



COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 2014 PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. SEPTEMBER 23 AURORA PUBLIC HEARING

Of the 28 attendees at the September 23 Aurora Hearing, three people provided written comments, six people provided public verbal comments, and two people provided private verbal comments.

Written Comments

There were three written comments provided on the night of the Aurora Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	Extremely excited for the expansion and improvement to the state of Colorado. This project will not only improve our complications and difficulties today but also years to come. For the growth of Denver for 75+ years. Wow!
2	The City of Aurora has already gone on record supporting the preferred alternative and providing specific technical comments.
3	It is something we need to deal with as I-70 is always so backed up. I need to learn how you plan to do more about it.

Verbal Comments

There were six public verbal comments provided on the night of the Aurora Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	<p>Okay. I live in one of what I would deem to be 12 I-70 adjacent neighborhoods in Denver between Stapleton Center Boulevard and Harlan. And I'm happy I have the opportunity to be here. I do a lot of volunteer work in various parts of I-70 adjacent neighborhoods, including Globeville and Swansea. I have a perspective that's a little bit different. First, I think that the CDOT people have been repeatedly very gracious, thoughtful, and wonderful in these public meetings. There've been many public meetings. The attempt at community outreach has been very very good. However, it's not reaching all the people that it needs to reach. So I think that we continue to see many of the same people over and over and over in some of these meetings, and that's a problem.</p> <p>We have some meetings that I think should be open to the public meetings, which have been closed meetings. I was thrown out of one of those meetings. That was the meeting with Councilwoman Judy Montero earlier this year. We have situations where there's a disconnect between what people who are doing the door-to-door outreach are saying is inconsistent with what the CDOT people are saying. That, I think, is a problem.</p> <p>We have recently in the last four or five months had a bunch of volunteers out knocking on doors asking, What's happening? What are you aware of as it relates to this project? This project which, including the service roads, makes the freeway 3.2 times wider in Elyria and Swansea. That, I think, is going to have</p>



#	Comment
	<p>devastating impacts to this community. And of the 91 people surveyed, three percent—no, I'm sorry—a total of three said that they know a lot about this project, 27 percent said, Very little, 28 total said that they know nothing about it, zero said they don't care. Of those asked if they have been involved, 81 of the 91 said no. Of those who we asked, Do you think that an option of a full I-76 and I-270 reroute should be studied, 85 of the 91 said yes. I am in favor of CDOT looking at all the alternatives before we make a decision. Do we know if an I-270 and I-76 reroute is going to work? No, we don't. But I think that there's a fairly good likelihood that it will not devastate 12 I-70 adjacent community neighborhoods. I think that it has great potential to solve the traffic congestion issues on I-70 on both sides of I-25, because it's not going to solve one with a bottleneck at Brighton Boulevard on both sides of I-25. And there's very very good rationale to suggest that it could cost significantly less, and cause—cost significantly less, and solve the problems on both sides, and do very good things for the community.</p> <p>I want to end by just showing this illustration that Ian Lockwood, an incredibly well-respected urban planner, not from Denver, he drew, and he references the thing. The thing is the machine that's gobbling up an elevated section of I-70 and out the back end comes a sense of place, a sense of community, and an area that really works, a place where the urban fabric has been woven back together since it has been very very badly torn apart in 1961, '62, '63, and '64 when this freeway so painfully carved through 12 Denver neighborhoods.</p>
2	<p>First of all, everybody knows road construction sucks. We have to live with it. I'm in favor of a lowered highway. Two other comments. I personally don't like roundabouts. I'm old school. I don't like them in different places in different states, but everybody would get used to them. I'm just not crazy about them. And managed lanes, I just hope they don't turn into a toll road to where I have to go. Thank you.</p>
3	<p>I live in Park Hill. I have been interested in this construction or reconstruction for a number of years. It started with me when my grandchildren were somewhat younger, and I would take them swimming at the Swansea and Globeville swimming pools. I would sit on the north side looking south, and I would see the highway. One day the kids said to me, Let's take a look at that. Can we get downtown? And I couldn't get downtown from Swansea and Globeville because the maze of roads that were there blocked by this highway. So I asked my friends, What do you think? They're going to reconstruct that. Maybe we ought to consider an alternative. And I got a good bit of people, good number of people saying, That may be a possibility. Why don't you look into it? So the snowball started, and the snowball is continuing on. And I continue to say, Why don't you take a look at alternatives besides just building and rebuilding I-70 through the neighborhoods that are there. I have continued to receive notices to say, We have looked at it, and it's either too expensive or it's not a good idea. And I said, Show me. And I haven't been able to get the information in which they said, We have done this, we have done due diligence. And I think spending a couple of billion dollars on something deserves the opportunity to evaluate all options to make certain that the spending of that money is done best for the citizens of the city and county of Denver as well as the state of Colorado. I think that if you only limit your options to two-thirds or three-quarters of the possible opportunities or possible options that you're not doing due diligence. So my recommendations to you is, slow down. We don't have to build this tomorrow. Slow down, take a look at these other options, and make certain that the decision that you make is the best decision for all of us. At the present time I don't think you can do that because I don't think you have looked at all of the options.</p> <p>I've seen stuff in the literature recently. And I've looked at this project snapshot. I think that this diagram really is disingenuous. When we take a look at the building of this highway between Colorado Boulevard and Brighton Boulevard, some 1,800 to 2,000 feet long, you're talking about building a cover that is 800 feet long. Now, that's only 10 percent of the whole project. And yet when I look at this document, it looks like this cover takes up three-quarters of the cover of the highway. I don't think that that's really a good way for you to be telling us, we're doing due diligence to this project, and we're doing the best thing that we can for the citizens of Denver. I also saw the picture that was on one, two, the third option here in which the roads that</p>



#	Comment
	<p>are on the north and south side of the highway don't completely go through north—pardon me, east and west, but there's a stoppage between in front of the school allowing people who were traveling east and/or west on the north side to have to make right turns across the highway, and right turns along the highway, and then right turns across the highway and then right turns back on it. And I recommend that you take a look at the California Department of Transportation. They had a problem with a road that was going up to Yosemite National Park in which there was a big rock slide, and so they had to do something about it. What they did was temporarily build bridges across a river to accommodate the traffic. And lo and behold, they put these bridges at right angles to the highway. And after building it, they discovered that people couldn't make these right turns. Maybe the little cars that I see around here now that are about 10 feet long are able to make a right turn, but I wonder whether the big trucks are going to be able to make a right turn. I think that those are lovely pictures, but I don't think you're doing a good job. And my recommendation is let's go back. You don't have to do anything right now. Let's go back and make sure that the decisions you're making are the best for all of us.</p>
4	<p>I don't care. 'Cause it doesn't make any difference. That's my point. They're being paid here. If you look around you'll see how many people are being paid to be here. And the few of you who aren't, I'll tell you, they really don't care about your comments after three years. You're being used. They're in negotiations with the City of Denver. They care what the City of Denver says. They got a letter from Adams County that says they rejected options. They care what the Adams County officials say. They're using you to (inaudible) the project out, to say, We reached out to public comment. Nothing will change because of what you say. They're using you as a tool. You need to understand that about this project. This is the pet project of the CDOT Director Don Hunt. They met in 2008. This alternative was rejected as unworkable. He came in and said, I love it. And so now they're going to destroy communities, they're going to build a contaminated project, they're going to increase air pollution in a community that has 30 percent more asthma, 40 percent more respiratory disease than the rest of the city, and they're going to do it 'cause Don Hunt wants to do it. In city—traffic engineers are going to plan your city. It's okay; you're not going to do anything about it. Sit back, relax. It's going to happen. As they said, construction's going to start in 2016. They already know that. What's the purpose of public comment if they already know the answer? Thank you.</p>
5	<p>I'm an urban design architect. I'm also an architect. I've been in the city of Denver for 30 years. I worked with the City and County of Denver as an urban design architect for two and a half years. I worked on the T-REX project, which was I-25 through the narrows through Alameda and out to Sixth Avenue. I'm here to voice my viewpoint. My viewpoint is also very, very similar to that of the American Institute of Architects, Colorado chapter's viewpoint because I'm a member of the Urban Design Committee for the AIJ Colorado. We have voiced our perspective a number of times and it's fallen on deaf ears. We support the 270-76 loop around because it's better for the city of Denver, it's better for Adams County, it's better for the drivers passing through Denver from Kansas to our wonderful ski areas and campgrounds. It's better for everyone because the acquisition of private property is industrial property or salvage yard property, and not high density residential neighborhoods that have already suffered because of a mistake that was made 50 years ago. One of the great things about architecture is we fix our mistakes. We plant vines if it's an ugly house. Well, guess what. We got us an ugly highway. And we can plant vines in the form of real parks. Let's touch on my T-REX experience. T-REX was promising beautiful, 800-foot-long covered parkways to connect Platte Park with Washington Park. We got nothing. We got a little bit of a widened area at the Louisiana light rail station—that was it. We got nothing what they were promising. They were promising a lot of pedestrian safety amenities. I'm sure that the I-70 has lots of pedestrian safety. Guess what. They didn't build any of them. They took out auto—they took out pedestrian barricades to protect people from the cars for pedestrian traffic. That got cut. So if you think you're going to see a tunnel, if you think you're going to see a buried highway, if you think you're going to see a depressed highway, it's not going to happen. They promised a depressed highway in Phoenix at a similar project. Now they have the great wall of Phoenix, concrete isolation walls. So instead of a viaduct you're going to have the great wall of Denver if you let your voice not be heard. By coming here tonight you're saying that you want to be a voice. Be a voice. Call the TV stations.</p>



#	Comment
	<p>Call radio stations. Get what you are here for. What's your stand going to be for these wonderful neighborhoods that have a promise if we do take the highway traffic up and around instead of barreling a ten-lane traffic monster through these residential areas. I got to think that the right of ways for 270 and 76 are abundant compared to the I-70 right of way today, so there's land we don't have to buy and there's underutilized, underdeveloped land along I-76 and 270. We're highly congested in density, neighborhoods. We have a huge opportunity to create a wonderful long redevelopment of I-70. You know, when they built I-70 they had to fill in part of a lake and cut Willis Case Golf Course up. I just wonder if we take out I-70 all the way from this large loop, we've got huge opportunities beyond the city of Denver into Lakewood, and we have abundant opportunities to help the connectivity of Adams County and northern metropolitan areas if we go around this bottleneck. And I have no more time. Thank you very much. I'd love to talk with each and every one of you.</p>
6	<p>Can you hear me? Good try, CDOT. They put forth a nice effort. But all I can see is the status quo design, which I'm very much surprised. You can build 30 lanes going and coming, but first of all you have to solve the funneling like DIA found out when you get to the end of the road, you know, when the lanes decrease. And so I really, I see a status quo design. I'm very disappointed.</p>

Private Verbal Comments

There were two verbal comments made privately and recorded by a court reporter.

#	Comment
1	<p>I've been a Montbello resident for close to 50 years, and I've never experienced good service from the Denver representatives. Right now my biggest concern is that they're turning 56 into an overflow for I-70. People are traveling up and down at speeds of 70 miles an hour. There's a heavy load, and there are no streetlights. This encourages people to speed. They become hostile. If you're slowing down to turn into your neighborhood, you can't get out. You have to go all the way from—I live right at 56. I have to go all the way back into the neighborhood to get out at a light closer to the interstate, and then I have to travel all the way back to get to 56 to go west. It seems like a very dangerous situation, and I have tried to contact Denver councilmen, and I'm just getting no results. We know it's going to go in, but we would like to be considered important enough for Denver to put in streetlights that would say that they value us as residents and want to protect us. And it would also slow down the speeding and the road rage because if they had to stop at stoplights, it wouldn't be a person they were targeting. So I'm requesting for the umpteenth time as many streetlights as possible along 56 that are along the borderlines of the Montebello neighborhood. That's it. I just want streetlights.</p>
2	<p>I've been a commercial driver on I-70 for the last 40 years driving a truck and also people movers, delivering wholesale food to restaurants and then transporting people from downtown Denver to the airport and then—and then other places around Denver and Aurora to the airport and then to the mountains. I took my first person—or family to the mountains using I-70 in 1979. And it's changed a lot. And I live in this neighborhood, which is the Aurora-Altura neighborhood, and we have limited access to I-70. We have to use 225, which is very congested from Colfax going to the Anschutz campus and then coming up 225 and then like Chambers Road, which gets heavy truck traffic from the commercial south of—south of I-70 to Smith Road. And so it's really a burden to get onto I-70 from this section of Aurora. I'm also the head area coordinator for the—this—this area. It includes the section of I-70 from I-225 to Airport Boulevard. So the main things I hear is, you know, it's so hard to get on 70, we take the service roads. And it would be nice for people to be able to get on the highway and be able to get to where they're going easier.</p> <p>I think this plan is good because in the—in the early '70s I took seniors to a meal site in Globeville, so I would pick them up in Swansea and Globeville. They're gone now. But the—it wasn't that hard to get around using</p>



