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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Mesa County, on behalf of Grand Valley Transit (GVT), contracted with LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. to provide technical assistance in selecting sites for a maintenance facility in the Grand Junction area. This project was initially begun in 2005 as part of a joint Transfer/Operations and Maintenance Facility Site Selection process. Due to the dynamics of funding, the maintenance facility portion of that study was not completed. This study is in response to the need for a maintenance facility for county-operated GVT vehicles.

Mesa County, specifically the greater Grand Junction area, is served by Grand Valley Transit, contracted through Mesa County. Based on the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Transit Element, Mesa County is attempting to develop a new maintenance facility site in order to be proactive regarding regional growth and increased future demand. The maintenance facility follows the planning and completed development of the new transfer center in downtown Grand Junction.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary goal of this project is to assist in the selection of suitable sites for the development of a transit maintenance and storage facility, referenced herein as “facility.” Objectives include creating a set of guidelines for the implementation of the new facility and guiding local staff in developing an implementation plan for the new facilities. The study requires an assessment of current and future public transportation service within Mesa County to determine facility requirements and suitable location(s).

The end result of this project will be a preferred site selection and supporting documentation for the Federal Transit Administration for a facility location in the greater Grand Junction area.
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Chapter II presents an overview of previously established requirements for a maintenance facility. These requirements include the amount and type of space that will be required to maintain staff and vehicles. It also takes into account some future growth of the transit system to insure that the facility remains relevant in coming years.

Chapter III looks at the chosen site for development of the maintenance facility. This chapter includes the impact on the current transit system as well as an overview of the layout of the proposed design. The proposed features are also discussed in this section.

Chapter IV presents a discussion on the possible funding scenarios, specifically regarding federal stimulus monies. The potential for acquiring federal stimulus money requires many procedural policies that are outlined in detail.
CHAPTER II
Facility Requirements

This section provides an overview of an initial list of facility requirements based on meetings with the Project Team and LSC’s experience with similar site selection projects. This section also provides a description of the site selection process used by the Regional Transportation Planning Office (RTPO) and Grand Valley Transit (GVT) to evaluate potential sites and determine the best location for the maintenance facility. Based upon foreseeable requirements, initial site evaluation criteria can be developed that allow for the proper site to be selected.

FACILITY REQUIREMENTS

The Project Team identified requirements for the maintenance facility along with desirable features. These are described in the following section. There are specific criteria that were viewed as necessary for the site to be valuable for the facility and there are also desirable features, which are not necessary but are considered preferable.

The initial set of requirements for the maintenance facility were divided into two categories—those that are essential and those that are desirable but not essential for operation of the facility. Many of the desirable elements are those that may not necessarily impact the type or size of site that can be developed, but that impact design and construction of that site.

Based on the previous Transit Element and Project Team meetings, a preliminary list of essential and desirable facility requirements was compiled. Though not a comprehensive listing of all the requirements for function of the maintenance facility, these help to define the needed space footprint. These requirements form the basis for evaluation criteria.
Facility Requirements

Minimum Facility Requirements

- Secure space to store up to 40 buses, a mix of large and small. A covered site is considered to be a desired, but not essential, requirement.

- On-site parking for 45 vehicles. On-site parking will be required for employees, visitors, and deliveries to the maintenance facility.

- Convenient access to downtown to minimize deadhead time. The site should not incur substantial shifts in employee hours or deadhead miles to start shifts at the downtown transfer center.

- The site will require three maintenance bays, one wash bay, one lube bay, parts storage, tire room, welding area, battery room, and office space for up to eight employees.

- The site must have no known or observable environmental issues. It must meet the requirements for a Categorical Exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and FTA regulations.

Additional Facility Features

In addition to these minimum requirements for the maintenance facility, a number of desired features were also identified. The additional features would increase the size of the building and lot.

- Space for other ancillary functions
- Covered parking
- Landscaping
- City- or county-owned property or other property that could be obtained at little or no cost

The ability to incorporate these additional features is dependent on the final site selection, interest on the part of other users, and design of the facility.

Initial Site Evaluation Criteria

Following is a list of criteria that were used for the initial site evaluation. These questions should be addressed for each site so as to insure that there are no major constraints to the land development.

