



PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

Date/Time: May 2, 2012/5:30 P.M.

Location: Commerce City Civic Center

Attendees:

Yesenih Robles	Thia Gonzales	Edward Hernandez	John Riecke
Grace Valehzuela	Jong Lee	Elligo Forres Jr	Calvin Green
Brent Hilvitz	Cliff Carney	Guillermo Serna	Taniger Barnes
Anna Cruz	Manuel Martinez	Donald Sater	Felix Zermeno-Martin
Jaime Marston	John Olson	Loretta Petty	BJ Mirelez
Bob and Nance Zeiler	Michelle Caprioli	Gary Kowalski	Juanita Mirelez
Loreha Ruiz	Dean Forceman	Betty Wonder	Bradley Zeig
Gilbert Vasquez	Joe Rojas	Mac McFarlin	Cynthia Gallegos
Julie Murphy	Jeff Stapleton	Marykate McCutcheon	
Jerry Fitch	Ruben Urquidez	Jeannette Lewis	
Aidan Mcguire	David Kwietnewski	Dawn Tollakson	
Lee Kaley	Adriana Lopez	Bettie Cram	
Happy Morrow	Norman Lane	Maxme Ichikawa	
Anna Maria Hunt	Luis Morales	Trudy Smith	
Darlene Espinoza	Jim Hynes	Gene Hook	
Valerie Castro	Frank Woertman	Rodolfo Hernandez	
Phil Hilvitz	Carl Goolsby	Carl Kelley	
Crystal Cain	Jay Corbett	Paul Andrews	
Curtis Cane	Scott Jaquith	Angelo Salazar	
Albert Maldonado	Craig Jackson	Anthony Thomas	
Lorriaine Maldonado	Harvest Thomas	Jeremy Evans	
Charles Cown	Heather Browning	Orval Lewis	
George Pigford	Ronnie Dominguez	Christian Baker	
Jimmy Burds	Frank Mclaughlin	Louis Thomas	
Bernadette O'Donnel	Joe Elliott	Dan Klepper	

I. INTRODUCTION

The I-70 East environmental impact statement (EIS) project team conducted public meetings on May 2nd and 3rd as part of the on-going community outreach process. These notes reflect the public meeting held on May 2nd. The primary purpose of the public meeting was to eliminate the Realignment Alternative and introduce the Revised Viaduct and the new Partial Cover Lowered Alternative to the public and seek their input.

The meeting started at 5:30 pm as an open house style meeting with discussion tables. The open house let people arrive at their convenience, get information that interests 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 give them an opportunity to discuss their concerns with a project team member in more detail.

II. SUMMARY OF COMMENT SHEETS

The following section details the comments received to date from the comment sheets distributed at the meeting. These comments are recorded verbatim.

1. What comments do you have on the alternatives presented?

- Revised Viaduct North Option
 - Best
 - Glad that the school will be rebuilt
 - Impacts school

- Revised Viaduct South Option
 - Loss of Purina plant may not be good for jobs
 - Like it
 - Impacts Purina Dog Chow (jobs)

- Partial Cover Lowered
 - I like the I-70 to be partially submerged about 5' use the cubic yards of dirt & pile the dirt to make a berm on each side above a 5' concrete berm & plant vegetation on the piled up berms. Any over pass can be arched above the freeway with the approaches built up from the cubic yards of soil removed from the ground that partially puts the highway below ground.
 - Better but not good for Swansea/Elyria
 - This one is the best
 - Like the partial cover - visual appearance - CDOT hearing the voice of the people - keeping the community as a whole benefits for future school to remain intact - Safety
 - I think this is a very creative alternative, glad that someone thought of it
 - I prefer this option because it will save the school, jobs. Also it will be more aesthetically pleasing & might attract investment as opposed to deterring investment.

2. Which alternative seems best to you and why?

- The best alternative is temporarily route I-70 down a permanently widened I-270 all the way where to where I-270 rejoins I-70 while the viaduct is replaced with a permanent alternative
- I like the North option because it has a Vasquez exit which is the ONLY Commerce City Option (EXIT) where all the other exits are Denver exits. Plus less impacts & maybe we can save the school & save money too!
- The lowered viaduct, it would appear that it would be a long term solution.
- Move I-70 to [I-270/I-76 area] to allow Swansea - Elyria to heal from a serious mistake 50 yrs ago. This would move I-70/I-25 intersections out of "Denver Bowl" to Utah

Junction area. This would leave the Mouse-trap for EB I-70 but move WB I-70 a mile north so that there is adequate to merge onto I-25 SB.