#	Comment
	<p>the service roads. And then also our—where I picked up my vehicle every day was just south of I-70 and Globeville. So I lived in Montebello, 12—and the—it was hard then to get—get to work on time because of the—a lot of it because of the —the runway going over I-70, and people would slow down and then cause accidents, or they'd slow down, and then there would be a ripple effect. And I was there one day that a police officer got put in the back of a car by being hit by a semi truck that didn't see her with her flashing lights, and that was dramatic. And I've seen a lot of near accidents. And this—the—there needs to be more education and maybe not more lanes. People need to know that they can't go across five lanes—five lanes of traffic within a block and that it's not safe. And the—also, coming from the airport, there needs to be more signage in different languages because people get off the plane from Mexico or France, Germany, Japan and get in a car to go to the mountains, and they could—they're very tired, and they've waited for their bags and waited to get off the airplane, and they may get in a car that may be five or six years older than their vehicle, and they're learning how to drive it on I-70. And so the signage needs to be in different languages, I think. And the—and then the limit—limited access to all lanes at different intersections or different on-ramps, I've seen it very successful like in Chicago and different cities, but the—but the—like, I-270 getting onto eastbound I-70, it slows down because of that reason. People change from one to four lanes all in a matter of seconds, and some are really speeding. And I've had so many near misses. And I've never had an accident on I-70 except in Vail, and this teenage girl, she was 16, and she clipped my—she—there was a hole in the road or a pothole, and she went in my lane to get away from the pothole and clipped my bumper. And that's the only accident I've had on I-70 in 40 years. And then she started crying because her father was a state trooper, and it was her second accident, and she was only 16, and she said he was going to take her car away. But the—I think it's going to—I hate a lot of money being spent in Denver since I'm an Aurora resident. We need a lot—we can have—we needed the help on I-70 in Aurora, but it's good that they—that we can get to have people, patients, doctors, and employees at Anschutz have a better way to get to that—the energy—or the magnet that that caused. And also if they get Tower Road through to Sixth, it will relieve some of the streets that Buckley affects. But I think the two main things is signage and then noise level.</p> <p>So I thank you very much, and have a good night.</p>

2. SEPTEMBER 24 COMMERCE CITY PUBLIC HEARING

Of the 47 attendees at the September 24 Commerce City Hearing, four people provided written comments, 13 people provided verbal comments, and three people provided private verbal comments.

Written Comments

There were four written comments provided on the night of the Commerce City Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	I support the cover project.
2	I like the idea of having a tunnel. I lived in Swansea for 21 years and this is one of the best ideas I've heard of. It is safe for all of the community. Safe for the children when crossing the street. And plus it will improve the looks of the neighborhood.
3	Don't put in roundabouts; go rounds; they aren't built big enough. People don't see them often enough to know how to use them. What about dividing trucks from cars. Some bridges in the east have trucks take the "low" road & cars if you want to be with the trucks. The majority of car travel goes on the "high" roads. Partial Cover Alt, Basic Option—may be the good fix—helps traffic flow—the people still can mostly live in their area—the school can stay in place.



	<p>For the people who lose their home or business—give them a good-fair compensation for having to be uprooted, lose their home or business and have to start over somewhere else. You wouldn't want to be put into that situation and be cheated!!</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to see the plans.</p>
4	<p>Colorado Motor Carriers Association (CMCA) supports the partial cover lowered alternative. CMCA strongly opposes any reroute or elimination of Steele/Vasquez Blvd. CMCA conferred with truck movement/access during construction and recommended needed improvements at Colo. Blvd/ I-270 Interchange.</p>

Verbal Comments

There were 13 public verbal comments provided on the night of the Commerce City Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	<p>Good evening. Thank you, CDOT, and the Federal Highway Foundation for the 13 years of process to work with the affected communities to find the right solution for Interstate 70. When the Draft came out [in 2008], Commerce City opposed the realignment alternatives, and wrote a strongly worded letter advocating for a supplemental document and a better approach to find the solution to address traffic and community PACTs. Commerce City actively participated with businesses and residents in a collaborative process to eliminate the realignment alternatives, and to reaffirm a route of the interstate, rerouting the interstate made absolutely no sense from an emergency management, traffic, or cross perspective. We still believe this is the case, and thank the agencies for the Supplemental Draft to acknowledge this is true. Also, support different efforts to revitalize Elyria, Swansea, and Globeville neighborhoods, Brighton Boulevard, and CDOT's effort to mitigate PACTs directly adjacent to the highway.</p> <p>While the Supplemental Draft EIS generally addresses big picture concerns, there are several significant changes the City might have to address in the final EIS before we can endorse the project. Commerce City supports the Partial Cover Lower Alternative, basic lower alternative option with the managed lanes as a preferred alternative. Our support for this alternative is routed within the SDEIS, which finds this alternative provides the best regional economic benefits, provides a significant number of jobs, and offers the best construction value. More importantly, most importantly, it preserves direct and directional interstate access to and from Vasquez Boulevard. This is the only alternative Commerce City and City Council will support. The City opposes moving interstate access from Vasquez to Colorado Boulevard because it has significant impacts to the city residents and businesses. It negatively impacts on truck traffic. Commerce City has a great amount of truck traffic heading from the north-south. It limits Commerce City's economic development opportunity to the benefit of Denver. And there is not adequate traffic analysis on Colorado Boulevard for the modification that eliminates Vasquez. The City has worked collaboratively with Denver and the state to identify alternatives that balance immediate neighborhood concerns, and keeps the interchange open. The City expects these discussions to reflect in the final EIS preferred alternative.</p> <p>Consistent with our previous comment, the City remains concerned with the lack of analysis or recognition of Commerce City PACT within the defined project area. The document fails to discuss the social, economic, or environmental justice, air quality, and noise impacts of associated mitigation within the City at Sand Creek, 50th Street, 56th Avenue, Central Park, Rose Hill, South Rose Hill, and the Stapleton Industrial Park neighborhoods. We also advocate for the City to be actively involved in the construction phasing plan, and approval for detours and changes to the interstate and the state highway within the city limits that may see traffic increases.</p>
2	<p>Everything that our city council and acting mayor said, with added comments from the community point of view.</p>



#	Comment
	<p>We talk about environment. I-70 destroyed one environment already when it came to a section from the stock show to Colorado Boulevard. And now you want to infringe on Adams County's opportunity that we have for growth, the planning that our city has planned for some of this area. We had input from both Cities' perspective as to the solutions that we came up with in this. And blocking the entrance from Vasquez Boulevard cannot be. We've been there. People are used to coming through there. Yes, work it through as far as what you want to do with the level portion of it. But Adams County people need access; Adams County businesses need access. We have shortcuts that people want to come through here. And we have enough participation there from all the cities. Boulder is coming through. And we don't talk about what we're going to do with 270. They're going to increase. Brighton, Thornton, Commerce City, we provide labor to Denver, and people need to get that.</p> <p>Now, we have gone through almost three or four mayors that now really they didn't have any participation in the decisions that they had. Adams County, Commerce City, we had the minimum amount of people there. And what happened? People decided, Okay, that's where it stays. Every time we change our minds—and this is I think the third time if you include Vasquez Boulevard in there—it costs us, the taxpayers, money. Because what are you going to do with 270, and what are you going to do when you start tearing it down? I've gone through three or four, I'm not sure now. And I have a reason to forget, because the trust factor is not there. Directors, we have the money, we got the input, and we feel good. We're ready to build. We're ready to go out there and get the money, the rest of the funds that we need. Now it's costing us money. And all Adams County wants is a fair share of what's happening. We want to compete worldwide with let's say the Olympics, but yet we can't build a road within six years? That's going to be tough. That's going to be kind. And we want that opportunity. Our city has bent backwards. Our county bended backwards, okay? And now we're saying 270 is separated, okay?</p>
3	<p>I'm going to take the opposite position of the last two speakers. I'm speaking because there is a better alternative to the three that have been advocated by CDOT that meets the need and purpose of the project that has not been given serious study by the Colorado Department of Transportation. That option is rerouting to I-70 over 270 and 76, and replacing it in Denver with a surface-level boulevard. I want to be very clear, this is not NIMBYism; there is nothing wrong with interstate highways. What's wrong is interstate highways going through densely populated residential neighborhoods. And as the previous speaker mentioned, that's exactly what happened in Denver, and it's destroyed those neighborhoods and continues to do so.</p> <p>Rerouting along 270 and 76, however, would not be through residential areas. 270, everybody admits, has to be rebuilt; it's a disaster right now. The grant submitted to study rebuilding that has just been rejected by the federal government, which means 270's rebuilding and expansion is at the bottom of the list right now. Rerouting the highway would put it at the top of the list to redevelop it, okay? Every developer that we have interviewed says that building a modern highway such as the highway that goes across Vail Pass or through Glenwood Springs would promote the kind of economic development through southern Adams County and Jefferson County that's appropriate for an interstate highway. That's the kind of development that exists at the Tech Center or at Interlocken, which is commercial development and light business development. It doesn't, I mean, that means jobs and economic development for Commerce City and Adams County at the same time it improves the quality of the neighborhoods through Denver. So it really is a win-win alternative.</p> <p>In conclusion then we just say that what's really unfortunate is that city officials in Commerce City, Adams County have consistently refused to meet with us, discuss this proposal. The point is we have consistently asked elected officials in this area to understand and allow us to promote the development of it to people in this area. They refused to do that. Thank you very much.</p>
4	<p>Hello. Thank you very much for letting me speak tonight. I'm an architect. I've been an architect in Denver for over 30 years, and have been working for the last three years on this project. I worked through the design, the urban design community at the American Institute of Architects, so I'm very familiar with the proposals</p>



#	Comment
	<p>here today.</p> <p>I'm here to speak against the current PCL proposal or any of the alternatives CDOT has proposed. They're shortsighted and ill conceived, and it's a poor plan for several reasons. Environmentally they're going to be damaging. It's cutting every utility through this lowest part of the city. Gas, electric, water, storm drainage, all are going to be cut and rerouted. The drainage is—this is the lowest spot in the city. We're cutting a potentially 40-foot trench lower than the river. And it will dam underground streams that are going through this region now. It will require pumping, surface retention ponds, taking more surface ground area that should be used for development. It will disturb polluted groundwater, and require deep watering, which is expensive, and certainly rain events in a trench like this could have disastrous consequences as was seen in the mountains around here. If one of those rain events happened in this area, imagine the consequences.</p> <p>Physically, we believe that this highway, by widening it, actually reduces access. 46th Avenue is a street now. There are 16 through streets in this area that allow people to get access back and forth underneath it. This will reduce it to four, so it's a highway with limited access on the roadway. The creation of side streets will actually bring traffic into neighborhoods rather than speed through, which would be more damaging. We don't believe that DRCOG models currently reflect current trends, which have been seen to be reducing since 2005, so they have not demonstrated the growth in this portion of the corridor that justify this widening.</p> <p>We believe the widening will degrade the neighborhoods, taking out, removing more houses and businesses, which is unfair to place the burden on a disadvantaged populous. This only looks at cars; it does not solve the transportation needs in the neighborhood. They need multiple modal networks to reduce the demands on the roadways. This design will actually increase the congestion. By improving level of service, it induces more traffic, forcing them into the mousetrap, which is still only one lane, and will not be widened by this project from what I've seen.</p> <p>We believe the toll lane is unfair patently. It allows those who are rich enough to afford to bypass the traffic to get through the areas that are congested, that will remain congested because of the mousetrap.</p> <p>We know too that P3, public-private projects, are going bankrupt around the country. One of the companies you're talking with, they've gone bankrupt in Albuquerque and in other cities. We believe this is a potential disaster for the City as well.</p> <p>We believe the design of the cover is shortsighted. Recall the tunnels that were built at Stapleton that caused backups and accidents frequently in that section. The east-west orientation will keep it in shadow for a good bit of the year. And you recall too the incident at I-25, which is east-west, where a microclimate caused a big pileup. We believe this is potentially going to happen here as well. We believe that in looking at other cities around the world and around the country that more and more of these highways are actually being taken down. Believe it or not, it is counterintuitive, but we believe this can work. Thank you very much.</p>
5	<p>Good evening. Thank you. I'm here representing the Sierra Club this evening. I'm here to actually kind of defend the clean, the air quality act because I think it's very, very important for CDOT to make sure it's in compliance with the air quality act and also, also NEPA, the National Environmental Protection Act. The First Supplemental Draft EIS is inadequate because it fails to assess the impact that emissions from the expanded highway will have on the health of the near-highway neighbors and secondly, compliance with the clean air act by failing to model the ambient concentrations of pollutants that EPA has identified as causing significant threats to public healths—health, excuse me.</p> <p>NEPA requires that an EIS use the best available science to assess all impacts that the project will have that significantly affect the human environment. If an EIS fails to disclose significant impacts and fails to consider alternatives and mitigation that can avoid or prevent those impacts, then the EIS is not in compliance with</p>



