

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

HEARING DATE: Tuesday, October 5, 2010

---

IN RE:

I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR PEIS PUBLIC HEARINGS

---

**AGREN BLANDO COURT REPORTING & VIDEO INC**

2

PURSUANT TO NOTICE to all parties in interest, the above-entitled matter came on for public hearing on Tuesday, October 5, 2010, commencing at 5:57 PM at 400 Blue River, Silverthorne, Colorado, before Martha Loomis, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Colorado Notary Republic.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

Presentation:	Page
Mary Ann Strombitski	3
Commissioner Steigelmeier	5
Scott McDaniel	8
Public Comments:	
Mr. Dodich	25
Mr. Melcher	27
Mr. Craig	29
Mr. Baron	34

1           WHEREUPON the following proceedings were had:

2           MS. STROMBITSKI:    Good evening.  If you'd like to  
3    join us in the general presentation area we'll be starting our  
4    meeting in about two minutes.

5           THE INTERPRETER:  Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.  
6    My name is Lilia.  I'm the interpreter for tonight.  
7    (Untranslated.)

8           Anybody who needs interpretation into Spanish please  
9    look for me in the back room.  (Untranslated.)

10          MS. STROMBITSKI:  Thank you, Lilia.

11          Welcome, and thank you for coming out tonight.  We  
12    appreciate your public participating in this process.  My voice  
13    booms and I don't want to blow anybody out of the back row or  
14    the front row.

15          My name is Mary Ann Strombitski.  I'll be your  
16    facilitator this evening.

17          We are here at a public hearing.  And I hope that many  
18    of you or all of you have been enjoying the open house, looking  
19    at the displays, as well as talking to the many CDOT reps that  
20    are on hand tonight.

21          If you would, let me direct your attention to the  
22    public hearing agenda this evening.  We've had an hour to look  
23    at the displays and ask some questions.  Certainly while this  
24    presentation is going on you can still do so out by the  
25    displays.

**AGREN BLANDO COURT REPORTING & VIDEO INC**

5

1           We will have about a 30-minute presentation. And then  
2 we'll move right into oral comment. If you haven't signed up --  
3 we have I think three people so far who have signed up to make  
4 oral comment at the microphone. If you would like to do so you  
5 certainly may sign up at the entryway.

6           We will give you three minutes apiece to do public  
7 comment, and we have a number of ways for you to make comment  
8 tonight. Enclosed with your packet is a comment sheet. Feel  
9 free to fill that out and drop it in one of the comment boxes  
10 out in the entry area, or take this home, think about your  
11 comments and, mail it in. There's an address on the back where  
12 you can do that.

13           Out in the public comment area where we have the  
14 documents on display for review there's I think we actually have  
15 two computers set up so you can go on line and provide comment  
16 yourself.

17           And near that same area is a second court reporter.  
18 We have one here and we have one in the outer area where you can  
19 privately dictate your comments to that reporter.

20           Tonight is our opportunity to listen and hear your  
21 thoughts and comments about the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS. We  
22 very much appreciate your participation here tonight.

23           Just so you know, in case you get thirsty during this  
24 process this evening, we have water in the public comment area.  
25 Feel free to make yourself at home.

1           There's a diagram inside that gives you an idea where  
2 all the different pieces of information are, and people manning  
3 those areas so you can make comment to them; however, any  
4 questions that you ask of those folks, or comments that you  
5 make, are not considered formal until you do one of these  
6 things: submit it in writing, do it on line at one of the two  
7 stations, or have it captured either with the court reporter in  
8 the outer area or here at the microphone in about a half hour,  
9 all right?

10           Before we get started I'd like to welcome Karn  
11 Steigelmeier, Summit County Commissioner. She'd like to make a  
12 couple of comments to you.

13           Thank you.

14           COMMISSIONER STEIGELMEIER: Hello. I'd like to  
15 welcome you all here. Thank you for being here.

16           This is the first, I believe, public hearing on the  
17 release of the Revised Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact  
18 Statement, otherwise known as Revised Draft PEIS.

19           It's been a long long time coming. This is just an  
20 overview of other EIS efforts that will be done under this  
21 umbrella at the local level. It's still a very important step.  
22 It's an extremely long-awaited release.

23           There's been work going on on this effort for about  
24 ten years. And some of you may have been here in 2004 when we  
25 had a draft PEIS release and this is a bit of a deja vu.

1           In '04 that release was met with pretty much universal  
2 dislike. And if not the outcome, the process was questioned.

