



## CORRIDOR-WIDE PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

**Date/Time:** April 11, 2013/5:30 P.M.

**Location:** Swansea Recreation Center

**Attendees:**

Jose Acosta	Alfonso Espino	Keith McCormick	Daniel Sandoval
Lisa Aguado	Jose Esquibel	Katie McKenna	Joe Schaube
David Aguado	Maribel Estrada	Linda Mervin	Michelle Segarra
Reza Akhavan	Jason Evans	Nola Miguel	Joe Siegel
Denise Alarid	Dick Farley	Ernesto Miranda	Mary Siseros
Ralph Aragon	Diane Fleck	Gary Mitchell	Melanie Sloan
Aaron Aragon	Dean Foreman	Juan Montelongo	Jack Sparks
Francisco Arevalo	Fresc	Helen Montoya	St. Jacobs Lodge No 12
Carmen Arriaga	Michael Fritts	Guy Morse	Bonnie Stackhouse
Salvador Arrieta	John Furcean	Dana Morse	Wilber Stackhouse
Art Ballah	Bob Garcia	Steven Moss	Bonnie Stackhouse
Maria Banuelos	Marie Garcia	Nancy	Jeff Stapleton
Sal Blea	Troy Garner	Angie Nation	Mike Stone
Jordan Block	Diana Gates	Dawn Neill	Philip Strait
Maria Bonilla	Micheal Gates	Wayne Nelson	Stuart
Carl Bourgeois	Thia Gonzales	Jason Newsom	Gaspar Terrana
Leo Branstetter	Abraham Gonzales	Traci O'Brian	Anthony Thomas
Leon Braunagel	Stanley Gronek	Ricardo Ocampo	Maria Torres
Paul Brown	Tom Gusta	Dave Ortega	Anthony Toth
Earl Brown	Liz Gwinn	Debbie Ortega	Les Townsend
Larry Burgess	Arturo Hemaney	Leonila Ortiz	Jack Unruh
Artemio Bustillos	Joe Huff	Hector Ortiz	Rosendo Valdez
Abel Bustillos	Whitney Ice	Valerie Pacheco	Shirley Valentine
Don Callarman	James	Ron Pacheco	Brenda Vasquez
Maria Campos	JJH Inc.	Paul	Eva Vasquez
Francisca Cardenas	Jean Johnston	Joe Perez	Gilbert Vasquez
Veronica Chavez	Kathy Jones	Wall Peter	Juan Veloz
Rumualdo Chavez	Victor Juarez	Robert Pitt	Laura Verlander
Janice Chavez	Karl	Jeff Portales	Saul Villarreal
Maxine Chikawa	Andrew Kenney	John Prosser	Robert Wecal
Chuck Cornish	Nanci Kerr	Joe Racosky	Hazel Wecal
Bettie Cram	Christof Kheim	Mauro Ramirez	Steven Weideman
Roberta Curtis	John Knop	Sanjana Ramirez	Lana Welsh
Antonio Diaz	Riley Lamie	Greg Reed	Neil Welsh
Robert Dimig	Patricia Langenberg	Ference Renee	Malcolm Whitman
Brad Doyle	Mariana Lara	Sara Richardson	Benjamin Williamson
Larry Drake	Ronald Littleton	John Ricke	Terry Willis
Crisanta Duran	Anthony Lopez	Susan Ricke	Frank Woertman
Chris Eastin	Loretta	Jose Alberto Rocha	Sherman Yamaguchi
Heriberto Elias	Dennis Lovato	Rosemary Rodriguez	Stella Yamaguchi
Joseph Elliot	JD MacFarlane	Les Rogers	John Young
Frank Elwess	Jesus Madrigal	Benjamin Roldan	Luisa Zamora
Jackie Elwess	Angie Malpiede	Loretta Ruiz	John Zapien

Emp Real Estate  
Enrique Espino  
16 unnamed guests

Robert Manzanares  
Dave Mares

Sinhy Ruiz  
Yadira Sanchez

Bradley Zieg  
Armando Zomorano

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) project team conducted corridor-wide public meetings on April 10th and 11th, 2013 as part of the project outreach process. These notes reflect the public meeting held on April 11th. The primary purpose of the public meeting was to announce the preliminarily identified Preferred Alternative.