- The latest seem to be the safest for the neighborhood
- Partial cover lowered, increase in green space, connectivity for the neighborhood, I also like how this was done by I-25/DU area
- The south bound is the best option, I will believe that I-70 should be 2 levels like the Oakland bridge from the entrance of I-225 & I-70 to Federal or Wadsworth so we will never have to suffer for traffic congestions and bottle necks - each way should have 6 or 8 lanes
- Partial Covered. Decreases air pollution, decreases noise pollution & improves aesthetics (eye pollution) although the raised viaduct option is 200 million less the cost of maintaining a raised viaduct is very costly over time.
- Partial Cover Lowered - raised hwy viaducts are outdated. They create what I call "doom and gloom." Shadows, hovering over residents are depressing. I think the partial cover option will be better for bike/ped connectivity.

3. Which community resources are most important to you (for CDOT to protect)?

- There is always a cost - I like saving Purina jobs & the school if possible & saving the taxes that come from Purina for the area
- Wildlife, history, pollution
- As a resident of Clayton Neighborhood, I am heavily concerned about noise of I-70 (in 46th Ave. location) in our neighborhood.
- Swansea School
- The community as a whole. Keeping Residents in the same community. Keep the school. Visual.
- Environment, jobs, neighborhood integrity
- It is important to me that the community be able to walk across the access route (walkways) at Josephine, Clayton, Columbine & Vasquez Blvd. Many residents in this community do not have cars.

4. Any other comments or questions?

- I think you're on the right track!
- I liked the discussion tables as a method of citizen participation
- Would like to see pulling 46th as tight as possible to the highway to minimize impact
- I like the idea of a green space partial cover. Especially used as a community garden. I like the idea of breaking up the 800 ft covered area & breaking it up so more regions have access to it. In fact I love the idea of community gardens; this industrial area/community is in need of fresh produce. Saving jobs and the school are important.
- I think the partial covered option is the best alternative for accommodating multiple modes of transportation. I also think that the partial cover has more potential to attract businesses/new development/re-investment along 46th Ave.

III. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION TABLES

The public meetings included several discussion tables (each facilitated by a project team member). All the discussion tables were open for all topics except two that were marked for CDOT right-of-way acquisition and City and County of Denver. Below is a summary of the discussions at these tables.

- Preference on Revised Viaduct - North
 - Don't like residential impacts of the Partial Cover Lowered
 - Less impact to commercial and residential than Partial Cover Lowered
 - Less expensive (cost)
 - School relocation is ok
 - Less fumes, no drainage issues, less cost, and less impacts

- Concerns on Revised Viaduct - North
 - Do not like north option because of paid off house that has been fixed. If house is not taken, don't want to be against it or closer to highway. Houses close show deterioration.
 - Consider the increased maintenance cost of revised viaduct. It is more expensive.

- Preference on Revised Viaduct - South
 - Lower cost
 - Middle ground
 - No impact to school

- Preference on Partial Cover Lowered
 - Less impact to her property
 - Want to get rid of the viaduct
 - Get away from the viaduct
 - Property values should go up
 - Decreased air pollution (particles)
 - Decreased noise
 - Improves the aesthetics

- Concerns on Partial Cover Lowered
 - Air quality
 - Noise
 - Vibration/ground rumble
 - Connectivity during construction
 - Construction impacts
 - More property takes
 - Cost
 - Residential loss and the churches
 - Sufficient funding availability – Do not want to wait any longer
 - Access at Vasquez to I-70, Commerce City access
 - Drainage and snow storage

- Uses and placement of the cover
 - Like the cover with a park
 - Better located by the school
 - Provide grass and trees, make it look natural
 - Evaluate all options, parks, landscape, etc.
 - Would like to see more covered, cover more sections to reintegrate the neighborhood

- Break up the covered space do different areas along the route can enjoy, not just around the school.
- Really like cover and adding “green” to the neighborhood. Construct a community garden.

- Additional comments and suggestions
 - Would like to see businesses rebuilt and revitalized/new infrastructure.
 - Like idea to relocate school. Good for kids to get a new school and remodeled recreation center.
 - Reconnect the neighborhood. Revise alignment of 46th at school to reduce impacts.
 - Try to minimize ROW impacts by narrowing up section (46th)
 - It is very important for all access routes to accommodate pedestrians with sidewalks (i.e. Vasquez, Clayton, Columbine, etc.)
 - Saving jobs and school are very important
 - Most important – connecting the neighborhood, can see downtown Denver
 - Most important to reduce the impact (quality of life)