- Adequate size and shape: The site must be adequate to accommodate the minimum space requirements for maintenance and storage, as well as operational requirements by staff.
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- Environmental constraints: Any known or observable environmental issues must be considered. Sites adjacent to property owned by the railroad have a potential for significant unknown environmental mitigation.

- Proximity to downtown: Several of the routes start and end at the current downtown transfer center. As this siting progresses, a maintenance facility that limits deadhead time to the downtown area is important from financial and operations standpoints.

- Adjacent uses: Are the adjacent uses compatible with a maintenance facility?

- Consistency with the city master plan: Will a maintenance facility be consistent with development plans as envisioned in the city plan?

- Land development: Would use of the site improve the existing land and site?

- Safety and security: How does this site relate to safety and security issues for bus storage and building security?

- Site preparation: How much work is required to prepare the site for a maintenance facility? Sites with major demolition requirements are scored lower.

- Relocation of utilities: Are there obvious above-ground utilities that would have to be relocated to accommodate the maintenance facility?

- Relocation of uses: Are there existing uses that would have to be relocated? Sites with residential uses score lower because of the regulatory requirements specific to relocation of residential uses. The more uses that are displaced, the lower the ranking of the site.

- Acquisition potential: What is the relative availability for the city to acquire the specific site? Sites with multiple owners would be more difficult to acquire than sites with one or two individual owners.

- Displaced parking: Is there existing public or private parking that would be displaced by the transit center? Would the parking have to be replaced as part of the transit center development? Are there opportunities for replacement parking?

- Regulatory problems: Are there obvious regulatory issues with the selected site? For example, use of park lands for federal transportation projects has a number of regulatory issues that make the use very difficult.

- Politics: Are there political issues involved with using the individual site? Would community reaction be positive or negative toward using the site for the maintenance facility?

- Joint uses: Does the site offer opportunities for joint development? Is there additional space available for other uses as part of the maintenance facility development?
Table II-1 provides an estimate of the initial space requirements needed for the maintenance facility based upon the outline parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Maintenance/Storage/Washing</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Units in Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic Bays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bays</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lube Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bays</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enclosed Bay</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room/Area</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent/Lubricant/Liquid Storage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fueling Tanks/Pad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room/Area</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grossing Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18,563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking and Circulation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Storage Parking</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Parking</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor/Delivery Parking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Maintenance Facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>68,563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

It is essential in any site planning that governmental regulations and rules be followed. There are a host of regulations under the Federal Transit Administration requirements as well as ADA regulations, Clean Air Act Amendments (CAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), Environmental Protection Act (EPA) regulations, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. Many of these requirements may have an effect on space considerations.

FTA Site Planning Requirements

Before the federal government will disperse funds for facilities, transit operators must ensure that certain rules and regulations are met. One of the first and major steps in securing these funds is the current process of selecting a suitable site. In the eyes of the FTA, federal dollars should be well spent on facilities planning prior to major decisions by an agency to construct a site. The planning process should make sure to contact the correct environmental authorities prior to construction. Thus, a careful approach to ensure regulations and requirements are followed and fulfilled is essential to the success of a facility.

One of the largest concerns in siting any facility is environmental. In the case of a maintenance facility, the environmental process follows the same type of planning and research. Typically, a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX Section 771.117(d)) is sought to eliminate the need to perform a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is a lengthy and costly process. A CATEX requires a list of information that is reviewed by FTA to determine if a full EIS is needed. This information is provided during the grant application process for federal funds.

FTA Considerations for Categorical Exclusion

A completed CATEX application, along with the appropriate supporting letters, is provided in Appendix A. This information is necessary to meet FTA requirements and receive federal funding for facilities. The following elements are considerations for a Categorical Exclusion by the FTA:

- Air quality conformity
- Zoning
- Traffic impacts
- CO hot spots
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- Historic resources
- Noise impacts
- Vibration
- Acquisitions and relocations required
- Hazardous materials
- Community disruption and environmental justice
- Use of public parkland and recreation areas
- Impacts on wetlands
- Floodplain impacts
- Impacts on water quality, navigable waterways, and coastal zones
- Impacts on ecologically-sensitive areas and endangered species
- Impacts on safety and security
- Impacts caused by construction

A maintenance facility falls under the exemption of CATEX Section 771.117(d.8) which says:

“Construction of new bus storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and located on or near a street with adequate capacity to handle anticipated bus and support vehicle traffic.”