#	Comment
	<p>NEPA. In its latest version to the national air quality standards, the EPA identified two pollutants emitted from highways as posing significant risks to human health, PM 2.5—soot and fine particles—and nitrogen dioxide. Because of the significance of the health risks associated with these pollutants, the EPA now requires the states to establish monitors adjacent to highways to monitor public exposure to these pollutants. The health effects research that EPA relied upon to identify emissions from PM 2.5 and NOx from highways as causing significant health risks has since been augmented by additional research more recently showing that highway emissions cause health risks to fetuses, newborns, and the elderly. Because these pollutants present a significant health risk to the communities adjacent to I-70, the air quality technical report prepared for the SDEIS is inadequate because it fails to model the impact that these emissions will have on attainment of the national ambient air quality standards for PM 2.5 and NOx.</p> <p>This omission is particularly egregious because the emission inventory data developed for the PM 10 modeling shows that 50 percent of the PM 10 emitted from the build project alternatives is less than 2.5 micrometers in size, and is therefore likely to cause violations according to the law.</p> <p>I just wanted to point out that a study that Denver Environment and Health did is quite compelling. It shows that people are dying 3.5 years younger in these neighborhoods than in similar neighborhoods in the state. That means that 15,000 residents in these neighborhoods are losing 50,000 years of their lives. So we need to make sure that whatever alternative is finally implemented that these people's health and also our national environmental standards are upheld.</p> <p>Thank you very much. Oh, we'll be writing a longer comment by the way. The Sierra Club will write it probably in cooperation with other environmental organizations, and submit it via email.</p>
6	<p>I'm an urban design architect and a practicing architect in Denver. I've been here since 1984. I worked for the City and County of Denver as a design architect for two and a half years. I was involved in the I-25 widening project between the narrows all the way up to Alameda Boulevard and Sixth Avenue. That was done about nine, ten years ago.</p> <p>I would like to talk about the CDOT project. I'd like to mention a lot of things. The widening of the existing I-70 route, which CDOT has proposed, has numerous fatal flaws. First, it causes the destruction of 20 businesses and 53 residences. It causes a large five-year-long process of detoured traffic and massive detour traffic jams. It cannot be functional nearly as well while it's in construction as a reroute option. It will also, it also has had a large citizen and neighborhood organization resistance. It causes approximately—it doesn't have enough land for a right of way as it is; they're going to have to purchase land. It does not alleviate traffic problems for vehicles headed to the overall northern Colorado region; it does not allow for vehicles on their way to our vacation destinations, such as the mountains and ski resorts, to get around the large Denver traffic snarls. It's going right in the middle.</p> <p>It will likely cause drainage problems because of the depressed areas of the highway. It will likely cause icing problems for the westbound lanes throughout the whole area due to shadows; it will likely cause groundwater buildup due to the retaining walls that are going to be part of the depression. That groundwater is going to be retained, and also will be collecting in polluted ground soils.</p> <p>The widening proposes only one grass covered area, which is coincidentally near an elementary school. The pictures you're seeing around this room have more than one grassy area, but there's only one promised tunnel, not multiple promises. I'm calling that out because highway projects often include pedestrian and urban design amenities such as landscape areas, pedestrian safety zones, light pollution shielding, and public art. These amenities are often cut in construction to save money and time while building the projects. That's going to happen because we will run over budget with this solution, and they'll cut all the amenities. So forget about the park, forget about the tunnel; it won't be there. In fact, you can forget about the depression</p>



#	Comment
	<p>because they won't do it because why move dirt when you don't have to? They'll build it at grade and they'll put up isolation walls. We'll have the great wall of Denver.</p> <p>The loop option maximizes the existing 300-foot-wide right of ways of Highway 270 and 76. It can be built without the destruction of 20 businesses and 53 residences. It has little, if any, citizen and neighborhood opposition. It will only be passing through industrial and commercial areas of the cities. It can be built while I-70 still remains operational. That's huge. The limit—it also has enough room to be a 10-lane highway. It can alleviate traffic snarls, and it will provide connectivity for the area of I-70 that right now has currently been missing for 50 years.</p>



#	Comment
7	<p>Thank you. I just want to make it short and sweet. I believe that running the, running I-70 below grade is a good idea. It worked around Washington Park. I'm for the kids in the neighborhood.</p> <p>If you think that you're getting this tunnel as a gift to the neighborhood, you're all sorely mistaken. We need a new school that would be away from this highway. It would be less pollution, it'd be less money, it'd be less money spent trying to mitigate all this pollution and all. If you want some bridges, put the bridges all across streets that go through one side to the other. We don't need to keep separating the neighborhoods north and south. There are, we can use a lot of that money too that's left over from putting this, this park that we don't need—there's a park two blocks to the north, there's a park two blocks to the south. We don't need our kids playing on top of a freeway. Nobody's going to see this park. Nobody's going to see this park when they're driving on the freeway. You're just going to see an embankment you're going under. It's going to be, it's going to be very dangerous. That's why they turned around and took Stapleton's tunnels down years ago. I'm sure a lot of you residents know that. You can't see it when you're coming through it in the morning and the night. People are getting killed in accidents upon accidents happening because of this tunnel. The money that we save on this tunnel can also be used to help mitigate all this extra pollution that's going to go into the residents' houses without making them pay for it out of their own pocket.</p> <p>I'm pretty much finished. I just wanted to bring that up so people have a clear view that this tunnel is not a gift to Elyria and Swansea and Globeville, it's a detriment. I'm sure in the next 10 or 15 years after it's built you're going to see how bad of an idea that was. Denver is going to be, oh, we're so forward thinking at this time and it's going to be so great, and we'll soon find out it's more of a boondoggle. But thank you for your time.</p>
8	<p>Okay. I have lost a lot of sleep over this business because I live at 3330 Bruce Randolph, 10 blocks from I-70. And there are a number of problems. Unless the mousetrap is completely uprooted and changed, this project seems to propose to create the largest start-and-stop parking lot right in what I consider a part of Denver that I love and support. I am objecting to, you know, I'm not saying that Don Hunt doesn't have good intentions. But to uproot 55 houses of Hispanic people because they won't fight back is, I think, immoral. And if we can't do better than that—okay.</p> <p>Also, what in this proposal is going to improve air quality around I-70? Because I am aware of those who say that the air quality is so bad around I-70 that those who live near it expect three years and ten months less life expectancy. Is this not a problem? Is this not a problem? I mean, you know, why do we, why do we think people should be killed early in order to have this coterie of diesel trucks that are, I think, part of the problem. I have heard that, well, if the city council would move, the diesel trucks could be moved to the 270/I-76 area, and this would remove half of the air pollution. And if that were part of the proposal, then it might make kind of sense. But killing people just because it says we're saving jobs, making things nice for the trucking companies, doesn't impress me. Thank you.</p>
9	<p>Hi. I'm a longtime Denver resident. I actually own my parents' house that they bought in 1940 on Elliott a half a block off I-70. I saw I-70 being built, and have owned the house now it is affected by currently. The expansion being proposed is something that we're not in favor of.</p> <p>We really would like to see that study being done because I-76 to 225, that's the original plan that I-70 was supposed to go through in the 1960s, and got diverted through central Denver, and has disturbed north Denver as well as Swansea and all the neighborhoods along the viaduct for the last 45 years, 50 years. That's what we would like to see, that there would be more studies done in moving the highway to the north. There are many cities around the country that have successfully diverted highways going through a large population area. By expanding the highway, it's going to cause more traffic concentrated in a high population area, which could cause all kinds of health issues. I can tell you my father—who never smoked—died from asthma because he lived a half block off I-70. I don't smoke. I kind of sound like I have asthma, but I don't right now.</p>



#	Comment
	<p>But not only that, I-70 has deteriorated throughout the years. If you drive along it, nothing is kept up. The fences are not kept up. The overgrowth of trees are ridiculous. None of that is kept up anymore.</p> <p>I come from a family of highway people. My grandfather built the Pikes Peak road. My father worked on the Million Dollar Highway, so I know what is involved in the construction of highways and how it affects people. I also don't understand why this would be a less expensive project in the long run, because if you're going to dig a trench down through the middle of the city, you're going to have a lot more maintenance cost 50 years down the road, 60 years down the road than having it diverted out to the north where it already, the highway department already owns the property. They don't have to put, we don't have to buy 50 some homes and 20 some businesses to do this expansion.</p> <p>So that's about all I want to say. Thank you very much.</p>



#	Comment
10	<p>Hi. I have not always lived up in north Denver, but I lived in a more affluent area I guess you would say in Denver where this would not have even been considered. And I just feel like it's really inappropriate of you, because that area that this is going through is a lower socioeconomic group of people who are afraid to speak up a lot of times.</p> <p>I also work as an RN, and I have personally seen small children in asthma attacks. And I have talked to those parents saying, "You know you have to keep your child away from fumes, away from smoke, cigarette smoke, car fumes, that type of thing." And you know how difficult it is to say that to a parent that you know cannot even afford to get their child out of a neighborhood like that? To look a parent in the eye, and have that parent say to me, "I can't move anyplace else. I can't afford anyplace else." And yet you're going to increase the amount of traffic, increase the amount of fumes there? To me that is very wrong. I also don't understand.</p> <p>With this they're also saying that there's going to be toll lanes where people who have the opportunity and the good paying jobs can pay money and go faster and get to where they need to faster, but the people who actually live in that community who are lower socioeconomic would not be able to afford that. I have lived in Chicago where they did have private people, private companies manage the tolls, which is what you guys are talking about. And ask anybody in Chicago what they think of that. And they will tell you that it was a horrible mistake by the government. So please don't do that. I think that would be adding insult to injury to those people who live in that neighborhood.</p> <p>And again, the other health issue, that it's going to decrease my life by three years, I think my three years are just as important to me as they are to you and as they are to anyone in the government that are making this decision. So I would please ask of you, think about doing a study to see what it would do, the impact on the community to move this up to the I-76 reroute. It only makes sense to me.</p> <p>You're going to be spending five years building this, rerouting people on I-70. It's already difficult during rush hour to get through I-70 in that area. Over the five years, it's going to make it even more difficult. I don't agree with that. It's going to be a swimming pool down there. How are you going to address the ice issues in the winter on the tunnel? You know, I just don't quite understand the thinking of it. And I just please ask you guys to consider that reroute. Things don't have to be written in stone. Big business does not need to tell us, as the individuals that are actually paying the taxes, what should be done with that highway. You know, it's, it's sad that we listen to business more so than the people that are actually living there. Thank you for listening.</p>
11	<p>I live in northwest Denver. I won't take anything like four minutes because I'll put some more detailed comments in writing. But I wanted to give some overall comments, one of which started 20 years ago when I worked on a community project with a fellow who went on to become the executive director of the American Association of Transportation Planners who said to me, "They would never design the interstate system today the way they did it in the 50's because it crushed communities." So when I saw the layout for this trench concept, I said, "That won't last long because that's been rethought many times." And so I'm terribly disappointed to know that it's not being rethought, but it's being carried forward.</p> <p>So as a person who was born and raised in rural Colorado where I think we will see some damage out there. When the bridge maintenance funds are used over the course of 20 years, rural Colorado will be the people who will pay for that. But the folks who will pay the dearest price are the folks that live right next door in the communities that we are in right now, and their children are breathing very polluted air. And so I put all that down somewhere else. But highways shouldn't crush community. And there is no reason that this can't go around. The reason they started building the beltways was because they decided it wasn't a good idea to run highways right through communities. And I would just like to say thanks to Baltimore who said, "No, you're not coming through our neighborhood." They began to rethink that. I think that there's time for you to</p>



#	Comment
	<p>explore other possibilities. But I really think that this expense will not serve the citizens of any part of Denver well at all, and I encourage you to rethink this. And I look forward to communicating more later in writing.</p>
12	<p>Good evening. First of all, welcome to Kearney Middle School. I'm a proud Kearney Bobcat. Born and raised in Commerce City my entire life. So welcome to my old stomping grounds and middle school. I am the State Representative for Commerce City and southern Adams County, so basically all of the southern unincorporated neighborhoods of Adams County, and represent the areas that are being talked about in terms of a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>I come tonight to advocate my support for the partially lower covered option on the current alignment that is currently being expounded upon or proposed by CDOT. I say that for a couple of reasons. One, I've not heard from anyone in my community that actually has advocated or wants to see the additional traffic that comes with combining two major highways in the metro area. 270 and I-76 already cannot handle the traffic counts that are on those roads. And to think that we can expand and put the additional traffic from I-70 onto those roads I think is a huge problem. The other is that I would like to advocate for the continued access from Vasquez Boulevard onto I-70. That is a major corridor for many Commerce City businesses. Transportation logistics and distribution is a major lifeblood of this community, and we need to make sure that we maintain the proper access.</p> <p>I certainly sympathize with folks that are affected by I-70. But I don't think the answer is, you know, there are areas of Commerce City and southern Adams County that are just as economically disadvantaged, just as diverse ethnicity-wise as those areas of Denver. The answer is not to advocate for putting, removing one burden from one disadvantaged community onto another. I've personally walked those neighborhoods that abut next to I-76. I think some of the comments that suggest that there are no residents or there's not as many residents in those corridors I think is misguided because I've walked them and talked to those folks. And they already experience the challenges of living next to a highway. And to advocate for increasing that traffic flow, increasing the environmental concerns I think is something they are particularly concerned about.</p> <p>So I certainly want to advocate my support for the partially lower covered option. I think it is the best option that's currently being addressed by CDOT. And Commerce City recognizes that too. That's why we have early on advocated for the partially lower covered option so we can do some work to reunite those neighborhoods that are traditionally divided by I-70. Thank you for your time tonight. Appreciate your time.</p>
13	<p>Good evening. I'm a resident of Adams County. I'm here to lend support for the proposed I-70 plan, and to oppose a reroute of I-70 up to I-270 and I-76. Adams County Economic Development, as a member of the North Area Transportation Alliance, supported a letter of opposition to the reroute last year, and a letter of endorsement for the proposed plan as it currently has been presented. I find it ironic that the group that proposes for the reroute would wish on the citizens of Adams County the ills that they wish to get rid of in their own neighborhood. And I also sympathize with them, but that is not the solution, to simply move the problem to somebody else's neighborhood. Adams County residents are very aware of the proposal. And we're not on record for having opposed the reroute because no one has proposed it as the preferred alternative. But there are communities that will oppose it, and there are businesses.</p> <p>The area that's along 76 and 270 is wrought with landfills, with a wastewater treatment plant, a river, a creek, canals, and a lot of businesses. A refinery. I know that SunCor probably would not want to have a bigger, wider, closer highway to the refinery for safety reasons, so we don't find that it's a viable alternative at all to the I-70 plan. We lend our endorsement to the currently proposed plan. Thank you.</p>