3           And soon after, not long after that, CDOT retained a new  
4 director, Russell George. And he's been at the helm actually  
5 since '07.

6           Since then CDOT, in my mind and in a lot of people's  
7 minds, has operated in a very different fashion. And every  
8 project is reviewed and okayed by citizen groups. There's a  
9 real true belief in the public process.

10           So it's under his leadership that things have changed  
11 I think, in my mind and a lot of people's, for the better. It  
12 was his leadership, Russ George's leadership, that led to the  
13 public process called a Collaborative Effort that looked at this  
14 PEIS. That included stakeholders from government entities all  
15 along the Corridor, citizen groups, environmental groups,  
16 transit.

17           And most of the members of the group -- I was one of  
18 the members -- came in very critical of what had happened  
19 before. And we were actually in shock that in a relatively  
20 short period of time -- I think it was about nine months -- we  
21 reached a consensus agreement.

22           It's really important to realize that the PEIS  
23 includes the P, which is Programmatic. So it's really looking  
24 at that 30,000-foot level and not down at the project level.  
25 Think about that with your comments.

1           The proposed solution that the collaborative effort  
2 came up with is multimodal. It's comprised of an advanced  
3 guideway system, highway improvements, non-infrastructure  
4 components including traffic demand management and appropriate  
5 law enforcement; improvements to allow us to solve some short-  
6 term problems as well as looking at long-term solutions while  
7 considering the impact of traffic, emissions, asphalt,  
8 alternative transportation, environmental impacts, and impacts  
9 on our communities.

10           The solution also has adaptive management so that the  
11 effectiveness of improvements are evaluated prior to moving on  
12 to the next step. It's a relatively complex but flexible  
13 solution.

14           One of the main criticisms of the recommendation so  
15 far has been the cost and unknown funding. But most of us  
16 remain optimistic. It's a huge investment but we really feel  
17 it's the right direction for us to go.

18           Please share your thoughts tonight. And thank you all  
19 for being here. I'll turn this over to Scott McDaniel, the CDOT  
20 Engineer, who will give you more history and an overview of  
21 where we are in this process.

22           I want to say it's been a pleasure to get to know  
23 Scott, who came in later in the process. And Scott is one who  
24 is extremely open minded and committed to public input.

25           Thanks, Scott.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MC DANIEL: Welcome, everyone. And thank you,  
3 Commissioner Steigelmeier, for that wonderful start to the  
4 presentation. I want to thank all of you for taking time out of  
5 your busy schedules for being here tonight.

6 My name is Scott McDaniel. I'm with the Colorado  
7 Department of Transportation. I'm also the project manager for  
8 the I-70 Mountain Corridor.

9 We're real excited to be here tonight to share  
10 information with you about the Programmatic Environmental Impact  
11 Statement, or as we like to call it, the PEIS.

12 This has been a long process, as Commissioner  
13 Steigelmeier has alluded to. And I know that many people out  
14 here in the audience, including the commissioner, has dedicated  
15 countless hours of their own personal time to help us get to  
16 this milestone. For that I'd like to thank you all.

17 But the main reason we're here tonight is to receive  
18 comments on the PEIS. During tonight's meeting I'll give you  
19 some information and background about the document to help you  
20 find what you're interested in commenting on. I will also give  
21 you an overview of what you can expect to happen next.

22 We have a number of Staff here, if you haven't met  
23 them already, that are stationed at the information stations.  
24 And they will remain; they will be there after the presentation  
25 as well.

1           As Mary Ann alluded to there will be an opportunity  
2 after this presentation to provide oral comments. You can also  
3 make comments in a private setting with a court reporter or in  
4 the comment area, or you can simply fill out a comment sheet  
5 located here in the back room.

6           If you wish to spend more time to think about what  
7 comments you want to make that's great too. We will be  
8 accepting comments on this up until November 8.

9           So what is a PEIS? A PEIS is a National Environment  
10 Policy Act, or NEPA document. NEPA is a law that requires any  
11 agency that receives federal funds, like CDOT, to consider all  
12 kinds of environmental impacts of their programs, policies, and  
13 projects before any work begins. In other words, we can't build  
14 anything without a very comprehensive environmental study first.

15           A PEIS document is the first phase of NEPA decision-  
16 making, and also results in a broad Tier 1 decision.

17           This document describes a broad program level action.  
18 And for the I-70 Mountain Corridor the PEIS provides a long  
19 range 50-year vision for the Corridor, and defines the purpose  
20 and need for the project.

21           It also defines the travel mode, capacity, and general  
22 location of the transportation solution for the Corridor;  
23 however, it does not result in construction or impacts.