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Regulations

- Larger rest rooms
- Parking areas will accommodate fewer cars in the same space
- More space required for elevators, if any
- Wider walkways

Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990

The Clean Air Act is the comprehensive federal law that regulates air emissions from area, stationary, and mobile sources.

- Accommodate alternative fuels
- Fuel handling
- Hazardous vapor venting
- Explosion-proof fixtures
- Special sensing devices
- Automatic controls to provide early warning of trouble
- Special exhaust systems in the fueling area and repair area
- Pits designed with floor exhaust
Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act regulates the amount of chemicals/toxins released by the facility via direct and wastewater discharges. These standards usually set concentration-based limits on the discharge of a given chemical by the facility. Requirements include some of the following:

- Recycle wash water which may add additional square footage.
- Provide facilities for processing site drainage before draining into the municipal sanitary sewer system.
- Using oil/water separators for the drain water to flow into before being discharged into the sewer system.
- The storage and distribution of oils, fluids, and lubricants must also be carefully considered.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Example)

Regulations on Underground Storage Tanks for Fuel

- Double-walled tanks with spill prevention features. Underground piping to and from the tank must also be double-walled.
- Consider using above-ground storage tanks for storing fuels (steel).
CHAPTER III

Final Recommended Site

There were a total of 15 sites that were originally selected for review. Many of these were not suitable and did not satisfy sufficient criteria. Because of these issues and time constraints regarding possible funding sources, the site located near the Landfill PUD was selected as the preferred site for the maintenance facility. The final conceptual site layout is presented.

CHOSEN SITE

The selected site is located at 971 Coffman Road in Whitewater, Colorado. Figure III-1 shows the location on an aerial map. It also shows the location of the Mesa Mall and Clifton transfer sites and the approximate location of the downtown transfer center and current maintenance facility. Because of the scale, the two downtown locations are grouped together. The proposed site is adjacent to the existing landfill for the county. Coffman Road is located off of State Highway 50, a major connector in the region.

Figure III-2 shows a proposed layout that was commissioned by the county. The red and blue dotted lines indicate areas that are to be paid for by transit. The area outlined in red is the initial proposed development. The region outlined in blue is future planned development. The remaining areas are to be paid for by other county entities. This was done in order to delineate the transit element from the rest of the county campus. The primary reason that this site was advantageous is because the county currently owns the land and is relocating other services to the site as well. The site also provides a great deal of space for possible future expansion of amenities. For example, the future location of a CNG fuel station is outlined on the image, showing the potential for expansion.

The site layout also shows the relationship between the transit element and the rest of the surrounding uses. There are a total of 62 parking spaces for staff and
Final Recommended Site

visitors. The proposed site offers much more space than the current location and has the ability to house and provide maintenance for vehicles on the same site.

The proposed site meets most of the aforementioned requirements, including adequate bus and staff/visitor parking, substantial space for maintenance bays and storage, and is easily ready to develop while lacking major environmental issues. The only major hindrance for the site is the distance from downtown Grand Junction where the main transfer point is located.
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Additional Information

Transit Considerations

The main disadvantage to locating the maintenance facility next to the landfill site is the distance from downtown. The location is approximately nine miles from the current transfer facility, whereas the current maintenance location is only a few blocks away. This adds deadhead time, when buses are driving to and from locations without passengers, to the current routes. It will take buses an additional 20 minutes to travel between the transfer location and the new maintenance facility. This has the potential to add costs for drivers and also for fuel.

Table III-1 shows the additional miles and approximate minutes it will take for each bus in terms of deadhead time daily. The start and end locations are the same for each bus route, making it easy to calculate both the additional time and mileage that will result from being parked at the new facility. The routes that have the lowest additional daily mileage are those that start and end at the Clifton transfer center, because the difference in miles between downtown Grand Junction and Clifton and Clifton and Whitewater are fairly similar. It is feasible that the new maintenance center could increase costs between $90,000 and $100,000 annually due to increased deadhead times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Current Start and End Location</th>
<th>Additional Miles</th>
<th>Additional Time (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>Mesa Mall</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Avenue</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisade</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Mesa</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC/WCCC</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>Mesa Mall</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Avenue</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Malls</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: LSC, 2009*
Environmental Assessment

Additionally, as part of the overall planning process, if GVT or the RTPO wishes to use FTA funds for the development of this parcel, an initial Environmental Analysis is needed. A Categorical Exclusion for the Environmental Analysis has been completed and is provided in Appendix A.
CHAPTER IV

Stimulus Funding Opportunities

This chapter examines the potential procurement of federal stimulus funds along with their rules and regulations. The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act was signed February 17, 2009. Much of this money has been made available to transit agencies for various projects including capital costs and new rail lines. Since the funding is fairly new, information on the procurement and regulation of such funds is constantly evolving and being refined. Therefore, this chapter should be viewed as current at the time it was written, but the information is subject to change.