Private Verbal Comments

There were three verbal comments made privately and recorded by a court reporter on the night of the Commerce City Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	<p>As an urban planning architect for the City and County of Denver, I was assigned to the I-25 widening and drainage improvement project from 2002 to 2004. I also worked on the Union Station Master Plan and the Colfax Master Plan while working at the City and County of Denver. I've been licensed more than 22 years as an architect, and I've served on the AIA Colorado Urban Design Committee. Highway project expansion plans often include pedestrian and urban design amenities such as landscaped areas, pedestrian safety elements, light pollution shielding, and public art. These amenities are often cut in construction to save money and time while building the project.</p> <p>The widening of I-70 proposal CDOT is proposing includes an 800-foot tunnel with a park area above and several smaller tunnel/park crossings over the highway. It also includes lowering areas of the roadway more than 21 feet below the existing grade. The loop also has an existing right-of-way large enough for a 10-lane highway throughout. The loop option better serves to alleviate overall Northern Colorado traffic by providing a way around the central congested areas of Denver. The loop option better serves travelers heading east and west of Denver by taking it away from the city center. The loop option improves the neighborhoods and commercial community with continuity that has been missing for 50 years where the viaduct has been existing.</p> <p>A plaza/boulevard would be a new replacement in the area vacated by the I-70 viaduct. And the loop option needs no conductivity amenities such as a tunnel/park space, as little residential areas would be affected by the new highway.</p> <p>You can find more information regarding my comments outlined in elements of a study performed by unitednorthmetrodenver.com. You can also see other options at reimaginei70.com.</p>



#	Comment
2	<p>One of my biggest concerns about the alternatives that they have chosen, which is the underground construction, is that it is taking a lot more money to construct such a big highway than to use that money for resourceful construction around the neighborhood.</p> <p>The other thing that I'm very concerned of is that there is local businesses there that are going to be very affected and homes that are also going to be forced to be moved because of the highway construction that is going to be taking place. It just seems that it would make more sense for them to do a rebuild of the highway basically just the way it is with a couple of more security walls to hold in some of the noise barrier and some of the particles that I think that there's a lot of people that are concerned about versus the underground choice that they're having because I think that the particles are going to be there regardless of how we choose the highway.</p> <p>If we choose the highway underground, the particles are still going to move up with wind or traffic, so they'll still be in people's homes and inside of their houses or businesses. And if you build the highway up above, the particles are still going to come down and are going to be inside the people's homes and businesses and ground.</p> <p>So, I think that one of the biggest concerns was the research for the alternative route was something that I believe that should be researched a little bit more deeply.</p>
3	<p>I personally think as well that this project that they are about to do or considering doing kind of sucks. First of all, to build a bigger highway in a residential area I think is not good because they're going to be taking out a lot of people's homes as well as the businesses as well that are around there. There are people that have been living there, in the neighborhood—or their neighborhoods—have been living there for quite a long time, and I don't think it's right that, you know, just because they want to build a bigger highway that they push everybody out for the highway. I think they need to build it just the way it is now, just three lines in each direction and leave it at that.</p> <p>To build a boulevard, there's a lot of traffic that's going to be going through the—or actually through our—residential area as well. And so I don't think that that's really an option.</p> <p>As well as the underground, I think that the underground highway that they want to—or are looking at building as well—is not good either just simply because of all the pollution as well is going to be staying underneath that. And to build something on top of it like playgrounds or whatever they want to build on top of it is not good either because that's very unsafe to have children playing on top of the highway.</p>

3. SEPTEMBER 25 DENVER PUBLIC HEARING

Of the 187 attendees at the September 25 Denver Hearing, 14 people provided written comments, 35 people provided verbal comments, and 12 people provided private verbal comments.

Written Comments

There were 14 written comments provided on the night of the Denver Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	I couldn't say anything when it was built the first time because I was only 9 years old, but I can now. Just tear it down & rebuild as is—no park—no 10 lane hiway! Makes no sense! Won't solve the congestion problem!
2	I do not want the Interstate to go to 10 lanes. Leave it alone and rebuild as is!!!
3	I prefer the hiway be moved with no changes but if changes must occur, I would like no action be taken!!
4	I don't want to loose my childhood home to THIS Highway nonsense! I ask for NO ACTION!!
5	We struggle to maintain our I-70 that exists—"3rd world landscape" and structural issues everywhere. Why would we spend 4x the \$ to improve/build a new I-70 when we claim we have no \$ to properly maintain what we have. Not a good business decision & certainly not sustainable. *Do the meetings speaking English (our countries tongue) give the Spanish speakers headphones connected to an interpreter?
6	<p>As printed in the Denver Post, CDOT has put forth the idea that both the Nat'l Western S.S. & the Elyria Swansea Globeville Business Assoc. have endorsed the below grade & covered I-70 option. The Nat'l Western's only request is that I-70 remains in its current location (no mention of below grade as a preference). The Nat'l Western letter is not dated. The ESGBA letter states that the board believes, as determined by PACT meetings, that the below grade construction with the covers is preferred. The PACT meetings were concluded in June of 2011, and at that time, a widened below grade hiway with cover was dismissed by the PACT members. Note that the ESGBA letter was dated 8/5/13 or over 2 years after this idea was discarded.</p> <p>I believe the "No Action" reconstruction will be less of an impact in homes and businesses lost in the neighborhoods affected, by far, compared to the much more intrusive below grade option. The "No Action" I-70 will cost far less, be completed in a much shorter timeframe and is the preferred option by many residents. CDOT cannot guarantee that a covered portion of I-70 will be maintained into the distant future. The last thing these affected three neighborhoods need is more blight, weeds, trash, graffiti.</p>
7	<p>I am making a comment on the I-70 project because I live in the development that is supposed to take place. I think that it would be a better idea to move it out to 270 because there is really nothing out that way and it won't impact any residential area any. If that can't happen then I think that they should rebuild the highway just the way it is now.</p> <p>For one making an underground high is very dum! This will impact our neighborhood. This means that everybody who has lived in this or these neighborhoods for a long time will now have to move because of this? That's not right. Just build it the way it is—less time less money. We like our neighborhood. If you stop and think I-25 had been expanded out to 5 or 6 lanes each side and it is still congested. No matter if—make it underground or leave it, the way it is it will not matter every highway has congestion. Underground what happens when it snows or rains? Raining it will flood and when it snows it will be very icy! What about accidents? or when your car breaks down? If you are in the middle of the highway you have no where to go! What about people who are closterphobic. Me personally I could not drive it because if I get sock in there I would really freak out. That is very scary to even think that would happen. Building the highway the way it is is a better disission, just because no one will have to move away or loss there house that they worked hard for for many years. Bissness would not be in jeopardy as well. Stop and think if it was your house and your neighborhood, would you like it if someone came and pushed you out of it? No you wouldn't. Everyone worked and works hard for what they have and to be taken away from them in a blink of an eye is wrong. Everyone chooses to live where they want yes? Well we choose to live there because we want to and like it. It's our neighborhood. So don't take it away from us.</p> <p>You could put noise barriers up for the noise. Make meralas to make it look nice. As far as a Blvd. I say no thats way to much traffic going through the neighborhoods. Not everyone has money to relocate somewhere else. We enjoy driving our routes we drive to get from one side to the other.</p>
8	-Increase demarkation between neighborhoods



#	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not effective use of public funds -Adding lanes with dual frontage roads on both sides is not prudent and increases separation -Additional bridges does not improve connectivity for residents ... greater distance, less crossover -Cap is not an effective solution to connectivity -Cap maintenance will be an issue as well as distribution of pollution below & above cap -Bottle necking @ I-25 will cause backup of traffic and increase pollution -Traffic challenges with tunnels—often causing increased accidents -Flooding possibilities -Better alternatives with rerouting above grade -Use of toll lanes to justify or help pay cost of construction -Displacing residents & businesses to widen road bringing closer to schools and increase separation
9	<p>1. We do not need to expand the # of lanes or add toll lanes. We need to invest in BRT and additional capacity for rail along corridor. If you build it like T-Rex it will become congested as I-25 continues to be. Do not expand the highway!!!! It is not preferred and not viable.</p> <p>2. Locations of covers do not connect community. The second cover makes no sense and needs to be relocated to facilitate better community connection.</p> <p>3. Cover option is actually worse for bikes and pedestrians. It lacks the current level of access and connections that the revised viaduct currently offers the community. This in turn makes the area more car dependant less connected which is a big health concern when people lose a healthy alternative to navigating there community as well as connect to the larger metro area. This area needs healthy alternatives such as walking & biking and the cover option removes that option & connectivity. If it is selected much more is needed for proper bike facilities and ped connections.</p>
10	<p>I prefer the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative, Basic Option. It will beautify the neighborhood, lessen air pollution and create better, safer traffic flow both on the interstate and frontage roads.</p>
11	<p>Air quality for Swansea Elementary & parking for dropping off students and picking up students—would like to know if there will different lots for this. Train noise is very disturbing now. What are the plans for the trains? Property impact—is CDOT pay each renter to relocate or just property owners?</p>
12	<p>Air quality—I myself have breathing difficulties. I have asthma & am on oxygen. The emissions put out from the traffic on I-70 & Manna-Pro, Purina & Pilot do have an effect on my wellbeing. I have lived here all my life & my health has been on a decline since I-70 has been built. (I am 58 yrs old) Every single day there is dust & grit in the house & on the cars from all this. The constant flow of traffic is annoying as hell. The continuous noise of traffic from I-70, especially at night, is unexceptable. If we want to watch television at night with the windows open for fresh air, we have to turn the sound way up just to hear it because of the sounds of the traffic on the highway! You say you want 10 lanes of traffic to ease traffic congestion. Take a look at I-25 in South Denver! You widened the Narrows for basically the same reason—but traffic along that portion of the highway is not any less congested now than it was BEFORE you widened it.</p> <p>What about water drainage from rain & melting snow? Where is the water going to go? How will CDOT handle the snow & ice we get in the winter months? 10 lanes of traffic between Washington St & Colorado Blvd? That's all fine & good but what happens as you approach Colorado? That in itself will cause a bottleneck & congestion which you are going to have no matter what is done!! I agree something needs to be done about I-70. It's been in such disrepair for many years but to make it a 10 lane highway for about 3 miles is a little bit ridiculous. I could see 8 lanes but not 10 lanes.</p> <p>I would actually like to see I-70 moved! To Commerce City! Alongside 270! We, the people that live along this proposed section of I-70, are split as to this decision CDOT has made in our favor but the way I see—no matter what ANY of the residents say—CDOT has ALREADY made the choice for us!! Some kind of democracy we have!!</p>



#	Comment
	Where it the funding for this project coming from? Will it be funded by independent out-of-country mega corporations like that of US 36? I have been told that you will buy the homes around I-70 new windows—wheres that money coming from? Who's gonna pay for that? I DON'T like the idea I may lose my lifelong home & have to move. I'm on SSI & cant afford much, let along be able to buy a new home! I sit on my front porch & watch the traffic on I-70 and even I see the congestion, primarily from the cars trying to get on the highway. I figure if you eliminate oncoming traffic, you eliminate the congestion.
13	We are worried on how the construction is going to impact the air quality in our area. As well as the noise and what is going to be the impact to properties. The most worrisome (issue) is when the bridge gets demolished, the dust is the problem if it causes trouble breathing.
14	I support the cover project.

Verbal Comments

There were 35 public verbal comments provided on the night of the Denver Public Hearing.