The meeting started at 5:30 pm as an open house with discussion tables. The open house format allowed people to arrive and leave at their convenience, get information that interested them, and provide feedback at any time during the meeting by completing a comment sheet or discussing their thoughts and concerns with a project team member.

The discussion tables allowed individuals to interact with each other, share their thoughts and opinions, and gave them an opportunity to discuss their concerns with a project team member in more detail.

Spanish translation, childcare, food and drinks, and special needs assistance in compliance with ADA (Americans with Disability Act) were available at both meetings. All meeting attendees were supplied with a handout in either English or Spanish, which included alternatives descriptions, maps, and a comment sheet. Meeting attendees were then directed to the open house where exhibits explaining the project's process and progress were presented. These exhibits are available on the project website at [www.I-70east.com](http://www.I-70east.com).

## **II. SUMMARY OF COMMENT SHEETS**

Comment sheets were received from the residents within and outside of the project area. The majority of the community members within the project area supported the recommended preferred alternative. The following section details the comments received to date from the comment sheets distributed at the meeting. Please note some comments have been translated from Spanish and are italicized.

### **1. Do you agree with the recommendation of the Partial Cover Lowered Option as the Preferred Alternative?**

- Yes: 20
- No: 20
- Not sure: 3

### **2. Do you have any comments or suggestions concerning the Partial Cover Lowered Option that you would like the project team to consider?**

- Preserve our historical heritage. Over 60 homes and businesses - too bad! 10ft walls a divided city. Money of over 500 million more to go recessed - why not save taxpayer money and build a new I-70
- Not at the moment. The only concern I have is that the partial cover option tears down the most businesses/houses. I do like the park, though.
- Begin construction ASAP! 2016!? Why another 3 years of waiting and delay?
- There are larger connectivity and land use conflicts in Elyria Swansea and Globeville that were not touched on in this meeting or in the November meeting. Though

connectivity changes were touched upon, it was at the site level rather than at the neighborhood, corridor, or regional scale.

- Could you ask this question so that it isn't very leading?
- If the cut and cover is inevitable, can we discuss an expanded cap or multiple?
- Discard the below grade proposal. Will disrupt the Elyria/Swansea community. Will cause the loss of 60+ homes providing affordable housing. Will cause the loss of businesses, jobs and tax base. Too costly to construct - too long a time to construct. Will further add to already extreme congestion on I-25 southbound.
- Comparison costs per lane/mile for each option both accepted and rejected would be informative. The decision making process after the PACT process hasn't been clearly spelled out. I did see a few links at the end of the I-70 east alternatives section.
- It's taken too much time to get this project going. We have had enough meetings, get busy and start this project.
- What happens to traffic at Washington and mousetrap? Can we get CDOT to fully analyze the rerouting of I-70?
- Get er done!
- You (team) have done an exceptional job synthesizing the interests involved. Continue the work to the detailed level with neighbors and best practice examples. You are professionals- respect your own work and make it better. This is not/cannot be a democratic process!
- I would suggest the third option for the covered part between Columbine and Clayton. Also, I would suggest an exit for Colorado Boulevard. This would minimize congestion at the Steele exit going east bound.
- I think replacing the 57 housing units that will be torn down in this process is important.
- I recently visited Washington DC and the subway system below the City is a fantastic example of how a lowered transit system can work in a high density area.
- Take I-70 out north to 270. Turn I-70 into a toll road. Have more exit and on ramps than just what's there.
- Community garden for partial cover portion.
- Remove the Vasquez exit. It takes up twice the space (Vasquez and Colorado) and only provides half the connectivity (split diamond). Don't widen the lanes. Encourages speeding and takes up wasted space.
- I feel that partially covering the freeway will make our neighborhood more appealing and help keep our children safer.
- Park like with flowers and bushes and small trees and some sitting places.
- Small park with flowers and small trees, park benches.
- I feel that partially covering the freeway will make our neighborhood more appealing and help keep our children safer.
- Yes, look at the I-70 reroute proposal.
- Take I-70 out of neighborhood.
- The option lacks vision. Too brutal to neighborhoods, cements their decline, too much impact on school. Reinvests in bad planning.
- Combining frontage roads to one side so that the other side connects directly to the school. Structure the deck spans to get tree balls into the structure depth so that the park has full sized trees and that the park surface is at curb height of the frontage streets. Slow traffic at the park through traffic calming techniques, get gaps in the traffic, or pedestrian crossing lights or something so pedestrians can cross more places than only at the ends of the park.

