

Why was the reroute of I-70 along I-270/I-76 eliminated?

Recently, there have been many questions on whether or not CDOT is evaluating an alternative that would realign I-70 around Denver using I-270 and I-76. This alternative was eliminated from consideration early in the project process, as documented in the Draft EIS. This option is not considered a reasonable alternative for the following reasons:



- Does not meet the Purpose and Need of the project, *“to implement a transportation solution that improves safety, access, and mobility and addresses congestion on I-70”*.
 - After removal of the highway (I-70), 46th Avenue would remain and traffic volumes would likely increase 10 to 20 times (over 50,000 vehicles per day). (safety, access, mobility)
 - Creates a barrier to the community making it difficult for bikes/pedestrians to move through the neighborhood.
 - May encourage highway trips to use 46th Avenue, a local roadway facility with many access points.
 - Delivery trucks and other large vehicles would need to frequently use 46th Avenue to reach the industrial and warehousing businesses located near existing I-70.
 - Does not maintain two major highways in the area (I-70 and I-270) for safety, multiple route choices, and emergency access. (access, mobility)
 - Increases out of direction travel, even small increases in mileage can have large effects on fuel costs and emissions (mobility):
 - 50 percent of the traffic heading west on I-70 continues past I-25, staying on I-70, adding 2 miles of out-of-direction travel.
 - 35 percent of the traffic heading west on I-70 exits to southbound I-25, adding 4 miles of out-of-direction travel.
- Requires over 12 miles of major widening along I-270 and I-76, which would double the cost of the project (estimated at approximately \$4 billion) compared to current alignment alternatives, removing the likelihood of funding the project in the near term.
- Many stakeholders, including Commerce City, Adams County, North Area Transportation Alliance, and the Colorado Motor Carriers Association, have expressed continued opposition.