise

- Loveland is too noisy.
- Noise ordinances should be put into place and enforced.

IV. Miscellaneous

A. Compliments

- Enjoys the widened highway at Washington/Eisenhower.
- Very glad that this issue is being addressed before all of the new businesses and residences are finished.
- Appreciates that CDOT is taking a close look at this area (especially the cloverleaf of I-25/34).

B. Complaints on Timing of Improvements

- "I don't understand why the area, from 287 to Madison was under construction last year if this was being studied. It affected my business greatly - it seems like a misuse of funds."
- The time line is far too long for improvements to be made.

- "I think that you are already 5 years behind schedule on this project. The traffic flow has at least doubled in the last five years. "
- "Why do we wait until it's such a mess when Loveland knew this problem was going to happen as soon as Outlet Mall Center Target Sportsman etc.....Hospital coming soon - This should have been addressed as soon as that whole marketing area was approved and developed."

C. Requesting Further Information

- "I would like to be mailed all drawings, plans and projected timelines regarding the intersection of Hwy 34 and Hwy 287."
- Would like to be kept informed of all aspects of the project.
- "I would like to be added to the mailing list for newsletters. I am involved with the N. I-25 EIS and I am currently looking at interchange alts @ I-25/US 34."

B.1.6 Conclusion

Most survey respondents use the US 34 corridor daily for shopping, and more than half of the respondents own a home in the US 34 corridor. Approximately half use it to commute to work or school, and many use it for access to recreation.

Respondents are most concerned about:

- Ease of travel along the US 34 corridor;
- Safety;
- Speed; and
- Access to residences and shopping.

They are concerned because of safety and because they live or work near US 34. They are also concerned about traffic and some want to maintain the rural character of the area.

The following are the most desired improvements in the US 34 corridor:

- Improving traffic signal timing
- Adding lanes to the highway
- Adding bicycles lanes and pedestrian access
- Improving bus service

Respondents appear to be divided on access points. While some desired more access points, slightly more desired fewer. Also, some suggested creating a bypass with a frontage road, and others recommended an alternate route. A few commented that improving the I-25 interchange should be a high priority.



Public Comment Sheet

Thank you for completing and returning this postage-paid comment sheet. We greatly appreciate your participation. Please seal with tape and mail by June 10, 2005, no postage necessary.

Name _____ Mailing Address _____
(Optional)

Phone _____ Fax _____ E-Mail _____
(Optional) (Optional) (Optional)

How do you use the US 34 Corridor (Eisenhower Boulevard)? (Check all that apply)

- Commuting (work/school)
- Live in Corridor
 - Own
 - Rent
- Work in Corridor
- Shopping
- Development Activities
- Own or operate business in Corridor
- Own property within Corridor
- Access to recreation

Other _____

What current issues/concerns do you have about US 34? (Check all that apply)

- Access to schools
- Access to shopping/restaurants
- Access to place of employment
- Access to residence
- Visibility of other traffic
- Ease of travel
- Environmental (noise, wildlife, etc.)
- Speed
- Maintaining scenic quality
- Maintaining farmland
- Crossing railroad
- General Safety
 - Pedestrian
 - Bicyclist
 - Motorist

Other _____

Why are these issues important to you? _____

What type of improvements on US 34 would be helpful to you?

- More access points
- Fewer access points
- Bicycle lanes
- Pedestrian access
- Better traffic signal timing
- Bus service improvements
- More traffic lanes

Other _____

Would you like to continue being involved in this study?

- Yes
- No

Do you represent any special interest group/organization in the project area? If so, please provide their name and address. Would it be possible to distribute project information through your organization?

Please use the following area to provide detail to your responses or additional comments.

(Continue on back if necessary)

B.2 April 2006 Open House #1 Public Comment Sheet Summary

Fifty-five (55) area residents and interested parties attended the US 34 EA Open House held on April 25, 2006, at Monroe Elementary School in Loveland.

Nineteen (19) attendees provided written comments. To date, no email or regular mail comment sheets have been received at JFSA. Written comments are summarized below.

B.2.1 Do you support the widening of US 34?

