



PUBLIC HEARING MEETING SUMMARY

Date/Time: September 25, 2014, 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Location: Bruce Randolph Middle School, 3955 Steele Street, Denver, Colorado

Attendees: 187

1. INTRODUCTION

The I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) project team conducted public hearings on September 23, 24, and 25, 2014, as part of the ongoing community outreach process. Childcare and translators were available to all attendees. The primary purpose of the public hearings was to provide an update of recent EIS study developments, summarize the Supplemental Draft EIS document available for public review, and provide an opportunity for public comment.

The hearings included an open house and a PowerPoint presentation, followed by a formal public comment session. The PowerPoint presentation focused on the Supplemental Draft EIS alternatives, but most of the project information was included on the exhibits in the open house. There were three ways to provide comments at the hearings: (1) verbal comments could be made before the assembled audience and recorded by a court reporter, (2) private verbal comments could be made to a court reporter in a separate room, and (3) comment sheets also were provided for attendees in an effort to solicit written comments about the project. In addition, comments could be emailed or mailed via the postal system after the hearings through the end of the comment period on October 31, 2014. The project team will consider and respond to comments from the hearings as they begin the preparation of the Final EIS. These notes reflect the public hearing held on September 25, 2014.

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

The following subsections briefly describe the project.

a. Project Overview

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) propose improvements to I-70 between I-25 and Tower Road. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires projects that are federally funded and may have an impact on the environment to be analyzed through a rigorous process that allows the public to comment on the project.

b. Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to implement a transportation solution that improves safety, access, and mobility and addresses congestion on I-70. The need for the project results from several issues:

- Increased transportation demand
- Limited transportation capacity
- Safety concerns
- Transportation infrastructure deficiencies



I-70 East

c. Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives Evaluated

The Supplemental Draft EIS evaluates the impacts to the project area of three alternatives: the No-Action Alternative, the Revised Viaduct Alternative, and the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative.

The No-Action Alternative includes existing, planned, and programmed roadway and transit improvements in the project area. It would rebuild the viaduct along the existing design without adding capacity, while expanding to the north or south.

In addition to the No-Action Alternative, two Build Alternatives with options are evaluated. The Build Alternatives are:

Revised Viaduct Alternative

- Expansion Options:
North or South
- Operational Options:
General-Purpose Lanes or Managed Lanes

Partial Cover Lowered Alternative

- Connectivity Options:
Basic or Modified
- Operational Options:
General-Purpose Lanes or Managed Lanes

The Revised Viaduct Alternative addresses safety issues with the aging viaduct by removing it and building a new structure that will add capacity, improve access, and increase safety.

The Partial Cover Lowered Alternative removes the existing I-70 viaduct between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard, lowering the highway below grade in this area. It adds capacity from I-25 to Tower Road by restriping and additional lanes. This alternative includes a cover over the highway between Clayton Street and Columbine Street to address environmental, social, and community issues.

Expansion Options refer to the North or South Options of the No-Action Alternative and the Revised Viaduct Alternative. These move the north edge of the highway north or the south edge of the highway south of the existing facility from Brighton Boulevard to Colorado Boulevard.

Connectivity Options for the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative—including a Basic Option and a Modified Option—provide different east-west and north-south street network and interchange configurations within the Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood to support a livable, connected, and sustainable city.

Two **Operational Options** for the Build Alternatives are designed to help handle the added capacity from I-25 to Tower Road. These options are General-Purpose Lanes and Managed Lanes.

d. Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative

The Partial Cover Lowered Alternative with Managed Lanes Option has been preliminarily identified as the Preferred Alternative by CDOT and FHWA. This alternative would remove the deteriorating, 50-year-old viaduct between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard, rebuild I-70 below grade on the existing alignment, and place a nearly four-acre landscaped cover over the highway between Columbine Street and Clayton Street next to Swansea Elementary School. It also would add managed lanes in each direction of the highway from I-25 to Tower Road to improve mobility. The cover over the highway reconnects the neighborhoods with urban-landscaped areas that could include playgrounds, plazas, outdoor classrooms, and community gardens, all of which have received major public support during community meetings. Feedback provided during the Supplemental Draft EIS public comment period will be considered before formally selecting the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

e. Transportation Benefits

Improvements to I-70 have the potential to affect the surrounding transportation system, including other roadways, transit services, rail and motor freight, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. All Build Alternatives will:

- Provide increased capacity and reduce congestion
- Improve safety by widening shoulders and improving interchanges
- Replace aging infrastructure
- Reduce peak-period travel time for I-70 travelers

The No-Action Alternative would not adequately improve the transportation system to meet future needs of the corridor. Congestion would continue to worsen.

f. Resources Evaluated

Detailed studies were conducted to determine the effects of the project alternatives on the following built, natural, and social environmental resources:

- Social and economic conditions
- Environmental justice
- Land use
- Relocations and displacements
- Historic preservation
- Paleontological resources
- Visual resources and aesthetic qualities
- Parks and recreation
- Air quality
- Energy
- Noise
- Biological resources
- Floodplains and drainage/hydrology
- Wetlands and other waters of the U.S.
- Water quality
- Geology and soils
- Hazardous materials
- Utilities
- Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources
- Short-term use and long-term productivity

The project alternatives and design options benefit or impact each environmental resource differently. For example, while all the design options for the Build Alternatives improve transportation conditions,

individual design options impact more properties than others or benefit some resources more than others.

g. Next Steps

The project team will consider and respond to comments from the hearings as they begin the preparation of the Final EIS. During this process, the project team will select a preferred alternative by working closely with local jurisdictions, continuing to engage stakeholders and the public, and holding meetings with various project coordination groups. When the Final EIS is available, the formal comment period and public hearings will provide the community, stakeholders, and agencies an opportunity to comment on the Final EIS. After considering additional public input following the Final EIS, a Record of Decision will be issued by the FHWA that specifies the project that will be built.

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. The following subsections briefly describe what was presented at the hearing.

a. Summary of Meeting Stations

The public hearing information session was divided into nine different stations manned by staff members and project technical experts to answer questions for attendees. The following stations were included:

- **Welcome—Overview:** This station started with the sign-in table, where attendees signed in and received the evening’s agenda and the Project Snapshot handout. Then they were directed through a series of boards that presented a project overview, information about the I-70 East environmental process, a history of what happened after the public review of the 2008 Draft EIS, and a look at public involvement throughout the 11 years of the I-70 East Project.
- **Project Alternatives Overview:** This station presented a description of the three alternatives evaluated in the 2014 Supplemental Draft EIS—plus all of the potential options. A bird’s eye view of each alternative gave attendees a visual impression of what the alternatives would look like through the western side of the project area.
- **No Action Alternative:** This station presented a map of the No-Action Alternative from Brighton Boulevard to Colorado Boulevard, showing both the North Expansion Option and the South Expansion Option. It also showed Typical Sections—or transverse views—detailing the roadway configuration for both the North and South Options.
- **Revised Viaduct Alternative:** This station presented visuals of the Revised Viaduct Alternative from Brighton Boulevard to Dahlia Street, just past Colorado Boulevard. The Typical Section showed a view of the Managed Lanes Option.
- **Partial Cover Lowered Alternative:** This station presented a map from Brighton Boulevard to Dahlia Street showing the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative with Basic and Modified Options, with a Typical Section depicting the below-grade roadway.

- **Build Alternatives:** The Build Alternatives station showed maps and Typical Sections of the remainder of the project area from Colorado Boulevard east to Tower Road.
- **Preliminarily Identified Preferred Alternative:** This station identified the Partial Cover Lowered Alternative with Managed Lanes Option as the Preferred Alternative. Boards at this station presented the reasons why this alternative has been preliminarily identified. Boards also covered other potential design variations to intersections, frontage roads, the highway cover, and north-south connectivity. They also showed an artist's drawings of cover uses and neighborhood enhancements.
- **Resources:** The Resources station presented study results of impacts to various environmental resources, including transportation/traffic, environmental justice, relocations and displacements, historic preservation, air quality, visual simulations, noise, drainage, and hazardous materials.
- **What's Next?:** The last station presented project costs, explained how the High Performance Transportation Enterprise is pursuing innovative financing options, described the Final EIS process, and showed attendees how to stay involved.

4. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

a. 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	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. 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



#	Comment
	<p>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 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 jeoperty 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 merales 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increase demarkation between neighborhoods -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 maintence will be an issue as well as distribution of polution below & above cap -Bottle necking @ I-25 will cause backup of traffic and increase polution -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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2. Locations of covers do not connect community. The second cover makes no sense and needs to be relocated to facilitate better community conection. 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



#	Comment
	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.
10	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.
11	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?
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> <p>Where is 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.</p>
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.



b. 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>



#	Comment
	<p>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 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</p>



#	Comment
	<p>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>
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>



#	Comment
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 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</p>



#	Comment
	<p>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 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>
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>

#	Comment
	<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> <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>
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>



#	Comment
	<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> <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>

#	Comment
	<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>
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>



#	Comment
	<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 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.</p>
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</p>



#	Comment
	<p>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: 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>



#	Comment
32	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.
33	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.
34	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.
35	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.

c. Private Verbal Comments

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

#	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</p>

#	Comment
	<p>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>
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>

#	Comment
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>
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</p>



#	Comment
	<p>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>
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>

#	Comment
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 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.</p>