REQUIREMENTS

Section 106

One of the requirements of obtaining federal stimulus money for transit projects is to provide Section 106 documentation. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires that any agency receiving federal money ensures that the project will have no negative impact on historic properties in the surrounding area. This process involves submitting documentation to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding the presence and effect of the construction.

Mesa County has contracted with ERO Resources Corporation to perform a cultural resource survey for the site. This documentation will ensure that the maintenance facility will not disturb any historic properties. This documentation is submitted by ERO directly to the SHPO.

Davis-Bacon Act

The David-Bacon Act says that all contracts involving federal funds worth more than $2,000 for public buildings or public works shall contain a clause that no laborer or mechanic employed on the site shall receive less than the prevailing
Stimulus Funding Opportunities

wage rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor. This means that all construction workers on site must be paid the “Davis-Bacon wage rate” which is set by the Secretary of Labor. This wage rate may be obtained via the Internet at www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon. Workers involved in the construction of the Mesa County maintenance facility will receive the David-Bacon wage rate.

Buy America

The FTA’s Buy America regulations state that all capital purchases using federally funded dollars are required to be American-made products. This is to ensure that the federal dollars are put back into the local economy. As such, the maintenance facility will have to ensure that all of their infrastructure materials (steel, bricks, flooring, etc.) are American made.

Disadvantaged Business Enterprises

The FTA requires that transit agencies set a goal of entering into contracts with disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE) at least 10 percent of the time. This regulation is designed to give minority- and woman-owned businesses the opportunity to prosper. The 10 percent goal is not a mandate and agencies cannot be punished for not meeting this goal unless they do not make a good faith effort to do so.

MONITORING

No official regulations have been set forth regarding the monitoring of stimulus funding for transit projects. This is due to the limited amount of time to establish these requirements since the ARRA was signed. The only information that has been released regarding the monitoring of these funds is that the regulations will undoubtedly be stricter than with other FTA programs. This may require more stringent documentation regarding the spending of this money. Once regulations are established regarding the stimulus funds, Mesa County will be updated with these requirements.
INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR PROBABLE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
(SECTION 771.117(d))

_____A. DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
This project is the development of a Maintenance Facility for Grand Valley Transit (GVT) in the vicinity of Grand Junction. This maintenance site will be the primary maintenance facility for Grand Valley Transit. The site is approximately 40 acres in size for development.

_____B. LOCATION (INCLUDING ADDRESS):
The location is shown in the site selection report. The final site’s physical address is 971 Coffman Road, Whitewater, Colorado 81527.

_____C. METROPOLITAN PLANNING AND AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY:
The new transfer facility will conform to the NAAQS of less than 35 ppm/hr of Carbon Monoxide. Please refer to the attached letter from the Mesa County Health Department, Environmental Health Division.

_____D. ZONING:
The proposed location is compatible with surrounding land uses and conforms to zoning requirements. Refer to the attached letter from the Land Use and Development Director.

_____E. TRAFFIC IMPACTS:
The maintenance facility will not result in substantial impacts to the surrounding roadway network. The maintenance facility will add minimal traffic to streets operating at a LOS C or better without lowering to LOS D. A letter is provided from the County’s Public Works Director.

_____F. CO HOT SPOTS:
The Mesa County Health Department currently operates a carbon monoxide analyzer at its primary air monitoring station along Pitkin Avenue between 6th and 7th Streets, 3.2 miles from the proposed maintenance station. The impact of bus operations from this maintenance facility will not unduly affect carbon monoxide levels within Mesa County. Please refer to an attached letter from the Health Department.
G. HISTORIC RESOURCES:
The site does not contain any historic sites. The property is not located within an established historic district. Please refer to an attached letter from the Land Use and Development Division, Mesa County Department of Planning and Economic Development.