#	Comment
1	<p>Since I have a limited time, I'm just going to read it—my letter—because it's going into the record. I just want to begin by saying I appreciate all who are here tonight to comment on this important juncture in deciding how CDOT is going to figure out the right solution for the neighborhood first and the I-70 corridor. As many of you know, we have been advocating heavily to have health be at the core of the citizens that live in this neighborhood and for them to be the driving force in the decisions that are made. These neighborhoods surrounding the viaduct are protected under the Title 6 Civil Rights Act and Environmental Justice Policy, which means that they are entitled to be informed and included in all the decisions being made and are entitled to significant mitigations that the project will have on their lives. While I believe that there are some good components to the partially covered lower alternative that has been mentioned, that is newly elevated here in the SDEIS proposal, I believe with all my heart that the proposed envelope of the highway needs to be reduced so that it can minimize the impacts on homes, businesses, and minimize air pollution. This highway is going through what I consider sacred ground in this community, and they should not be encroaching on these. There are a variety of studies that show that increasing the size of the highway does not necessarily reduce congestion. It's like from that movie—if you build it, they will come. The Colorado Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration should continue to be forward thinking and offer ideas that include mass transit, multimodal options to move people through this fragile urban environment and reduce the health impacts on residents.</p> <p>There is a potential for this project to be catalytic and have positive impacts in the neighborhood to promote new community and housing developments, to improve environmental quality issues, to create job opportunities, and a healthier neighborhood; but the details and the specifics of how this is to be done and mitigated are critical and they are crucial for the future of these neighborhoods. Now is a time that we need to work together to share common goals and leverage the resources we have to really move the neighborhood forward. We have worked on getting a Health Impact Assessment completed to inform the neighborhood in other planning processes currently happening. This HIA, the Health Impact Assessment, addresses issues because it took impact from the neighborhood on environmental quality, connectivity and mobility, access to goods and services, community safety, and mental well-being. It's important that recommendations in the HIA, the Health Impact Assessment, such as reducing truck traffic in and through the neighborhood and improved safety at the intersection of 47th and York, are acted upon when there are projects like I-70 that are impacting the neighborhood and its health. Elyria, Swansea—that's in espanol, Swansea; in</p>



#	Comment
	<p>English, it is Swansea—has long suffered from lack of connectivity within the neighborhood and with adjacent neighborhoods, most critical at the 47th and York railroad crossing. Since connectivity is being taken away in the proposal, CDOT should help fund the construction of sidewalks, bike paths, and other amenities that can help better link residents to their neighbors and go over or under the railroad tracks and the highway.</p> <p>Also, it should be looked at to limit truck traffic and access to I-70 and instead send the trucks out of the inhabited areas by using signage and enforcement to route the trucks onto 270 and 76. Air should be monitored before, during, and after construction, especially at Swansea Elementary. In order to retain neighbors and residents and encourage new families to move in, CDOT should commit to replacing the 49 to 53 housing units lost in Elyria, Swansea—Swansea—due to highway construction with three affordable housing units for every one that is lost. Additionally, affordable homeownership units should be replaced with the affordable homeownership options and affordable rental units should be replaced with affordable rental options. We should look at building a supermarket and a wellness center and pharmacy so that it be incentivized for people in Globeville, Elyria, Swansea to improve our well-being and curb the chronic health complications that are pervasive in our community. Also, a health and recreation center would make safe, clean air and a place for neighbors to exercise and be able to access health care. And finally, a good-neighbor agreement during the construction period should be forged and held up and honored as we go through the construction project.</p> <p>I am currently, along with Councilwoman Ortega and other members of Denver City Council, working on sending our mitigation strategies to the Colorado Department of Transportation. Councilwoman Ortega and I will be hosting an open house to review—for all of you to review our comments on Friday, October 17th, from 8:30 to 12:30 at Focus Points, which is at 2501 East 48th. If you have any questions, you can contact my office at 720-337-7709. Thank you for giving me your time.</p>
2	<p>I am opposed to the project, especially with 10 to 14 lanes plowing through Elyria, Swansea, and Globeville. In any language, most distressful at how socially, economically, environmentally negatively impacting these neighborhoods, the businesses, and especially the people. The cost is indefensible. I've been trying my best to talk common sense to the city and to the Colorado Department of Highways to lower the number of lanes. We don't need those lanes. And at today's price for an ounce of gold, I have figured you could pave the highway from Brighton Boulevard to Colorado Boulevard over 78 times at the same thickness we just paved the gold dome at the State Capital. And I want to promise you, I will not stand by while you crucify these neighborhoods on a highway of gold, to paraphrase William Jennings Bryan. We can do it. It's not too late, dear friends. It's not too late. We can do it. It's not too late to correct this mistake for a healthier neighborhood. But we've got to fight these too many lanes. We can do it. Let's do it.</p>
3	<p>I oppose the CDOT proposal for expanding I-70 through the Globeville, Elyria, Swansea neighborhoods. I would like to expand on some of the points the auditor, Dennis Gallagher, just made about the environmental cost of the project. According to a report by Denver's Department of Environmental Health that was released in April of this year, people in the area live 3.5 years less than the rest of the city. It's estimated that over 50,000 years of life are lost to these neighborhoods every year. Children with asthma are admitted to the emergency room over 70 percent more often than the rest of the city; 40 ER admissions per 1,000 children under 20 in this area versus 28.5 ER admission per 1,000 in the city as a whole. Cardiovascular deaths are up 35 to 55 percent higher in these three neighborhoods; 213 to 275 deaths per 100,000 in these neighborhoods versus 160 deaths per 100,000 for the city as a whole.</p> <p>No other socioeconomic factors are attributable to these disparities. I'm going to submit four maps taken from the Environmental Health Report. These four maps show percentages across the city for poverty, Hispanic population, percentage of population speaking only English at home, and percentage of adults 25 or older with less than a high school diploma. For those factors, the Globeville, Elyria, Swansea neighborhoods are statistically comparable to a number of neighborhoods on the west side of Denver. The only difference</p>



#	Comment
	<p>between the neighborhoods on the west side and the Globeville, Elyria, Swansea area is that people die sooner and live with more disease during their lives in Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea, specifically because they live next to the highway. Nothing in the CDOT proposal adequately addresses these health issues.</p>
4	<p>I live in Park Hill. I oppose CDOT expanding I-70 through Globeville and Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods, and I'd like to expand on some of the points that Auditor Gallagher just made. The project is too expensive, \$1.2 billion, without calculating the interest cost, as Mr. Don Hunt said last week. As recently as last week, Don Hunt said CDOT hasn't even calculated interest and loan costs for the project. The project calls for \$850 million from the Road and Bridge Fund. This fund generates about \$100 million a year and is intended to fund upkeep on our roads and bridges across the state. This project would eat up every dollar in the fund for 8 1/2 years. By CDOT's own calculations, the project will take half of the fund for at least 20 and possibly up to 30 years. The cost of the project is at least 10 times greater per lane mile than any other project ever completed or even contemplated by CDOT. For example, the T-REX project rebuilt 17 miles of highway with 209 new lane miles for \$795 million. That's \$3.8 million per lane mile. The I-70 proposal, rebuilding 53 miles with approximately 550 lane miles, including multiple new tunnels in some of the most difficult conditions imaginable, is priced at \$3.5 billion. That's \$6.4 million per lane mile. The expansion of I-70 between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard is now estimated at \$1.2 billion. That's 10 lanes of highway for 1.8 miles or 18 new lane miles of highway. That works out to \$66.7 million per lane mile.</p>
5	<p>I also want to expand on some of the things that Auditor Gallagher talked about. The first thing I want to say is we don't know what we're discussing. They talk about it's 10 lanes, and then it's 8 lanes. They talk about that it's \$1.1 billion, and then it's \$1.2 billion. Is it one cover? Is it two covers? Is there a Vasquez interchange or not? How can we make any decisions if we don't know what we're really discussing? And that is the biggest problem that we discuss today is we don't know what they are asking us to approve. So that's the first problem that we have with this.</p> <p>The second problem that we have is environmental and social justice issues. We have some of the poorest neighborhoods in town, and we want to build basically two new highways: One, six lanes to replace what we have now; and then another four what they call managed lanes. These are Lexus lanes. These are the lanes for the people who can afford to go faster, and we want to put it right through the middle of the poorest neighborhoods in town. How do we mitigate the damage? On that board over there, what they say is they want to mitigate it by giving an opportunity for homeowners near the highway to mitigate issues with their houses. What they're talking about is they're talking about loans. They're talking about making it easier for the people in these neighborhoods to go into debt to mitigate the issues that are created by people driving through their neighborhoods. It's not fair. CDOT isn't applying themselves to this, and until they do, we can't make decisions on whether or not we approve. Thank you.</p>
6	<p>I live in Park Hill. I have over 40 years of EIS and freeway construction experience across the country. My last was in Massachusetts as the Chief of Public Works and Transportation, Commissioner of Public Works for the City of Boston. I came after the Big Dig. I have 30 years of experience dealing with CDOT. I was here for the Mousetrap reconstruction and I was instrumental in maintaining the Washington Street interchange, which CDOT was bound and determined to close. My last assignment for the City and County of Denver was the city coordinator for the T-REX project.</p> <p>I'm glad to say CDOT is using the depressed section proposed by the city and county staff back in the 1990s when we were looking at expanding from the Mousetrap and funding only got us as far as Brighton Boulevard. This neighborhood has lived through 60 years of bad CDOT decisions. It's time that we correct it with this project. If you use the T-REX design standards, which FHWA approved, the proposed cross-sections here are grossly excessive. You can build the necessary roadway at a 200-foot cross-section. You put 46th Avenue on the south side only. You do not need frontage roads. That's a pro-roadway, pro-traffic, pro-truck type of interchange usage that you don't need. You also don't need the split diamond at Steele and Colorado Boulevard. Just go ahead and build a full one at Colorado Boulevard. The neighbors will be able to get out either on Brighton or Washington or Colorado.</p>



#	Comment
	<p>You only need eight lanes. If you want two managed lanes, then do concurrent flow in each direction, like they did in Virginia, separated by barriers. It's an approved design by FHWA, and it allows you to have managed lanes in both directions. You need to narrow the cross-section, okay. You need to protect these neighborhoods. Do not exacerbate the previous bad decisions. If you really look at the cross-section that's here, they have the ability to expand within the depressed section to 12 lanes in the future. Thank you.</p>



#	Comment
7	<p>I've been an urban community planner for 60 years working all over the globe, and this reminds me of what the great baseball player Yogi Berra said, This is deja vu all over again. In this case, I live in Alamo Placita, which is a neighborhood that was done at the same time in the 1800s, and I live at 390 Emerson. In the '60s and the '70s, the State Department of Highways was going to take freeways through 6th Avenue all the way to Lowry and they were going to take superhighways through Lodo; and we opposed that. And because there was a socioeconomic and political group that was strong enough, they were able to succeed. Now, I have to read this because this is a statement directly from CDOT's own EIS of 2008, and I don't want to misstate it. It said the lower I-70 alternative was eliminated in that Draft EIS during the initial screening process since it would, and I quote you, require building the highway through the South Platte River basin resulting in unacceptable effects on aquatic and ecological resources and increased potential for encountering contaminated groundwater and soils. That is Exhibit 3.5, page 3.8, in the November document. You can go read it. Now, I will ask you, why are we beating a dead horse all over again and in the process trying to destroy three essential neighborhoods for this entire metro area? Stop 10.</p>
8	<p>I've been a long-time resident of this neighborhood. What I see happening is that CDOT is thinking of the word "community" in a way that we in the neighborhood don't think of—define community in the same respect. It seems like CDOT is thinking of community as a location from there to over here. And those of us in the neighborhood feel that community is a sense of feeling we belong. This is our home. This is where we grew up. We have generations of people who have come. It's not from moving over there to over there. It's a heartfelt situation.</p> <p>The second thing is, you may have done the calculations to say that new lowered whatever it's going to be is going to be around for the next 70 years. But, really, if you stop and think about it, if Colorado continues to grow the way that it has been, that highway will no longer serve Colorado probably in 20 years because the growth of Colorado will continue and it will be obsolete; and, once again, the cost of that will fall on the payers—on the taxpayers' backs, which is not fair to us who pay taxes. That's it.</p>
9	<p>I'm a lifelong resident of the Sunnyside neighborhood. I have had family living in the Globeville area since 1888. I myself attended school in Globeville in the late 1950s when I-70 was being built. The neighborhoods were decimated at that time. Plans as stated to replace the current elevated portion of I-70 with a trench 10-lanes wide will put the final nails in the coffin of Elyria and Swansea. This plan is the very definition of social injustice—demolishing 53 more homes and 20 businesses to add four Lexus lanes so the wealthy who can afford to pay the tolls can get through Denver a little bit faster. Where are the 53 families now living in those homes going to go? Most of those folks are low income. The average value of those homes is less than \$200,000. What can those families buy at current prices elsewhere in the Denver area? What can they rent that would be affordable?</p> <p>CDOT says this plan will improve connectivity in the area. After five years of demolition, excavation, and reconstruction, there won't be a neighborhood left on the north side of the highway to worry about connecting. Residents not bought out will have been driven out. Other cities have bypasses around the urban core. Kansas City is an example of one, and their bypass is on I-70. I, for one, do not accept CDOT's statement that the loop alternative will cost over \$4 billion. CDOT is projecting the cost to build a completely new highway starting from scratch. Existing right-of-way already exists for the loop alternative.</p>
10	<p>Good evening. I am so pleased to see residents from the neighborhood here. I just would like a raise of hands. How many of you are from Globeville, Swansea, and Elyria? This is awesome. As you all know, these are the most directly impacted neighbors that will be affected by this project. And for the community, you all know that the NEPA process, the National Environmental Policy Act, regulates how these projects move forward, which includes many of the issues that Councilwoman Montero talked about earlier about addressing the environmental impact to these communities. So we have been working diligently to address issues that affect air quality. We will have some very robust comments on that issue that will be submitted as part of the EIS. We've got some 35 pages that we have compiled that will be part of the record that</p>