24           But this document does describe the type of impacts  
25 that may occur due to our actions, and outlines ways that we

1 will use to minimize or eliminate any program level or project-  
2 specific impacts along the Corridor.

3 So that was the Tier 1.

4 What's a Tier 2 process? The PEIS is what we're  
5 talking about tonight, and is considered the first tier of  
6 Tier 1. The Tier 2 process comes next. These are smaller  
7 projects and studies that fall under the scope of a Tier 1  
8 document.

9 The Tier 2 process is where the specific projects  
10 within the Corridor will be developed, designed, and  
11 implemented. So Tier 2 includes project-specific analysis that  
12 falls within the travel mode, capacity, and general location  
13 identified in the Tier 1 document. It will also refine  
14 alternatives, specific alignments, and design.

15 Tier 2 projects will result in construction and  
16 impacts, and it includes project-specific mitigation.

17 Again, as Karn alluded to, we've been doing this for a  
18 while. We started over ten years ago. We're vastly approaching  
19 eleven. And we released a draft PEIS in 2004.

20 Honestly, as Karn mentioned, that wasn't very well  
21 received. We received a lot of comments from the public, and  
22 agency comments as well, questioning our proposed improvements  
23 and the process that we followed to get there.

24 We took a step back, and we looked at our process and  
25 worked alongside stakeholders to try to find ways to improve it.

1 We formed the Collaborative Effort Team, which represented  
2 people with all kinds of interests in what happens on I-70. And  
3 we asked an independent facilitator to help us come to a  
4 consensus.

5 The recommendation became our new Preferred  
6 Alternative for the Corridor. That recommendation is now  
7 included in the revised draft PEIS. And this draft replaces the  
8 2004 draft.

9 This Revised Draft globally addresses the comments  
10 received from the 2004 draft. It updates analysis on  
11 alternatives and resources, and anticipates impacts of future  
12 construction, and identifies mitigation strategies in planning  
13 for Tier 2 processes.

14 So why are I-70 improvements needed? I-70, as we all  
15 know, is a very important corridor to the state. It is the only  
16 east-west interstate through Colorado. It is the major corridor  
17 that connects communities and recreational areas that are  
18 important to the quality of life, and it is the economic base of  
19 our state for freight and tourism.

20 The growth in the Corridor and in the Denver  
21 metropolitan region has resulted in an increase in the number of  
22 trips along the Corridor. Travel conditions are congested now,  
23 and are expected to become worse in the future.

24 A trip that now takes a little over three hours will  
25 take more than five in the future, and the congestion will be

1 unbearable. People will be no longer able to time the trips to  
2 avoid the stop-and-go conditions. In the very near future we  
3 estimate that as many as 9 million people per year will choose  
4 not to visit places along the I-70 Mountain Corridor due to  
5 congestion.

6           How do stakeholders participate in this process?  
7 Thousands of people helped us get to this point. We are truly  
8 grateful for the countless hours people spent to help us come up  
9 with this solution for the I-70.

10           Stakeholder involvement resulted in the formation of  
11 the Collaborate Effort Team. The Team is comprised of  
12 27 stakeholders from Garfield County to Denver, and represents a  
13 diverse set of interests along the Corridor.

14           This Team helped us craft the Preferred Alternative,  
15 and formulate the long-term stakeholder involvement process to  
16 guide transportation improvements in the future.

17           So what is Context Sensitive Solutions? CSS is a  
18 collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves all  
19 stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its  
20 physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic, and  
21 environmental resources while maintaining safety and mobility.

22           Context Sensitive Solutions is an approach that  
23 considers the total context within which a transportation  
24 improvement project will exist.

25           Context Sensitive Solutions principles include the

1 employment of early, continuous, and meaningful involvement of  
2 the public and all stakeholders throughout the project  
3 development process.

4           This is the Federal Highway Administration definition  
5 of CSS. The CSS process is an approach based on the idea that  
6 transportation projects should consider the big picture.

7           The way I like to describe it is that the PEIS is the  
8 "what" and CSS is the "how."

9           CSS will guide all transportation improvements in the  
10 Mountain Corridor. We are committed to well-thought-out choices  
11 that work now and well into the future. We are committed to  
12 early, continuous, and meaningful involvement of the public and  
13 all stakeholders.

14           So what alternatives were considered in the PEIS?  
15 Besides the No Action Alternatives there are four categories or  
16 families of improvements. But "No Action" is exactly what it  
17 says: It would be only the routine maintenance type projects  
18 that we do currently with no capacity improvements.