Fifteen respondents said yes, two said no and two identified the project as a temporary fix only.

Five noted safety as the main concern. Three mentioned turn lanes or left turn lanes. Two supported the project but asked for minimal impacts on adjacent properties. Four comments centered on needing more planning or more creative solutions (alternate routes or alternate modes of transportation). The respondents who opposed the project were concerned about the improvement attracting more traffic headed to Estes Park, impacts west of Garfield Avenue, and concerns about adequate property owner compensation for right-of-way.

B.2.2 Concerns about US 34?

- US 34 and Denver Avenue intersection (1)
- SH 402 Bypass (2)
- Left turns needed not mentioned above (2)
- Safety for school children (2)
- Too much traffic or congestion (3)
- I-25 interchange is a concern, is dangerous (3)
- Too high of speeds, drop speed limit (4)
- Signal timing (2)
- Transit planning is needed (1)
- Too much density on eastern developments (1)
- CDOT has different standards for small property owners (1)
- Concerns about condemnation and/or loss of access to Good Times (1)
- Roundabouts would work (to slow traffic), but they would need to be huge (1)
- Include trees and other landscaping (1)
- Adding lanes to Eisenhower (US 34) will create an unacceptable environmental impact on the residential area between Garfield Avenue and Lake Loveland (1)



Public Open House #1
April 25, 2006 5 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Monroe Elementary School
500 North Monroe Avenue, Loveland

Public Comment Sheet

PLEASE HAND IN THIS SHEET BEFORE YOU LEAVE TODAY - OR

- Mail it no later than May 9, 2006 to: J.F. Sato & Associates, 5898 S. Rapp Street, Littleton, CO 80120, Attn: Joanna Morsicato, Project Manager
- Provide comments on the US 34 website: www.dot.state.co.us/US34EA/
- Call 303-797-1200 x 1313

Are you a: resident business owner commuter other in the project area?

Do you support the potential widening of US 34 between Garfield Avenue and Larimer County Road 3? Why or why not?

What are your concerns about US 34? Why?

Optional Information:

Name : _____

Address : _____ City, State, Zip _____

B.3 February 2007 Open House #2 Public Comment Sheet Summary

Forty-six (46) area residents and interested parties attended the second US 34 Public Open House held on February 27, 2007 at Harold Ferguson High School in Loveland.

Four (4) attendees provided written comments. In addition to the invitation to the open house that was sent to those on the project mailing list (approximately 1,200 addresses), advertisements were placed in local newspapers, affected businesses owners were invited as a part of the interview process described in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.4.5, and CDOT sent an additional invitation letter to residents and businesses owners whose buildings were expected to be affected by the project. To date, no email or regular mail comment sheets have been received. Written comments are summarized below.

B.3.1 Do you support the potential widening of US 34 using the Action Alternative?

Three respondents said yes. One said no. This respondent said, "You show my property as a total take and I know you will not pay me enough to replace my hiway frontage property! You need to find a 'willing seller' and then replace my property with a like kind property...."

B.3.2 Concerns about widening US 34 using the Action Alternative?

- Loss of access to business as crossovers are eliminated
- Questions about roadway curving south through Dairy Queen when there is open and vacant land to the north between Lincoln and Jefferson avenues
- Under-compensation to frontage property owners
- Effects of decreasing access to properties on property value and tax revenue



Public Open House #2
February 27, 2007 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
Harold Ferguson High School
804 East Eisenhower Boulevard, Loveland

Public Comment Sheet

PLEASE HAND IN THIS SHEET BEFORE YOU LEAVE TODAY - OR

- Mail it no later than March 7, 2007 to: J.F. Sato & Associates, 5898 S. Rapp Street, Littleton, CO 80120, Attn: Joanna Morsicato
- Provide comments on the US 34 website: www.dot.state.co.us/US34EA/
- Call 303-797-1200 x 1313

Are you a: resident business owner commuter other in the project area?

Do you support the potential widening of US 34 between Garfield Avenue and Larimer County Road 3 using the Action Alternative? Why or why not?

What are your concerns about widening US 34 using the Action Alternative?

Optional Information:

Name : _____

Address : _____ City, State, Zip _____