#	Comment
	<p>addresses these issues, including connectivity, which is vital.</p> <p>So when you remove 46th Avenue underneath I-70, which is the connection that these communities utilize to get back and forth, that disappears. And putting that parallel to I-70, and particularly in front of the school, where there's a nice beautiful lid that children will have to cross, is not the right way to do this. We have recommended that that road be moved further north so that that connectivity that provides that linkage for all three of these neighborhoods, meaning crossing under the railroad tracks and connecting over the river—so that these three communities can all get back and forth. So, again, these are some of the points that we will be submitting as part of our comments, and we've been working very closely with Councilwoman Montero and folks from the neighborhood to ensure that these are all part of the public comment and that they get addressed as part of this project. Thank you.</p>
11	<p>I just have a question. Is this a federal project or a state project? That park that you plan, why don't we spend some money—I don't know how much that's going to cost—why don't we spend some money to try to put an overpass on York? All of us, we live with the nightmare of those trains, and something has to be done. Those trains are about 3 miles long, and that really is a nightmare. I don't know whether you save the money from the park and try to do something with an overpass—it will be nice. Thank you.</p>
12	<p>If a highway were planned in the same area today, it wouldn't be allowed because of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970. Both passed after the highway was built. And so widening will continue to violate both social and environmental justice. The original I-70 destroyed, I believe, between 300 and 500 houses, mostly belonging to poor immigrant families. This widening will take 70 or more, some of which are eligible for historic designation. Denver has sustainability goals for 2020. The pollution and waste from removal of approximately 75,000 truckloads of contaminated dirt alone would make meeting these goals unlikely.</p> <p>I urge CDOT to consider alternatives that would remove a portion of the highway to allow the historic communities of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea to truly reunite by providing the historic street grid enjoyed by other Denver neighborhoods. I don't expect to be able to go 65 miles an hour in my neighborhood. Why should we expect other neighborhoods to put up with that?</p> <p>CDOT and Denver officials traveled to Seattle to see an almost 40-year-old lid, which at 5 acres has been described as noisy. This lid will be less than 4 acres. But they have not gone to other places that have removed inner city highways and have shown great success with replacement boulevards. So I just encourage CDOT to start over again. We made a mistake once with where I-70 was put. Let's not keep making the same mistake.</p>
13	<p>Denver's 2014 Health Impact Assessment states that highway pollution is the main source of air pollution in Elyria, Swansea. In addition, the average age of death is 3.5 years younger than the citywide average and the causes of death are related to the pollutants released by highways. Yet in the Environmental Impact Statement, CDOT states that it does not need to mitigate for air pollution because although the project does increase air pollution, it does not take air pollution out of compliance with the national standards. However, according to CDOT's own models, air emissions will go out of compliance in 2036; in 22 years. They only look out to 2035, and in 2035 it keeps getting higher and higher, and that's the last year they look at, and it is exactly at the highest level it can be by law, and they stop looking any further. And they say that they are building the highway for 80 to 100 years and that they are only going to model the air out until it gets out of compliance and that that's okay.</p> <p>Now, consider that the people in this room will be still living in this neighborhood in 22 years and that their houses will lose value because of this community being out of compliance, let alone what this does to health in the neighborhood. So I do believe it is CDOT's responsibility to mitigate for air pollution, not say in the EIS that they don't have to mitigate for air pollution. How can they do that? Most importantly, they need to get the heavy trucks out of the neighborhood. Those heavy trucks are releasing the most diesel emissions. So</p>



#	Comment
	<p>they should be rerouted onto 270 and 76. The highway should not be built to 10 lanes. And relocation assistance should be provided to all homes within 500 feet of the highway, if desired by residents. They should be doing full-spectrum air monitoring; not just the air quality that they are told to do by the EPA, but all of the harmful pollutants that are affecting the kids at Swansea Elementary School. They shouldn't just put in filters at Swansea. They should also put them in at Garden Place Elementary School, which is not only near I-70 but near I-25 as well. And they should put filtration systems and improve the doors and windows at all the homes within 500 feet, not just offer to help people to get loans to do that.</p>



#	Comment
14	<p>Hello. I'm an ironworker; a native Colorado resident. And I understand that everybody is negative against this project, but I'm in support of it due to it's going to bring a lot of high-paying jobs to our area, which will help build our economy. And what everybody is not realizing is that I-70 is falling apart, and sooner or later it is going to have to be rebuilt. So whether you face it now or face it ten years from now, it's still going to happen. So I would suggest that everybody get on board with this and realize that this is in our best interest rather than when it falls apart and we lose five or six, seven people to a car accident when it collapses, whether it's somebody driving on top or below it. So that's my view on it. And please help Colorado Workforce build a stronger Colorado. Thank you.</p>
15	<p>My home is in Globeville. I'm going to just do some quick bullets of some things that I'll be submitting in a longer form. First of all, unless you're extremely long-lived and vital, probably nobody in this room is guilty of having put that road, the highway, through the neighborhoods when it was originally put through. Whether—in conversations with broad ranges of people that I'm extremely grateful for their outspokenness, their research, etc., whether folks would like to have a grand boulevard, to have a full reroute, to support the partially lowered cover, an amazing number of people I've spoken with in Elyria, Swansea, Globeville, Commerce City, Cole, and Clayton wish the road was not there. It's extraordinary. So this tells me that we need to absolutely minimize the impact. And I would like to just call for a grander inclusiveness of leadership from among our city and our governor's office, from the North Denver Cornerstone Collaborative. We have many places here of very caring people that are listing all of the various things that we have to consider. We have conflicting research around what the impacts are in terms of their scale and their depth. We have DRCOG that has a mission to positively impact the reduction of vehicle traffic. Why can't we make this a city vision? Why can't we make a decision based on supporting a positive trend—a positive trend away from the things that are killing us with our technologies?</p> <p>I don't know what's best. I think that the CDOT folks are very sincere. I think they have a horrific failure of leadership. We are having trouble getting unified as neighbors. We are up against each other. We have to get to the minutia, and some of that minutia is making sure there are no false promises. How are we going to upkeep this lid? How are we really going to make it a connecting place? I don't want it to be an ugly, horrible place with people pretending it's a place for the neighborhood. So please hang in there. And go to the Elyria Library. The Globeville Plan and the HIA are going to be available to look at. They must be a part of this. They have been delivered by our planning department to our steering committee. They are a part of this.</p>
16	<p>I live in Globeville. On my way over here this evening, I went through—underneath two underpasses, under the railroad bridge both places underneath I-70. I don't see why CDOT has to go so deep. Trucks get through there as now. So you don't need to go as deep as you're projecting. Your project is too big. We don't need the toll roads. If you can't afford it, don't do it. It's the old adage, you know. I think there are all kinds of reasons why you want to do the toll roads.</p> <p>The impacts on the neighborhoods are going to be bad. You're talking about traffic engineering, but in reality you're doing social engineering. The impact on these neighborhoods is going to be horrendous, as it has been in the 60 last years. And I want to take everything from this day forward and dedicate it to those valiant old people in Globeville who sued the Department of Transportation back then and lost. But we've had to live with the mistakes of what is now CDOT today—the old Colorado Department of Highways, it was.</p> <p>The cover, I think, is a cop-out. What about the rest of the neighborhoods? There's no cover for them. They are going to be exposed. The health impact is going to be horrendous. It has to be dealt with. The social engineering has been going on for 60 years across this part of the city. The important fact is you need to look at how it affects people in these neighborhoods. Thank you.</p>
17	<p>First, let me start and thank Councilwoman Deborah Ortega for getting the mikes and everything else squared away for everybody so that we did get an interpretation. I am a native. I support the folks in Elyria and Swansea. I am opposed to this project. They were working on this project for 11 years. The how does not make sense. The economy does not make sense</p>



#	Comment
	<p>I do work for a voluntary clean-up advisory board, and we can do this project better. We can get it cleaned up from Garden Place all the way up to the elementary schools that are affected—the heavy contaminants, arsenic, all the other things.</p> <p>I see we are going to put an HVAC system in a school. Whoopee. What do we do for the kids out on the playground? What do we do with the kids out in the park? When we look at DRCOG and the projection of 2035, our growth rate of senior citizens at 60, we are looking—as our living goes on, we are going to start seeing more and more people living to 100 years old. Well, that asthma, that hard breathing, all those things that goes into your lungs, right, that has a major effect on your health and your quality of life.</p> <p>We can do this better. There are alternatives. It's too big of a project. And we need to stand up for the folks in Elyria and Swansea now. Both Councilwomen Ortega and Montero have represented this area for over the last 20 years -- Councilwoman Ortega, when she was in District 9 and where she is now as an at-large, and Judy Montero. We need to stand up for these people now. We need to say no. And we need to make it economically sound. And the biggest thing is the environmental impact that it will have on everybody's health. Thank you very much.</p>



#	Comment
18	<p>I've lived in Elyria for 16 years. I knew Judy when she was a barista at Stella's Coffee Shop and we were getting Superfund Director Timothy Fields to reverse the record of the decision on the Shattuck Superfund site. So good to see you again, Judy.</p> <p>Central Refinery is another good little air contaminator in our neighborhood. If you don't live here, you probably never notice it. But it's due to double in size in the next 20 years too. So let's keep that in mind. By the way—nobody is paying me to say this—the city revoked my use permit to live in my house here in Elyria this summer in June—revoked my use permit to live here.</p> <p>As far as doing the No Action Alternative, if you were one of the parents of the 640 children in Swansea Elementary whose kids are underneath the viaduct the way it is right now, you wouldn't want to have no action. You would want to have the lid there and the school protected and the children protected as soon as possible. During that time of construction, what's going to be happening with those students? They'll be right next to all these bulldozers and cranes and whatnot. We don't have a plan for a new school in our neighborhood yet. Where are they going to go to school for five years?</p> <p>The city does not have a plan for our neighborhood yet. Here we are locking in a \$1.3, \$4, \$5 billion project; our neighborhood has no plan yet. Our neighborhood got a plan together in 2006; 1,000 people signed it. It's been on the Web since 2006. Look at our plan. We have a plan. The city is ignoring it. Finally, CDOT woke up. CDOT is doing something here. Is it perfect? No. But we still don't have a plan for our neighborhood yet.</p>
19	<p>I live in the Sunnyside neighborhood. I've been a teacher in DPS for 16 years. And when I read of what the pollution has done to children, my heart aches for them. It also helps me to understand why so many children have had learning difficulties—when you cannot breathe, when you cannot go outside and play without having an asthma attack, when you have to live until you have heart problems because of that asthma. I'm sorry, but this is not the project we need, to increase pollution for our children.</p> <p>I also look at—just reading some of the things about exact connect today saying that we're going to connect the northern part with the southern part by putting in 4 openings to get through, and doing away with 8—there are 12 right now. They are going to only put 4 ways to get across. Let me add the part about the children. Can you see these children out on this cover breathing the pollution that comes? And can you also see when they get up to I-25 and the traffic is sitting there because they can't get through; it backs up. How much pollution do we have? What do we need to do to get through to the powers that be that say this is going to be a healthy thing for this area? It's insane. It is absolutely insane. And I do not want to see this happen. I want to see the bypass which will go to 270 to 76, which will go all the way around. It will not affect Sunnyside or this area. Thank you very much.</p>