H. NOISE:
The surrounding area is mostly comprised of a landfill and parking. There are no existing housing facilities adjacent to the site. The area is located adjacent to the heavily traveled US 50.

I. VIBRATION:
The proposed project does not involve steel tracks, and vibration is not a considered consequence.

J. ACQUISITIONS AND RELOCATIONS REQUIRED:
At this time, there are no foreseeable relocation issues, such as overhead electric lines or parking which needs to be relocated. Additional parking will be provided as part of this project. No business will need to be relocated.

K. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:
The site does not contain hazardous material.

L. COMMUNITY DISRUPTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE:
No existing business would be displaced by the development of the maintenance site. It will not cause a change to current development patterns or community continuity. No access to community facilities will be altered due to the project. Please refer to attached letters regarding community disruption and consistency with local plans.

M. USE OF PUBLIC PARKLAND AND RECREATION AREAS:
There are no recreational park areas in the proximity of this site.

N. IMPACTS ON WETLANDS:
There is no evidence of any wetlands on this site or in proximity to the site.

O. FLOODPLAIN IMPACTS:
The site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain. Development of the site will not modify the existing pattern of runoff. Please refer to the attached letter on flooding impacts from the Public Works Director.

P. IMPACTS ON WATER QUALITY, NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS, AND COASTAL ZONES:
The proposed maintenance facility will not impact water quality or any navigable waterways. No contaminants are expected to reach nearby bodies of water. Storm
and sanitary sewers will handle runoff. Please refer to attached letter from the Public Works Director

Q. IMPACTS ON ECOLOGICALLY-SENSITIVE AREAS AND ENDANGERED SPECIES:
There are no ecologically-sensitive areas that have been identified for this site.

R. IMPACTS ON SAFETY AND SECURITY:
Design of the transfer center will incorporate measures for safety and security. The facility will meet all regulatory safety requirements. Security provisions will be incorporated to include staffing and observation.

S. IMPACTS CAUSED BY CONSTRUCTION:
Impacts due to construction will be regulated through City ordinances. Construction plans will be submitted to the Public Works, Building Division for review and approval. Construction is not expected to result in violations of any local, state, or federal air, noise, or water quality standards. Construction is not likely to result in adverse economic impacts on area businesses. Refer to the attached letter from the City of Grand Junction’s Public Works Director.

The action described above meets the criteria for a NEPA categorical exclusion (CE) in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.117.

_________________________________________   _____________________
Applicant’s Environmental Reviewer     Date

_____________________________________
FTA Grant Representative
April 14, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P. O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Construction Impacts

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Public Works Department has reviewed your correspondence of March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments for the project’s environmental assessment with regard to the proposed location at 971 Coffman Road in Whitewater.

1. Impacts due to construction would be regulated through Mesa County ordinances.

2. Construction would likely result in no violations of local, state, or federal air, noise, or water quality standards.

3. Construction plans would include measures to mitigate disruption of traffic and community services such as utilities.

4. Construction would not likely result in adverse economic impacts on area’s businesses.

If you have any further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter M. Baier, Public Works Director
April 14, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P. O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Flooding Impacts

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

According to the information you provided and an ensuing analysis by the Mesa County Public Works Department, we have determined the following with regard to Mesa County’s proposed bus maintenance facility project:

1. The proposed project is located outside the FEMA identified 100-year floodplain;
2. The proposed project would not increase flooding; and
3. The proposed project would not adversely modify the existing pattern of runoff.

If you have any further questions or comments, please call me at the telephone number listed below.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Baier, Public Works Director
April 14, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P. O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Traffic and Parking Impacts

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Public Works Department has reviewed your correspondence of March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments for the project’s environmental assessment with regard to the proposed location at 971 Coffman Road in Whitewater.

1. According to the information that you have provided, the proposed project would not result in substantial impacts to the surrounding roadway network (significantly less than 600 vehicles per hour per lane on principal arterials, and significantly less than 500 vehicles per hour per lane on minor arterials or collectors).

2. Proposed project would add minimal traffic to streets operating at LOS C or better without lowering LOS to D or worse.