19           The next one is Minimal Action. That involves only  
20 minor infrastructure and non-infrastructure improvements. With  
21 minimal action, parts or all of the minimal action components  
22 are included in all the alternatives, all the action  
23 alternatives.

24           The next is the Highway Alternatives. And the Highway  
25 Alternatives add roadway capacity, and they fix the highway's

1 deficiencies that are out there now, such as sharp curves and  
2 safety areas.

3           The next is the Transit Alternatives. And that  
4 introduces transit as a dedicated transit service in the  
5 Corridor.

6           And then finally we have the Combination of  
7 Alternatives, which adds both highway and transit service on the  
8 Corridor. Or it actually improves roadway capacity with transit  
9 on the Corridor.

10           Though the alternatives' development and screening  
11 process we, along with our stakeholders, determined that no  
12 single mode of improvement would meet the purpose or need for  
13 this project.

14           That's a very important point because that was a key  
15 issue going into this process. And the reason we know that is  
16 because the relationship between capacity and congestion is not  
17 direct. Lack of capacity may lead to congestion, but the  
18 increase in capacity will not necessarily reduce congestion  
19 because remember the 9 million people that I mentioned wouldn't  
20 make that trip if we just did capacity improvements? They would  
21 soon eat up the capacity that we built, and that transportation  
22 solution would not last long.

23           Therefore the transit system would also be needed to  
24 address capacity while highway improvements are necessary to  
25 address congestion.

1           The Preferred Alternate for this project is unlike  
2 anything else that CDOT's ever done. It consists of four  
3 primary parts: The non-infrastructure component, the advanced  
4 guideway system, a flexible program of highway improvements,  
5 which includes a minimum and a maximum program of improvements.  
6 And that's a very important point to remember. I will elaborate  
7 on that more. And of course future stakeholder engagement,  
8 which is also a very important component of this Preferred  
9 Alternative. It's unique to anything we've ever done in the  
10 past.

11           The non-infrastructure components are improvements  
12 that don't require new infrastructure. Some examples of that  
13 will be providing travel information, shifting passengers and  
14 freight travel demand by time of day or even by day of week, or  
15 promoting high occupancy travel and public transportation.

16           We can do some of these. But many require action such  
17 as land use controls by other agencies and local communities.

18           The Advanced Guideway System would be an elevated  
19 train through the Corridor. It would extend from C-470 to the  
20 Eagle County Airport, with visions of connecting to other kinds  
21 of transit services.

22           The specifics of the solution have not been identified  
23 because studies are required to determine the most workable  
24 system. We would need to study such things such as cost and  
25 benefit, safety, reliability, environmental impact, technology,

1 ridership, and other considerations.

2 All future studies however will involve stakeholders,  
3 and will follow the I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS process.

4 Preferred Alternative includes a flexible program of  
5 highway improvements. Again, this is unique to anything we have  
6 ever done in the past. It is designed with a flexible approach  
7 so the changes can be phased in as needed.

8 The Minimum Program includes what we refer to as  
9 specific highway improvements. This term is important because  
10 these are improvements that must be in place before additional  
11 improvements are considered.

12 The specific highway improvements include six lanes  
13 from Floyd Hill through the Twin Tunnels. It also includes new  
14 bike trails and frontage roads. It includes reconstruction of  
15 the Empire Junction interchange, eastbound auxiliary lane from  
16 Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels to Herman Gulch, and  
17 westbound auxiliary lane from Bakerville to Eisenhower-Johnson  
18 Memorial Tunnels.

19 The Minimum Program also includes more than  
20 20 interchange improvements, 25 miles of additional auxiliary  
21 lanes, new tunnel bores at the Twin Tunnels and  
22 Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels, and other improvements  
23 related to truck operations such as chain-up stations.

24 That was the minimum. The Maximum Program  
25 Improvements includes everything from the minimum plus a six

1 lane widening from Twin Tunnels to the Eisenhower-Johnson  
2 Memorial tunnel.

3 It also includes four more interchanges in Clear Creek  
4 County, and curve safety modifications at Fall River Road.

5 And this is the unique part of the Preferred  
6 Alternative we've identified. We talk about triggers. What are  
7 triggers, and what triggers additional highway improvements?

8 The Preferred Alternative allows for a flexible  
9 approach, and includes defined triggers for additional  
10 improvements.

11 The Maximum Program would only begin to be put in  
12 place if these conditions are met. And the triggers are:  
13 Specific highway improvements in the Minimum Program are  
14 complete, and an Advanced Guideway System is functioning.