#	Comment
20	<p>Hi. I live in northwest Denver. I lived in the Grandview neighborhood. And I'm here tonight—I want to strongly advocate for the SEIS on the full reroute on the study that includes rerouting through 270 and I-76. I think the current plan to widen the freeway—to put it in a ditch, to combine with toll lanes—is a bad solution for our city, and here are just a few reasons why. One is I think it's unconscionable to move a freeway close to a school. So I think that is a bad choice. We are going to kick up pollution—polluted dirt. We are going to have an ongoing pollution issue for these children and for those who have respiratory illnesses. We have an opportunity here, a once-in-100-year opportunity to rethink our city and to transform a scar that runs across our city into something we can be proud of; and I think we have to do that.</p> <p>We can partner with neighboring counties. We can make this a win-win. We can—a reroute could potentially bring businesses to those counties—counties that want easy access to a freeway and don't want to compete with a commute. For Denver, a reinvented 46th Avenue could be a boon in terms of additional housing and additional businesses. So it could also be a win for Denver.</p> <p>And I think toll lanes—I'm completely opposed to toll lanes. They are a tax on the poor to benefit the wealthy. So if we are successful in eliminating poverty, then let's talk about toll lanes. In short, I think the I-70 situation is not an engineering problem; this is a political problem. And it's time for our leaders to find a better option. I think the people of Colorado—they are watching. And will our leaders show the wisdom and the courage to follow great cities like San Francisco, who rethought the role of freeways in their city and they prospered by removing freeways?</p>
21	<p>Hi. We have a building site in Swansea for a residential duplex. A few months ago, we came to a meeting, and you guys told us that we should hire an appraiser and have an official value put on our property; and we went and did that. It was appraised at 25,000. And you guys came back and said, "We'll give you \$10,000 for it." When we didn't want to take that, you said, "We'll take you to court." And then you guys changed your mind and said, "Okay. We'll give you \$15,000," and we didn't want to take that. What was the point of the appraisal in the first place if you are just going to threaten to take us to court? Play fair. That's all I'm asking.</p>
22	<p>Hello. I've been a longtime resident. I've been here before they built the original I-70. I know that an interstate highway has to go through. Unfortunately, it has to go through our neighborhood. It's been through all this time. The lesser of evils would be to just widen it. The people that are most fortunate, unfortunately, are the ones that are going to be bought out and moved out. The rest of us have to deal with all this highway being built up and all the noise from the traffic and having the highway encroach closer and closer into our neighborhood. I'm against the park over the freeway. We don't need this. It's just a way to cause more accidents. The Stapleton tunnels were approved for that years ago. If you want to give a park to the residents, we have a park on both sides, two blocks. Move the school two blocks away. The pollution will be 200 percent less if it's two blocks away. You won't need this park. You won't need a lot of this pollution mitigation there at the school. If you want a park, put the park where the old school was.</p> <p>I believe there's an issue that's going to come up, and it's affecting people right now—because 20 years from now this neighborhood is not going to be the same. So what has happened now is zoning changed their laws in 2010 where they got rid of grandfather laws. So there's going to be about 60 percent of the neighbors that are going to find that they are going to be in a fight with zoning about their properties do not conform to the new existing zoning regulations. And they are going to buy you out or bankrupt you to the point where you're going to have to sell at a cheap price so that the developers can put in what is a 20-year plan of all new condos and low-income housing; and that is unfortunately what Elyria and Swansea is going to be is low-income housing in the next 20 years. Thank you very much.</p>
23	<p>Hello. I'm a longtime citizen of Globeville and a 1965 flood survivor. We've had a lot of health studies in Globeville, and there's a lot of impact studies that we haven't done. One is of a mousetrap. You're going to turn 10 lanes into three lanes. It's already bottlenecking.</p>



#	Comment
	<p>My main concern is flooding. If you build this underground—when I was 10 years old, I seen that river turn into a monster. And if we get this flooding—when we have storms to the west, to the southwest, and it goes back and forth, we get in real trouble in Globeville and in Swansea and Elyria. Our underpasses flood. It happens downtown. And if this underpass floods, you're going to possibly cost a lot of lives. And I don't know if the engineers have studied that. But if there is a very minute possibility that this can happen, it should not be built.</p> <p>We should study the fact of taking it north and getting it out of our city and to stop all the health and all the fighting and bickering and let us be part of our neighborhood. These engineers that have decided to do this have never lived in our neighborhoods. We in this neighborhood want to be part of our neighborhoods. We want to have a say-so on what happens in our neighborhoods, and we look out for each other. That's why I'm here with concern of this tunnel possibly flooding. Like I said, if there's a minute chance that it will flood, don't build it.</p> <p>Please look at our sides of the story. Look at reality. Look at history. I don't know if that's been taken into consideration. That thing is only—I don't know how they figured it. Thank you very much.</p>



#	Comment
24	<p>All right. I didn't write anything down, so I thought I'd pull the great iPhone out as our notes. I live at 4600 Pearl Street. My grandfather helped build the house in 1935, and upon his death when I was one, my parents moved back into the house. I currently live there again with my 77-year-old mother after my father passed away two years ago.</p> <p>I have an enormous amount of pride in our neighborhood, and I know that this is—I share this—that this same sentiment is shared with many of you here today. I am too young to remember the days before the interstate divided our wonderful community, but I am old enough to have seen the changes over the years. The wall has created such a barrier between the neighborhoods. And the alternative solution, the reroute to I-76 and 270, would create a new—have a new at-grade at 46th Avenue. This is a better proposal due to the fact that there has been so much construction within these last few decades that many of the—excuse me—the widening of I-70 will cause approximately five years of construction detours. The widening of I-70 option will cause massive traffic jams beyond the realm of the existing I-70 traffic jams for the duration of the process.</p> <p>The widening of I-70 option will likely cause drainage problems from the highway on already contaminated soil. The depressing of I-70 option will likely—will generate more harmful fumes, more noise pollution and construction pollution for the duration of the construction and beyond. The loop option can be built without the likely destruction of any businesses or residences and has little, if any, citizen or neighborhood opposition. This loop option can be built while I-70 is operational. There has also been traffic studies showing the amount of trucks and heavy-duty rigs that already take the I-76 or 270 route. Therefore—this is done. Thank you.</p>
25	<p>Tonight I stand before you as a former resident of the Swansea neighborhood. In November of 2002, there was a small meeting taking place about the I-70 east corridor project; and I've been through this process since February of 2003. I've watched every alternative on the table. And as I look through this, I have to commend CDOT for really putting it on the table, making sure people were informed, making sure that these meetings took place. The partial cover lowered alternative would be my decision.</p> <p>I think if you look—if anybody here drives along Interstate 25 between Hampden and Broadway—you've seen a significant change; but I don't think you've looked in those neighborhoods and seen the significant change it has made for those neighborhoods. There's positive changes.</p> <p>I know that the highway came through in 1961 before I was even born. In 1938, my grandfather and grandmother purchased the house at 4619 Claude Court. Today, it sits vacant. CDOT has purchased our property. We were the first residents to move on, and I'll tell you it's been an absolutely incredible change. It's been hard, but at the same token it's been a nice change to really move forward and start to see that progress is about ready to take place. There's 54 properties—53 properties now left to be acquired, and I really think that the neighborhood and people—the thing is if you drive along I-25, you know there's a Whole Foods over there. How long have we had a grocery store in this neighborhood? We don't have nothing in this neighborhood. This is what's going to help bring economic development right here. But we have to stand—just because I moved out of the neighborhood doesn't mean I don't stay within the process, because this is still my home. This is still home for me, even though I don't come back to it every night. Thanks.</p>
26	<p>I live in north Denver right off of I-70 and Federal, actually four houses away from I-70. I oppose the expansion of I-70 and I am in favor of the rerouting and the research of taking the highway I-76 to 225—270. And what I keep seeing is that we're talking about a very minor—a very small part of the I-70 corridor being changed. We really have to look at the bigger picture of what it's doing all through the concentrated high-population areas in Denver. To move 53 homes—buy 53 homes, 20 businesses—is not a good solution when we can reroute; and CDOT already owns that property. I come from—I spoke last night, and I wanted to let</p>



#	Comment
	you know my grandfather built the Pikes Peak road. He was a road contractor. He built a lot of roads in the southwest in Colorado. My great uncle was a part of the project—he was an engineer—that built Red Rocks. Those are great historical things that have taken place in Colorado. Building a 10-lane lap pool through the middle of Denver is not a good idea. Thank you.



#	Comment
27	<p>I'm a third-generation native Denverite. This won't take long. I understand we are discussing a preliminary preferred alternative, and I'm sure there are many people here who have whatever feelings they have about it. People working for CDOT, of course, probably have their views. I'm just wondering if I can get a show of hands. There are probably going to be three alternatives here. You're either going to say I don't understand it completely and I don't know what I want—if that's your feeling, raise your hand for a moment. Okay.</p> <p>There's going to be a number of people who feel that this is a good thing to do. A couple of people have spoken of that. Those people who would like it to be done, could you raise your hands?</p> <p>And then there are those who probably don't want it done for various reasons. Could you raise your hands?</p> <p>I think that CDOT should listen to what a majority of people want, not just political, and talking, and what they want. Listen to the people too. Thank you.</p>
28	<p>Shame on you, for one thing, to put this the last on your list, you know. And if you would have been up-to-date in fixing it, we wouldn't be in this predicament.</p> <p>Second of all, I went to Globeville. I moved to Globeville in '92. I went to the schools there. Instead of putting in \$1.1 billion on a freeway, you should be dedicating that to the schools. Look at how sad this is how this cafeteria and auditorium has to be shared. That's sad to me, very sad.</p> <p>Second of all—third of all, I moved here three years ago, and I'll be damned if you're moving me out. I will live there and I will die in that home. And that's all I have to say.</p>
29	<p>I used to be the director of the transportation program and Environmental Defense Fund, and in that capacity I helped write the provisions of the Clean Air Act that you are implementing when you do the air quality analysis for this project. I've reviewed maybe 10 or 15 highway projects for environmental groups and communities, and I'm working with the communities here tonight. And I would have to say that this is the worst air quality analysis of any of those projects that I have seen. There are very important omissions from this air quality analysis.</p> <p>First of all, there are no analyses of the ambient impacts of the two pollutants that EPA has called out as being the pollutants responsible for the greatest health effects from highways, and those include PM 2.5, which are the small particles that we often refer to as soot, and nitrogen dioxide. Neither of those pollutants are addressed in this air quality analysis, and they should be.</p> <p>What's particularly important is that the information that is in this EIS for PM 10, which is larger particles, shows that the fraction of PM 10 that is the smaller particles will actually violate the national health standards for PM 2.5. That information is the kind of information that must be in an EIS. It is not here. I would say that the people who put together this modeling analysis knew that. This is not a surprise to them.</p> <p>Looking at this information, it's the kind of thing that most people in this audience can't look at and make sense of. That's what I do for a living. But it's the kind of thing that experts who put this together would know. And I would have to say that the fact that it is not in this EIS must be a cover-up. That's all I can draw from this. And the fact you have not included this is outrageous. It is not a service to the public.</p>
30	<p>I live in the Sunnyside neighborhood. I should point out that part of Sunnyside is in the project area—the part of Sunnyside which is east of Pecos Street. As many have pointed out, the original placement of Interstate 70 in its current location caused intense, acute, and persistent environmental damage. Enlarging the freeway, expanding the freeway will worsen and intensify that damage.</p> <p>There are meaningful potential mitigations which the study that we have before us tonight—the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for this project—does not consider. I will list only one:</p>



#	Comment
	<p>Moving the school to a clean, quiet location. Although this is very undesirable because the school actually is in the right place and the highway is in the wrong place, not to consider this meaningful mitigation for the sake of the children who are more vulnerable to air pollution and need their learning years to be productive means to me—this is only one example of several I will be sending you in written comments—that the process is deficient. And it also conceals the total fiscal and human cost of the project. This is unwise and shouldn't go forward. Thank you.</p>
31	<p>This is kind of to CDOT. For over ten years, I have fought for and I have asked for this neighborhood to be historic and special. Then, about seven years ago, unknown to us, you decided our fate. So sad. Have you no compassion? Over 50 years—homes and 20 businesses gone from our area, our small area. We don't need 10 lanes and 2 toll roads. You know that is about the width of a football field. You will dig and cover us with dust and dirt. And do you care? More money for DOT and more taxes for us to pay. Yes, I listen to the traffic report, and I've never seen bad accidents over there. I could be wrong. But imagine going down in a tunnel and hitting—coming out at High Street and hitting that sunshine. I can't imagine what it would be like. Last week I heard a panel of expert highwaymen, some of them from out of state, and heard one of them say, We don't build open trenches roads anymore, but we can build you a well-planned viaduct, one that is more than practical and beautiful, less costly, and faster to install. How about that CDOT? A few years ago, I was at a CDOT meeting where a highway was split to save a mouse. Aren't we kind of special people of God also? Thank you.</p>
32	<p>I would like to ask a question. It's been many years since the project has been going on. Still, at this point, I don't know what to comment, but something that makes sense—everything is already basically set up, but anyway, I have a comment, not a question. I've seen prints of the project, but my question is, what's the objective of having six lanes in the new project? I don't see the solution of this mousetrap going west. There is only one lane on the south. I don't know what would be the answer to that question. I don't see any board or situation related to this part. I don't know if this is a question or just a comment.</p>
33	<p>This might be a comment or somehow an understanding, but is there to be something that there is going to be better streets, or they are going to build more parks, or just one park, or is it going to be the park on the building? And no action. Thank you for mentioning that. The no action plan that still exists—I just don't know if many people are aware that that's still on the table—means they are going to build the highway the way it is without affecting the houses the way they are.</p>
34	<p>My concern is that everything is being concentrated on this side of Swansea. I've been here 26 years. Like it was said by Yadira, I am concerned about the platform they are going to place and if this is going to bring some more pollution to the area. We have also concerns with Garden Place, which is the I-70 and 25 area. That school does not have air-conditioning. It does not have heating. The school is exposed to contamination and pollution, so we are concerned. I would like to see more preparation and concerns with the pollution and the amount of traffic around. Right now traffic is increasing substantially. The neighborhood is being filled with cars right now. So this is going to affect not only to the west, but it's going to affect all the area.</p>
35	<p>Good evening. I want to comment on this project that I am in agreement because this is going to bring more green areas to the neighborhood. I also want to make a comment. There has been talk of many subjects, but nothing has been said about the benefits for the ones that will live around the neighborhood near I-70. We want to know about all the benefits there is going to be for all the people around the highway. There's also talk about around Pecos there is going to be a rotunda. That area is very dangerous. If you don't stop doing that, it's a very dangerous rotunda with Vasquez Boulevard. I don't think this would really benefit people. Thank you very much. That will be all.</p>

Private Verbal Comments

There were 12 verbal comments made privately and recorded by a court reporter on the night of the Denver Public Hearing.



