

# DRAFT

## Subtopic i2: Historic Resources

Nine public and agency comments were received on the i2: Historic Resources subtopic. From those nine comments, seven common concern statements were created. Themes for the i2: Historic Resources subtopic include:

- Mitigation policies within a historic landmark district should be clarified and the landmark district should be identified as a uniquely sensitive area.
- The Draft PEIS did not sufficiently address mitigation effects on Georgetown.
- The discussion of mitigation options in the Tier 1 PEIS were limited, with only noise impacts being addressed.
- Mitigation of Section 106 resources is inconsistent.
- There are contradictions in the mitigation discussion about whether variations to the standard CDOT designs will be possible or whether context sensitive design can be used.
- Context sensitive design is appropriate and should be used in the Georgetown-Silver Plume National Landmark District and the Georgetown Hill area.
- Any plans to increase capacity through historic communities should seek to minimize and reduce visual, audible, and vibratory impacts and incorporate the collaborative problem-solving approach embodied in context sensitive design.

CSS No.	Mitigation Common Concern Statements
<b>Subtopic i2: Historic Resources Mitigation</b>	
i2-a	<p><b>Clarification of Mitigation Policies</b>                      The Town of Georgetown requests a clarification of mitigation policies within a Historic Landmark District.</p>
i2-b	<p><b>Insufficient Discussion Concerning Mitigation for Georgetown</b>                      Mitigation on the effects of all of the alternatives on the town of Georgetown and its residents and property owners is not sufficiently addressed in the PEIS.</p>
i2-c	<p><b>Limited Mitigation Discussion</b>                      Mitigation options available are also severely limited by the Tier 1 PEIS. There is no discussion of reduced width widening, and a very limited discussion of tiered highways or underdecking. Tunnels are eliminated. The discussion of mitigation for Historic Resources in Section 3.19 relates to noise impacts only.</p>
i2-d	<p><b>Inconsistency in Section 106 Resources Mitigation</b>                      In regard to Section 106 resources, the mitigation appears to be inconsistent.</p>
i2-e	<p><b>Contradictory Discussions</b>                      There are contradictions in the mitigation discussion in the PEIS whether variations to the standard CDOT designs will be possible or whether variances or “context sensitive design” can be used. The Georgetown-Silver Plume National Landmark District and the Georgetown Hill area are places where “context sensitive design” is appropriate and it should be used in these areas.</p>
i2-f	<p><b>Treatment of the Landmark District</b>                      The Landmark District has not been identified in the mitigation sections of the PEIS as a uniquely sensitive area. The commitment to follow a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement in the face of policies to only vary standard design in “isolated instances” (Chapter 3, Section 3.19.2 of the Draft PEIS) does not avoid or minimize harm to this District.</p>

# DRAFT

<b>CSS No.</b>	<b>Mitigation Common Concern Statements</b>
i2-g	<b>Use of Context Sensitive Design</b> Any plans to increase capacity through the National Register eligible historic communities should seek to minimize and, to the extent possible, reduce existing visual, audible, and vibratory impacts on these communities, and incorporate the collaborative problem-solving approach embodied in context sensitive design.