15 Or specific highway improvements in the Minimum  
16 Program are complete, and studies prove that the Advance  
17 Guideway System is not feasible.

18 The last one is the local, regional, national, or  
19 global trends or events unexpectedly affected, have unexpected  
20 effects on the Corridor travel.

21 The Preferred Alternative therefore includes a  
22 collaborative process to evaluate these conditions with the  
23 stakeholders. We'll be checking in with them on a regular  
24 basis.

25 Ongoing stakeholder engagement is the key part of

1 Preferred Alternative, as we talked about. CDOT is committed to  
2 collaboration following the I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS process  
3 for all future projects or studies within the Corridor.

4 For the Preferred Alternative this means a commitment  
5 to review corridor conditions with the Collaborative Effort Team  
6 at least every two years.

7 This review will look at the efficiency and  
8 effectiveness of the transportation improvements made to date  
9 as well as any changes in the travel patterns or trends.

10 In ten years we will fully re-evaluate both the  
11 corridor needs and determine if a better solution can be put in  
12 place. This flexible approach allows us to focus our efforts on  
13 immediate problems while maintaining a long-term vision for the  
14 Corridor.

15 As we all know, for most of us who travel and live in  
16 the mountains, the I-70 Mountain Corridor is very unique. It  
17 spans four life zones, four watersheds, nine geologic domains,  
18 two national forests, and five counties.

19 Its rugged terrain, extreme temperatures, and steep  
20 canyons, and sensitive environmental resources challenge even  
21 our most basic highway maintenance jobs.

22 One of the goals of the PEIS is to take into account  
23 the needs of the people and national resources in the Corridor,  
24 and preserve the best of Colorado.

25 The PEIS does not look at every possible site-specific

1 impact. We do not have enough detail about the footprint or  
2 scope of our action to do that at this point, so our focus has  
3 been on the bigger picture.

4           What are the important resources in the Corridor that  
5 we need to consider in looking at future projects? Where are  
6 the bottlenecks? And what are the resources that have the most  
7 sensitive, that are most sensitive to impacts?

8           What we've done today is we've reviewed the available  
9 agency data. We've held workshops with the communities, and  
10 we've also held workshops with special interests groups and  
11 gathered public comment as well.

12           We've researched data from maps, databases, published  
13 sources, and we've done our own fieldwork as well. We took this  
14 information and we compared the scope of the alternatives and  
15 mapped possible impacts that may occur under each of the action  
16 alternatives.

17           The PEIS describes a range of impacts that are  
18 representative of a full spectrum of alternatives that we will  
19 be considering.

20           So what are some of the impacts that we are expecting?  
21 Obviously any construction that we do on the Corridor will  
22 disturb resources. Impacts may be direct. Indirect impacts, or  
23 direct impacts result from the expansion of transportation  
24 facilities into areas next to the Corridor.

25           Direct impacts also result in a loss of wildlife

1 habitat, a loss of recreation areas, or access to recreation  
2 areas, or loss of historic buildings or other remains.

3           Impacts may also be indirect. Indirect impacts  
4 resulting from changes in the Corridor conditions caused by new  
5 or expanding transportation features, induced road or changes to  
6 noise or visual conditions are examples of indirect impacts.

7           Cumulative impacts result from a combination of  
8 actions with others in the Corridor that affect the same  
9 resources. Example of cumulative impacts include channelization  
10 of streams and increased pollutants entering waterways from  
11 runoff from multiple construction actions.

12           The Preferred Alternative, as we have defined it,  
13 best meets the purpose and need for this project. It relies on  
14 a 50-year vision, and has enough flexibility to meet future  
15 needs. As a multimodal solution the Preferred Alternative meets  
16 both capacity and congestion demands.

17           The environmental and social impacts of the Preferred  
18 Alternative provide the best balance from across the range of  
19 choices; however, the Preferred Alternative has generally higher  
20 than minimal action impacts on resources than the minimal action  
21 and single modal alternatives, but generally less than the  
22 combined alternatives.

23           And the impacts, something that's really important to  
24 keep in mind, the impacts presented in the PEIS are before we  
25 actually apply any mitigation measures. So we can expect the

1 impacts to be significantly less than before.

2 So what mitigation strategies does the Preferred  
3 Alternative include? The footprint of the Preferred Alternative  
4 will need to be refined in Tier 2 processes.

5 We tried to avoid impacts where we could. For  
6 instances, in most locations the Advanced Guideway System would  
7 run in the highway median to minimize impacts to vegetation and  
8 wildlife.