I-70 East

#	Comment
1	<p>My main concern would be the creation of the bottleneck going west into I-25 with all the congestion in I-25 already at rush hour converting to I-70 and going either direction, west or east. Could you imagine that bottleneck at rush hour? You go out there right now without any improvements whatsoever and look at that bottleneck, and it's like creating, say, a gallon of milk going into a pint container and trying to get all that milk in a pint container. I don't know how else to put it being that I'm not an engineer or anything. But it's only common sense to evaluate that situation and see if you're correcting the problem for 100 years, for 50 years, for 20 years.</p> <p>And now that the value of property is low, this would be the time to buy out some houses all the way as far as it would take to solve the problem. The population in Denver, Colorado alone is multiplying at a tremendous amount because so many jobs are being created here in Denver, Colorado. People are coming in and doubling up the area in size. Say, for example, every six months you're getting, say, 30,000 people. You multiply that times another 10 years, how many people are you going to get and how many people are using the rail system? They're using their own vehicles.</p> <p>And being a taxpayer, I sure hope that there are workers here in the United States that could do the work and done by people here in—not necessarily in Colorado. They don't even have to be union work, but as long as it would be people in the United States without having to go to Australia and get somebody else to do our work for us like they did on Interstate 36. That's another one of my pet peeves. Regardless if it's for maintenance or whatever, I think there's people that qualify to do that here in the United States. With the economy being so bad, you could get workers to do it. You could train workers. I guess that would be about my main concern right there.</p> <p>And I wish I would have been more prepared, but you might as well explain what you have on your mind as you have it fresh right there. And I do it in a kind way as a taxpayer. That's where my money is going. I want it to stay here in the United States, not in Australia.</p> <p>When evaluating the wall—the retaining walls that are in place right now from Washington to I-25, have the proper engineers, instead of driving in their car and visualizing it, walk it and visualize it. There's a lot of stuff you can't see when you're driving your car. When you're walking it, you can see way lots more. I see it every day, the hairline cracks all the way to foot thick wall busting cracks in the wall. That's all.</p>



#	Comment
2	<p>One thing I don't like is the 10 lanes on the highway. I prefer an eight-lane highway. Okay. Another thing is the tunnel. I do not like that. They don't know what they're getting involved in when they start that because I've lived in Swansea for 50 years, and it's going to be so much dust. They tell us at CDOT that there's not going to be lots of dust and dirt and this and that. I have COPD. There's lots of people in our area that has oxygen. I'd say at least 25, 30 people and maybe more. What are they trying to do, kill people in the neighborhood? When they start that tunnel under there, I'm going to tell you, they're going to get into lots of problems. I have told them at almost every meeting that I went to. They're going to have lots of problems there. They think we don't know anything about our area, but we know lots about our area.</p> <p>I don't want to see them building, I don't know what you call it, but over the school, what is that, a playground or something like that, something like a playground all over the school? I don't like that part of it either. I don't know whether the kids can go up there or not. I never asked them, but, you know, that's going to be lots of trouble there the way they're building all this stuff in our area. And our area is a really small area. Have you been in the Swansea area? You should take a drive in our area. That's all I ask. Just take a drive and tell me what you think about all this crap. I think that's all I have to say. I don't want to say any more.</p>
3	<p>The roundabout that was made on Pecos and I-70 is—to me personally—nothing but a hazard, an accident waiting to happen. Whoever designed that should go during rush hour and get around that and take two or three of their friends and follow them all the way away, and I guarantee you'll see an accident during rush hour on that roundabout. They are good but not with that much traffic going at the same time, because nobody respects each other as a courtesy to take turns. Everybody's in a rush. So whoever engineered that should actually drive it during rush hour. Thank you.</p>
4	<p>I guess what I want to say is that if I had my preferences, I would prefer them to not rebuild the highway, not in the proposed capacity. To me, 10 lanes of traffic through a populated area is a bit ridiculous. I've lived here my whole life. I'm 58 years old. I was born in the house I live in. I would prefer to die in the house that I live in. With this coming, I don't see how that will happen. I was alive when I saw them build I-70 back in the '60s. To me, I was a kid and it was fun. But now it's just not very good.</p> <p>The highway itself, the emissions from the traffic from the trucks, from the cars, from whatever motor vehicles going east and west on the highway is kind of detrimental a little to my health. I'm on oxygen. There's particulates, small grains of grit, sand, dirt, whatever you want to call it, in my house all the time. It's all over the cars. Like I said, I've lived here my whole life, and I put up with it, but I think adding more traffic it is going to just increase it.</p> <p>I don't want to lose my home, not because of that. And right now I'm not able to purchase another home. If they have to rebuild the highway, I would prefer them to rebuild the elevated portion without the covered nonsense, whatever they want to call it, without that revision. It needs to be done, but going to that extreme to me is just ridiculous and time-consuming, costly to the taxpayers, myself included. I just—I don't want it, period. That's all I have to say.</p>
5	<p>We live on 4640 Milwaukee, and I don't think they should tear it down and build a 10-lane highway—four lanes being toll roads—when they can just fix it, tear it down and fix it and leave everybody's house, not buy everybody's house. That's what I have to say.</p>
6	<p>I have almost the same opinion only—only because if it would go underground, my house would be right on top of the highway, right next to it. And they said that they were going to build a big, old cement wall and you won't be able to see nothing across, you know, or anything. And I would rather for them to leave it the way it is. Tear it down and fix it. Do something, you know.</p>
7	<p>I don't want any changes. Okay. Just renovate what's already there. It impacts too many people who have been here for generations. And this area has a sense of family, of belonging, and with any of the revisions there, that will disrupt that.</p>



#	Comment
8	<p>Over 10 years I have fought—fought and asked for the neighborhood to be historical and special. Then about seven years ago, unknown to us, you decided our fate. So sad. Have you no compassion? Way over 50 homes and 20 businesses gone from our area, our small area. We don't need 10 lanes and two toll roads. Do you know that is about the width of a football field? You will dig and cover us with dust and dirt, and do you care? Why? More money for CDOT or more taxes for us to pay. Yes, I listen to the traffic report every morning and hear of no big accidents in our 20 blocks. But imagine a wreck of about five cars in a foot of water or a foot of water or snow, and how do you get out?</p> <p>Last week, I heard a panel of experienced highwaymen, some from out of state, and heard one say, “We don't build open trench roads much anymore, but we can build you a very well-planned viaduct now that is more practical and beautiful, less costly, and faster to install.” CDOT, how about that? A few years ago, I was at a CDOT meeting when a highway was split to save a mouse. Are we special people of God? CDOT, please, no 10 lanes, no toll roads.</p>
9	<p>This really is a disaster. We do not need to expand the highway to include additional lanes and toll lanes. Instead we need to invest in other options such as bus rapid transit and additional capacity on our rails to facilitate for the additional capacity needs. This community does not need to have further destruction of their community to facilitate for this.</p> <p>T-REX was a disaster. It expanded the highway, and it's still absolutely congested and has done nothing to alleviate what is said to be congestion for the I-70 corridor. So we've done this once before, and we've seen the results. It does not work.</p> <p>The covering of the highway, their placements do not necessarily make a lot of sense. It is not improving bicycle and pedestrian connections. This is actually going to be much worse for bikes and pedestrians. And the cost of building bike facilities as well as pedestrian facilities to cross the new expanded lanes of the highway will be cost prohibitive and will never get done given their costs. As a result, this area will continue to be car dependent, which is a huge health concern as our obesity rates continue given that we have no alternatives for people to connect with their community and their greater area based on alternative modes such as walking and bicycling. And so this really is a detriment to the community, to bicycle connections and networks as well as the pedestrian network and experience.</p> <p>The viaduct system has much more connectivity for the community as it provides more opportunities to cross under the highway as well for bikes to cross—safely cross—under the highway as there will not be enough facilities built for this to happen as it's currently designed.</p>
10	<p>I'm opposed to the expansion of I-70 based upon the past health history of the residents of Elyria, Swansea, and Globeville. In collecting the initial data for the EIS, I was part of the yellow shirt group. And many residents anecdotally talked about how their health issues seemed to increase in terms of the number of colds. The time it took to recover from a simple cold would go from two to three days to two to three weeks. The number of incidents of cancer increased, emphysema. The fact that children in the elementary and middle schools that are off the highway—and particularly Swansea Elementary School—the children are breathing in these toxins. Studies have shown that those toxins will replace the oxygen that children need in their brains in order for the brain to function well. So if their brain is not functioning because of a lack of oxygen as a result of the pollution, how effective are the children going to be in terms of the learning process? This is a real concern because most of these schools have been determined to be failing schools by Denver Public Schools. There has to be some relationship between the lack of oxygen to the children's brains and their ability to learn. I think there needs to be more research in this area before you proceed to increase the levels of toxins that children are going to be exposed to. Okay.</p> <p>This program needs to be rethought, and look at alternatives such as doing a 76 to 270 expansion and turning I-70 back into a boulevard so the communities can reconnect.</p>



#	Comment
11	<p>What is going to happen when they are going to start the construction for the highway? Are the houses going to be affected, because the houses are very old houses, more than a hundred years old? What are the dangers with the construction that are going to affect the houses? What kind of help—economical help—are they going to give us? What are the other options about the danger? What are the benefits, and what are the help that we are going to receive, all the neighborhood close to I-70, because I believe that there are going to be problems because the houses are very close to the highway? Is the highway going to be open into the north or to the south? Because if it's on the north side, it's possible that it's going to be less problems or less danger. If they are going to do it on the south side, our houses are going to be impacted, I believe. I would like to have a meeting or someone to let us know, make us understand how are the things going to be. We would like to have a meeting just with people—with Spanish speaking people—to be more secure and to agree with whatever they are going to do. And I would like to be informed about the reunion or the meeting so we can understand how are the things going to be. That's all.</p>
12	<p>I've been living in Swansea for perhaps the last two years. I live just a couple blocks away from the highway near the corner of 47th and Thompson.</p> <p>Once construction of the project begins, I will be affected because I will be perhaps one block closer to the highway. I'm concerned about the project, but I'm concerned about the present and the future of the project. I'm concerned how it's going to affect the neighborhood and the city and the community as a whole. I've noticed lots of residents are concerned now. It's going to affect themselves and the community as well, but I think it's very important and it's inherently clear that we need to also prepare for the future. Considering all of the different options that are available, all the different options that have been studied, EIS statements, the option that makes the most sense to me is the partially covered option. That's because it's the best compromise considering the environmental factors and the few options that are available at this point. I'm in favor because it corrects the problems that are already there without making a dramatic impact to the community.</p> <p>As part of this project—as part of this option, I mean—I'm in favor of the 10-lane larger expansive highway option as well. And this is because this is the option that takes into consideration the growth of the neighborhood and the traffic and the growth of the city as well. It makes no sense to do any of the options without considering how much our traffic is going to increase, how much more the population of the area is going to increase and the traffic going around this particular section especially. The 10-lane option, the larger I-70 option, is the best option because it allows for growth while taking into consideration the community as a whole. I recognize that this particular area is a difficult environment to make it perfect. There's no such thing in this particular area. But the partially covered option resolves many of the problems and issues that are currently present.</p> <p>It actually connects the two neighbors between Swansea and Elyria. That's one problem that's been existing for many, many years—that's connecting these two neighbors. It's perhaps one of the best options that resolves this problem. It connects the two neighbors. It provides safety. It provides a green option where people can actually connect together, people that can actually meet in the green park areas, which is an additional benefit that allows the two communities to be brought together. It also eliminates the— the partially covered 10-lane option allows traffic to pass through the neighborhood without making a dramatic impact as well. Traffic will not be stagnant. It will not be a parking lot allowing all those carbon gas emissions from vehicles to stay in the neighborhood and affect the residents and the community.</p> <p>I also recognize that there might be some homes and people that might be displaced in this option. It is unfortunate, but the residents will be taken care of. And, honestly, this particular option, the partially covered option, is the one that will affect the residents the least. I recognize if the highway is created much smaller, it would be a smaller impact, but it would be a smaller impact for a short amount of time, which I think it makes no sense to do a smaller lane highway and years later have the same problem come up again</p>



#	Comment
	where people, the city, residents, the community will have to come together again and decide what changes need to be done again because the amount of lanes is too small to take into consideration the amount of traffic that will be a part of this area of Denver in the next perhaps 20 years. It's best to plan for the City of Denver and this neighborhood and the residents long term. Instead of planning 20 years, let's plan 50 years, 60 years, even more.