- I-270/I-76 is a better idea. Pollution, noise, and semi-truck traffic hurts the area. Re-unite our neighborhood with Denver. Clear up the air and noise.
- It's concerning that nothing is being done to get semi-truck traffic out of the neighborhoods and that this proposal further divides our neighborhoods from downtown and the rest of the city. There are many other major roadways outside of the neighborhood to route traffic. I received an alternative plan at the meeting suggesting re-routing I-70 onto I-270 and I-76 which makes much more sense than expanding a highway which should have never been built in this neighborhood to begin with.
- I do not like this option. I believe there are better options if I have to take one I would like the one that does not have many houses and businesses affected.
- We feel that the partial cover lowered option should be taken off of the table. We have no problem with the overhead bridge. In fact, we prefer it. If you would tell the truth about the problems you will have lowering 30 feet more problems than you are admitting. I do have a POA to be able to speak for my husband.
- It will be hard to keep that grass green. It will hold the pollution under and release it for the school.
- If you put a tunnel in the lowered option it will be a mess in the winter and taking out too many homes. You better think about this before you do the tunnel there.
- I feel that north/south connectivity still needs to be better addressed with this plan as it contains less connections than the other two alternatives.
- I do not agree with this approach and believe the reroute option should be reconsidered. It will not only reconnect the neighborhood together but also create enormous economic advantages for the neighborhoods and the city.
- Currently there are several agencies that have agendas that say me-me-me, forget others. CDOT and FHWA are worrying about this financial side of the I-70 project and are engaged in battles with the neighborhoods on a number of issues. In close proximity to the project is the National Western Stock Show, who is saying they need additional room for expansion and are having financial problems. To the south of us is another agency professing to financial problems, the Colorado State Fair. Let's move to the old adage - location-location-location. The state fair is located in the third or fourth area for population density. It seems to me that the intelligent decision between the stock show and the state fair would be to combine forces. The stock show wants events for a greater part of the year. Stock show gains, state fair will be in the highest population center of the state and will therefore gain. CDOT and FHWA fit in here by adopting a different, previously undiscussed idea. 46th Avenue has no businesses that depend on 46th as an address. There are only a couple of streets that actually cross 46th. If CDOT put one direction of traffic on 46th and the other direction elevated, as in Glenwood Canyon, and routed the cross streets under I-70 there would be very little effect on the neighborhood. In Glenwood Canyon it was a radical idea that had people saying, "Whoa - just a minute here, what are you doing?" The end result was national recognition for alternative thinking. When the highway gets to the area of National Western (hopefully NWSS-Colorado State Fair) it could at that point go underground. Doing so would open a good amount of surface area, alleviating one of the problems NWSS is stating. What this is amounting to is instead of various agencies merely thinking of their own needs, instead turning to other agencies that have similar needs, and developing a degree of cooperation wherein all parties involved experience a gain. Recap: CDOT puts one direction of I-70 at surface level, the other direction elevated. Gain: Very little impact on the neighborhood. Going underground in the area of the NWSS. Therefore giving NWSS additional area for expansion. NWSS and State Fair cooperating in bringing State Fair to

the status of population center, therefore increasing attendance. NWSS gaining a large event on their off season. In the process utilizing facilities for a greater part of the year.