9 Beyond designing solutions to minimize impacts we have  
10 committed to ways of minimizing both program and project level  
11 impact projects for Tier 2 processes.

12 If you go to chapter 3 in the PEIS it will describe  
13 the strategies for you. We will look at new ways of using the  
14 I-70 CSS process to implement more strategies as we know what  
15 those impacts could be.

16 And one of the things that is also unique to this  
17 study in this project is that we have signed or we will be  
18 signing similar agreements specific to the Corridor that protect  
19 the historic properties that will also protect water quality and  
20 resources and wildlife habitat.

21 The Programmatic Agreement, SWEEP, and ALIVE  
22 agreements are official and legally enforceable, and include a  
23 number of our partner organizations.

24 And here's the billion dollar question. How will  
25 improvements be funded?

1           The Preferred Alternative is expected to cost between  
2 16 billion and 20 billion dollars in the year that payments are  
3 made. We've identified just over one billion in state and  
4 federal sources currently that could be tapped into the Corridor  
5 over the next 25 years.

6           State and federal transportation revenues do go up and  
7 they do go down, but they're not expected to increase enough to  
8 pay for the project.

9           We do not have the dollars to implement the Preferred  
10 Alternative all at once. And they will need, we will need to  
11 find new ways to fund sources.

12           Alternative funding sources may include public-private  
13 partnerships, tolling, bonding/loans, or local government  
14 investments.

15           In the meantime CDOT is committed to implementing  
16 phases of the Preferred Alternative as funding becomes  
17 available. We will also continue to engage our Collaborative  
18 Effort Team to help prioritize improvements, review triggers for  
19 new improvements, and to identify funding sources.

20           The other thing that the Preferred Alternative or that  
21 the PEIS does for us is it does set us up in place for any new  
22 federal transportation authorization bill so that we already  
23 have a plan in place if new money becomes available for transit.

24           So what are the next steps of the study? We've been  
25 doing this for eleven years. We're near the end. And we're

1 very excited for that.

2 But this is a critical time. And it's a good time for  
3 you to comment and continue to be involved in this project. The  
4 public comment period will continue until November 8. We are  
5 interested in your thoughts. That's why we're all here tonight.

6 Of particular interest are your views of the first  
7 tier decision, the travel mode, capacity, and general location.  
8 This will not be revisited in Tier 2. If you have specific  
9 concerns we will also hear those, but we're most interested in  
10 the concerns of what, or the decisions that this document makes.

11 Then after that, after we get through this public  
12 comment period, the final PEIS will contain all the responses  
13 that we receive here tonight and up through November 8.

14 We will incorporate those comments into the Final.  
15 And we hope to have that Final completed by winter 2011, which  
16 isn't that far off. We have a very aggressive schedule for  
17 this.

18 Then the final step in the PEIS process is the Record  
19 of Decision. This Record of Decision provides a plan on how the  
20 Tier 1 decision will be carried out including the prioritization  
21 of projects, the relationship of the Tier 1 decision with the  
22 statewide planning process, and defining the Tier 2 process  
23 options for how parts of the Tier 2 decisions will move forward.

24 We expect to have a Record Decision by the spring of  
25 2011. Again we have built momentum. And it's taken us a long

1 time to get that momentum, but we have a full head of steam now.

2           So with that I hope this presentation has been  
3 informative and thought provoking. I'd like to turn the  
4 microphone back over to Mary Ann. And she will explain more  
5 about the comment process.

6           (Applause.)

7           MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Scott.

8           As you can see a lot of care was put into this  
9 presentation this evening, into the displays.

10           And we'd like to let you know at this point we're  
11 completed with the general presentation. We're about to begin  
12 oral comment.

13           You're welcome to stay seated and listen to the four  
14 folks who have signed up to provide oral comment. Or you can  
15 step back out. Our open house will continue. You can also  
16 continue review of the documents, or utilize the online site to  
17 provide your own comments, drop the comments into the boxes,  
18 written comments, as well as to be able to dictate comments to  
19 the court reporter in the outside area.

20           So at this point those four who would like to make  
21 comment, just a quick reminder. There are some rules with your  
22 agenda packet.

23           We'll have a three-minute limit for each of the people  
24 making comments. We'd ask that you state your name, spell your  
25 name, provide your address. And then you'll see the screen go

1 green, which means you have three minutes to make comments.

2           It will be green for two and a half minutes. Then it  
3 will turn yellow for 30 seconds, then red when we need you to  
4 wrap up your comments. So I'll allow you to complete that  
5 sentence wherever you are.