If you have any further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter M. Baier, Public Works Director
April 14, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P. O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Water Quality

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Public Works Department has reviewed your correspondence of March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments for the project's environmental assessment with regard to proposed location at 971 Coffman Road in Whitewater.

1. No contaminants from the project will likely reach nearby bodies of water.

2. The project must be designed such that storm and sanitary sewers will handle the project's flows.

3. Dewatering or recharging of water table is not likely to be involved with this project.

4. Proposed project likely does not require a Section 404 permit from the Corps of Engineers.

If you have any further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Baier, Public Works Director
March 25, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck  
Manager  
Mesa County RTPO  
PO Box 20,000  
Grand Junction, CO 81502-5093

Re: Grand Valley Transit Carbon Monoxide Conformity

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

This letter is being provided in response to your request for determining impacts of carbon monoxide emissions from the GVT’s proposed Transit Maintenance Facility in Whitewater, Colorado.

The Mesa County Health Department currently operates a continuous carbon monoxide analyzer at its primary air monitoring station along Pitkin Avenue between 6th and 7th Streets which is about 3.2 miles southeast of the proposed location. Current and historical readings indicate that hourly levels range between 1-2 ppm, well below the NAAQS of 35 ppm/hr. In addition, 8 hour NAAQS of 9 ppm has been easily maintained with no CO exceedences ever recorded in Grand Junction.

Therefore, I am providing you with this assurance that conformity for carbon monoxide will be maintained with the development of a new Transit Maintenance Facility located in Whitewater along Coffman Road.

If you have any other concerns regarding air quality issues at this location, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

Steven L. DeFeyter  
Director of Environmental Health  
970-248-6978
April 17, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager  
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office  
750 Main Street  
P.O. Box 20,000-5093  
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Land Use and Zoning

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Department of Planning and Economic Development has reviewed your correspondence dated March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments with regard to the project’s environmental assessment:

The proposed project is compatible with surround land use and conforms to zoning the requirements on the property.

If you have further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Linda Dannenberger  
Linda Dannenberger, Director  
Land Use & Development Division
April 17, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P.O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Secondary Development

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Department of Planning and Economic Development has reviewed your correspondence dated March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments for project's environmental assessment: the proposed project, detailed in your letter, does not have generation of secondary development as a goal.

If the project does, in fact, generate a demand for secondary development, it will likely be desirable and approved in conformance with adopted public land use plans.

If you have further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Linda Dannenberger
Director
Land Use & Development Division
April 17, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager  
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office  
750 Main Street  
P.O. Box 20,000-5093  
Grand Junction, CO  81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Community Disruption

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Department of Planning and Economic Development has reviewed your correspondence dated March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments with regard to the project’s environmental assessment:

1. According to the information that you have provided, no existing businesses would be displaced.
2. There is no reason to believe that implementation of the project will result in significant changes in development patterns and/or increased development densities that are not in character with or on the same scale as other structure currently in the neighborhood.
3. Neighborhood or community borders would not likely be split or altered by the project.
4. No service areas or access to community facilities would likely be altered with the project.
5. Existing patterns of circulation will not likely be disrupted.
6. Cohesion of the community would likely not be altered by the physical or psychological separation of residents and/or activities; no such "barriers" would be created by the project.

If you have further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Linda Dannenberger, Director  
Land Use & Development Division
April 17, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P.O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO  81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Historical

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Department of Planning and Economic Development has reviewed your correspondence dated March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments with regard to the project’s environmental assessment:

The proposed project is neither located within an established historical district nor subject to any regulations pertaining to historic preservation that would impact new construction on this site. Mesa County does not have historic preservation regulations pertaining to this property.

If you have further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Linda Dannenberger, Director
Land Use & Development Division
April 17, 2009

Todd Hollenbeck, Manager
Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office
750 Main Street
P.O. Box 20,000-5093
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Re: Proposed Mesa County Transit Bus Maintenance Facility – Consistency with Local Plans

Dear Mr. Hollenbeck:

The Mesa County Department of Planning and Economic Development has reviewed your correspondence dated March 24, 2009 and offers the following comments with regard to the project’s environmental assessment:

The proposed project, located near the Mesa County Solid Waste Facility, and as detailed in your letter, is consistent with the Mesa County’s Transportation Plan.

If you have further questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Linda Dannenberger, Director
Land Use & Development Division