- Worried about long term with trees/sod and stability of tunnel. Also, will this increased lane simply cause a jam as the I-25 Speer area is always stopped now? Do you have plans on mousetrap?
- *This option is the best of all the ones you have presented to us, and yes, I agree with this option.*
- *Option 3 design.*
- *Is the cover necessary? The money used for the cover can be used on other area for improvements and widening.*
- *Yes, consider keeping the exit ramp at York-Josephine because it is the only current exit from I-70.*

### 3. Do you have any comments about the other alternatives that are being analyzed?

- Yes, please forget about them, the other alternatives, and move forward with the covered/lowered option.
- I think more thought should be put into the need for and use of a highway, as opposed to a boulevard. Any option that takes personal property for city use should be avoided if possible. Most importantly, not expanding the highway is still an option.
- How much time and effort was put into analyzing the reroute option (I-270 and I-76)? How does the reroute option "limit access to and from the community" more so than other options?
- No Action or Revised Viaduct options are preferred.
- It seems the shortest distance between 2 points is a straight line. Airline pilots would remind us that the earth is spherical, and they take the great circle. I would emphasize the eliminated alternatives both reroute and realignment again to validate previous estimated costs of \$4 billion.
- We want to look at rerouting I-70. I don't think CDOT has given us enough information.
- North and south acts are inferior but marginally defensible. The north loop is an indefensible fiasco.
- I don't like them as much and I would not advise the managed lanes. There should be 5 lanes in the covered lowered option.
- Lowering the traffic, removal of bridge. Lower noise decibels would be good. Tremendous work/studies and presentation was well worth coming and being part of. Sound/obstructions advantages.
- Moving I-70 north will only move the highway from Denver into Commerce City. It makes no sense to improve one area to disrupt another. Placing the highway underground will re-unite the Swansea, Elyria area.
- If you're not willing to run the highway up I-270 and down I-76 then prefer the "no change" option. Rebuild in place as is. Saves \$1B by your numbers.
- I am not in favor of the other alternatives, because they are more of the same with nothing done about the noise.
- No
- No
- I-70 reroute proposal.
- I think the reroute proposal should be re-examined. I think CDOT's perspective, study area and criteria are too narrow. The proposed modifications by Ron Straka should also be examined for incorporation.

- The I-270/I-76 alternative is attractive, but more should be shown in how it would affect the stock show, how it would connect to I-25 so that its detail reality can be evaluated (not just its political reality).
- None of the CDOT ideas make sense. Get I-70 out of Swansea, Elyria and Globeville.
- If you are going to have a covered part and you do decide, can it please have a park that is usable for families, not just dogs, where will kids play?
- Yes, I want to rebuild a new elevated highway.
- The re-route (I-270 to I-76) option will better connect north Denver to the rest of the city and provide economic opportunity to these struggling neighborhoods. The estimated costs have been greatly exaggerated and need to be re-thought.
- *No.*
- *No.*
- *Not at this moment.*
- *Not at this moment.*

**4. Would you like to be a community leader to be more involved with the project by attending meetings and providing input to CDOT?**

- Yes: 20
- No: 16

**5. Do you have any questions or comments about future community outreach?**

- Keep doing it.
- Keep everyone in the loop, but please stop spending money on studies and "research" and move forward with this project.
- I think community outreach should be completely unbiased and not lead residents to assume that there are only three options, or that one option is best for everyone.
- Can there be more of a community-welcoming debate?
- I understand the scope of the EIS was limited to resolving congestion, improve safety, and make it easier to get on and off the highway; however, community building and health assessment should have been a greater part of the process.
- How will you portray the preferred alternative in terms of successes elsewhere? We need to know what's worked.
- When the option is chosen it would be great to be involved in the planning process in the massive project.
- Please keep holding public meetings! Thank you for having so many friendly staff on duty to answer questions.
- Side traffic/parking - future light rails impact.
- I am a RTD Director District K, 720-469-2871
- Outreach is fine. Bulldozing residents is upsetting.
- I would like to see room/time made for additional study (R/UDAT).
- No. Looks like it is thorough.
- Yes. We need to build up our community and opportunities in our community. Businesses, a grocery store, child care. Reducing the emissions from I-70 would also be great for our health.
- Yes I do. Can someone contact me?
- Bettie Cram is doing a fantastic job and it seems like she is getting ignored.
- There is a group now working with Denver Planning. We want to work wonders in this neighborhood.