6           And then if you have further comment at that point we  
7 ask you to go to the court reporter in the outside area. We  
8 want to be fair with everybody tonight; that's why there's a  
9 three-minute limit.

10           So if we might begin the first person signed up is  
11 Nick Dodich.

12           Nick, if you would come to the microphone over to your  
13 right.

14           MR. DODICH: My name is Nick Dodich, D-o-d-i-c-h. I  
15 live in Arvada, 6370 Deframe Way. And anything else you want?

16           MS. STROMBITSKI: I think that's it. Go ahead and  
17 begin your comment.

18           MR. DODICH: I'd like to talk on special projects. Do  
19 you have a stage hook? You may have to use that on me to get me  
20 off the microphone.

21           MS. STROMBITSKI: When it gets red you'll know.

22           MR. DODICH: Seriously speaking now, I'm very  
23 concerned about the Corridor. I've been in Colorado 40 years.  
24 And it used to be good until maybe about 10 years ago when we  
25 saw a trend happening.

1           Seems like nothing has been done. I think we're at  
2 the stage where if we don't act fast we're going to be in a lot  
3 of trouble.

4           There's an article in the newspaper this morning about  
5 how infrastructure in Europe and China and Russia, they have  
6 advanced far more than we have. And I think time is of the  
7 essence.

8           And one thing that I notice, the biggest bottleneck on  
9 the segment, the 15-mile segment from Floyd Hill to Empire is  
10 the twin towers (sic.) Those are permanent bottlenecks.

11           I think if you could bore another tunnel through the  
12 Twin Tunnels area it would greatly reduce the traffic problem.  
13 And there's a company that makes boring machines. I talked to  
14 them.

15           And they said a boring machine, 20 feet in diameter,  
16 costs 1.5 million. And it could bore through that 2-10ths mile  
17 length of the tunnel in 8.8 days, depending on the hardness of  
18 the rock. So that is nothing.

19           And they will buy back the machine once you're through  
20 with tunneling. But it may be worthwhile to keep it to make two  
21 more tunnels at the Eisenhower Tunnel or other tunnels around  
22 the state.

23           But I think we really have to act fast; otherwise  
24 we're going to lose a lot of business. The people out in this  
25 area are going to lose a lot of money in taxes because people

1 won't come through, they won't rent motel rooms, they won't  
2 frequent the restaurants. They go skiing maybe in Salt Lake or  
3 some other, Nevada, Utah, or Canadian places.

4 But we got to keep in mind economic benefits of that.  
5 I don't think that we should wait much longer.

6 Thanks.

7 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you very much.

8 Next speaker is Carl Richard.

9 Bert Melcher.

10 MR. MELCHER: My name is Albert G. Melcher, 7504 East  
11 Jefferson Drive, Denver 80237. M-e-l-c-h-e-r is the spelling.

12 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you.

13 MR. MELCHER: I'm speaking only for myself, not for  
14 any organization.

15 I've been a member of the Mountain Corridor Advisory  
16 Committee and conflict resolution panel, CE, and I'm also one of  
17 three people who've served on both the CDOT commission and the  
18 RDE board. I'm been involved in this Corridor since June 1946  
19 in engineering and policy.

20 My major -- first of all I want to compliment CDOT and  
21 the number of other people that participated in this in creating  
22 this massive change from 2004 mentality to what we have today,  
23 i.e. the Preferred Alternative based on the collaborative effort  
24 process.

25 Russ George, the CDOT director, deserves great praise

1 and compliments for bringing this into effect. It's a super  
2 thing, and it's going to lead to a lot of good. Also all the  
3 people that have participated, as Scott pointed out, certainly  
4 deserve praise and compliments too. It's been a great effort.

5 I have one major concern. And that is the C-470  
6 terminus, and what happens east of that. In 2004-2005 we  
7 thought there should be a supplemental PEIS to address this  
8 particular region, how it relates to providing ridership and  
9 travel from the residents -- there are two and a half million  
10 right now -- to the mountain area, and vice versa, actually.

11 That area, this region has to be, it must be included  
12 in the Tier 1 analysis. Board 7 back here says "studies outside  
13 the Corridor..." I believe it says "...can be conducted." I  
14 would say "must be conducted" at Tier 1 so that as Scott says,  
15 when we get to Tier 2, things are not locked into concrete, and  
16 can't be re-examined.

17 That area is absolutely critical. It's a very very  
18 difficult area to deal with. But it cannot be put off. No  
19 endless attitude is going to help solve the problems of this  
20 Corridor if we ignore that particular area.