- Bettie Cram is doing a fantastic job and it seems like she is getting ignored.
- All options and alternatives should be presented to the public before CDOT narrows it down to one real option. (CDOT, RTD, and City Planners should hold a Public Forum).
- *No.*
- *No.*
- *Get more people involved.*

**6. What are the most important community resources for you?**

- Local TV news, internet (denverinfill.com).
- Neighbors.
- The CDOT I-70 East website.
- emails, meetings, discussion forums -> for outreach, Connectivity and quality of life, Businesses and Neighbors.
- Food.
- Denver City Council persons- Debbie Ortega, and neighborhood grass root associations like Focus Points, Family Resource Center- Steven Moss, Judith Marquez, FRESC community organizer.
- N/A
- Public meetings are great!
- Bike accessibility, grocery stores, recreation center, library.
- Just improving our community.
- Transportation as a vehicle to prosperity and equity in society.
- My neighbors and neighborhood association.
- I am a teacher so the schools are on the top of my list.
- Council communications. Newspaper. Channel 8.
- Connectivity; usable and easily accessible parks that have 'eyes on the park' for informal supervision.
- The small businesses that are here now.
- *The school for the children.*
- *I do not want Purina to emit gases at night because we cannot open the windows due to the smell.*
- *The school.*

**7. Any additional comments or questions?**

- Question: Who will be responsible for maintaining the covered area? CDOT cannot maintain their existing "green spaces/areas". It would be a shame to spend a lot of money to landscape and then let it go to pot.
- Consider our lives and our struggles, the necessities.
- In my view what was lacking in today's meeting was a visual identifying the decision making process which resulted in the Preferred Alternative, namely was community input 50% or less. The other issue negates to costing components of all options, not unlike shopping for an automobile.
- Do this! Well! Soon!
- Think bigger! It feels like the scope was too small and the need was misinterpreted. Your goal was always to replace the highway, not to better use statewide resources or build community or the economy, just to move trucks.

- Will the EIS note comments or address them. Serious credible people have questioned the decision to eliminate the reroute alternative. CDOT needs to broaden the study area and integrate local and regional planning efforts.
- A community building should be considered to be on the deck to activate the park.
- It should be a priority to help the people of our community to make our community more attractive, healthy, and safe. Expanding I-70 to gut the community is not the best idea out there.
- Yes I do, but I would like some answers to my comment and so far I got none. I got a translator but I did not need one. As to anyone assisting me with my question, not one and the tables were full. Thank you. Hope to hear from you soon.
- I feel the reasons for not addressing the rerouting of I-70 through this neighborhood are not good enough or relevant enough considering that it has been done in Milwaukee and many other large cities. Expanding the freeway will create more traffic not alleviate it, and encourage more to drive, even though FasTracks is meant to alleviate freeway congestion.
- Doesn't expanding the highway "capacity" mitigate efforts for better transit option?
- I don't see the light rail incorporated into your graphs. Huge concerns on rerouting traffic during construction along with the time frame.
- *How long will it take to make a decision?*
- *We need more people from the community attending these meetings. Also, a documentary about this project so we can show it to the participants.*

#### **8. Comments received after the meeting.**

- I have been a resident of the City of Denver for 38 years. I am a small business owner in Swansea. I am 65 years old. I attended the April 11<sup>th</sup> meeting at the Swansea Rec. Center. I am writing to express my objection to the proposed 800 foot 'cover' on the I-70 lowered option for the following reason:

The history of the I-25/I-70 interchange from before the mousetrap to now has been one of frequent frustration to commuters. Even today the narrowing to two lanes east bound on I-70 before I-25 can be an issue.

The Stapleton (runway) tunnels were an issue for years and their demolition was a huge celebration for commuters both directions.

The I-70 tunnel at Idaho Springs is currently being widened because it has been an issue for years.

Given this history and facts, why put a cover/tunnel or any impediment adjacent to one of the busiest intersections in Colorado?

I have been told by CDOT representatives that the wider highway and bright lights will minimize traffic flow issues.

My prediction is this: The 'cover' will be called a tunnel by the general population and the risk of traffic slowing will be high because many drivers automatically hit the brakes when they see anything resembling a tunnel. To make a 2 billion dollar investment with this risk is, I believe, a mistake. Thank you for reading this input.

Orange dots were available at the April 10th and 11th meetings for attendees to show their interest on how to stay involved. As shown in Figure 1, having the designs accessible to the public through the project website received the highest vote collectively from both meetings for the most preferred way for public to stay involved.

Figure 1