21 The AGS, whatever it might be, travel time and  
22 convenience, conductivity from DIA or whatever must be solved --  
23 or addressed at least, not solved -- at this level.

24 Second thing I want to comment on is the BE was very  
25 much concerned with sustainability. This is a major concern of

1 mine. We have major resource global warming problems in this  
2 country. A lot of people may not want to recognize them but  
3 they are very real. And many decisions on resource use have to  
4 address sustainability.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you very much.

7 And now for Bobby --

8 MR. CRAIG: Craig, sorry.

9 Hi. My name is Bobby Craig, C-r-a-i-g. I live at  
10 1037 Foresthill Drive in Summit County.

11 First thing I'd like to say is I became a commuter  
12 four years ago on moving from Summit County to Morrison. And I  
13 had to commute back up to Summit County for my job here.

14 And I'll just say it was an insane experience between  
15 the weather, the traffic, the wildlife. I almost hit a bear  
16 going 70 miles an hour. It became unbearable.

17 And two years ago I moved back to Summit County  
18 because I couldn't stand it. That was during the week, not on  
19 weekends when you have skier traffic.

20 I'd also like to say one I think this is a great step  
21 forward and good vision. It's a vision for our kids and not for  
22 those of us in this room.

23 Fifty years from now I'm going to be 97. And that  
24 year is 2060. I'm not sure what the world is going to be like,  
25 but it's going to be a heck of a lot different than it is right

1 now. And the reason I know that is go back 50 years.

2 In 1960 there was no interstate, there was no  
3 Eisenhower Tunnel, there was hardly any ski areas, no  
4 cellphones, no Internet, all of these things that we take for  
5 granted. And I think this vision is the way we can get there  
6 and I guess pull our heads out of the sand.

7 I have three things that I'd like to say. Transit,  
8 transit, and transit.

9 Having traveled the world and seen what trains can do  
10 or other mass transit, particularly in the Alps, even in China,  
11 the ability is there if we have the will.

12 The other thing with transit, it can be impervious to  
13 weather. It can be almost unlimited in capacity, trains not  
14 lanes, and it can lessen our dependence on fossil fuels.

15 The key though is to have commitment. And I'd like to  
16 challenge everyone in this room, particularly people like Dan  
17 Gibbs, Christine Scanlon, and other local leaders, to be  
18 leaders. I'm willing to follow, but I'd like somebody to  
19 follow.

20 And with that I'd like to say thank you very much.  
21 And let's keep going.

22 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you.

23 Are there any others that would like to make oral  
24 comment at the microphone?

25 MS. MORALES: We do have one more signed in, Mary Ann.

1 That was Dan Gibbs.

2 MR. GIBBS: Thank you so much. I apologize for  
3 running a little bit late. I was actually over in Grand County  
4 on the fire, so I'm not dressed appropriately.

5 But I first want to thank CDOT, Federal Highway  
6 Administration, I-70 Coalition, the I-70 Collaborative, for  
7 working so hard for so many years on really trying to bring  
8 people together to look at what's possible on this 144-mile  
9 stretch that's very important to all of us.

10 It's very important to me. I'm the state senator that  
11 lives in Summit County. I represent Summit, Grand, Gilpin,  
12 Clear Creek, Western Jefferson County, and Western Boulder  
13 County.

14 I can't tell you how often I'm down at the capital  
15 with 100 legislators. And anyone that's on I-70 -- how much  
16 time do I have? No, I'll be short. Okay -- is a transportation  
17 engineer expert. That's good and bad. But everyone has  
18 wonderful ideas.

19 I think what came up with the recommendations within  
20 this PEIS study, I think that's a real positive. In particular,  
21 going back from the days a long time ago when CDOT had come  
22 forward to kind of share with the local impacted communities.  
23 And many of us had concerns at that time and many of you in the  
24 room shared these concerns that, Hey we need to have a long-term  
25 vision. We can't pave our way out of these challenges. So it'

1 needs to be multimodal in approach.

2 We need to have a long-term vision of 50 years. We  
3 need to remove this \$4 billion threshold that everyone kind of  
4 wondered where that number came from -- you probably remember  
5 that very vividly -- as well as making sure that when we look at  
6 improvements that we use this Context Sensitive Solution  
7 process. It's very much collaborative in approach.

8 I've worked on numerous pieces of legislation  
9 throughout the years that have been frankly, you know, just  
10 dealing with the pinch points, just dealing with kinda short  
11 term fixes.

12 The chain law bill is one example where we have  
13 improvements now along I-70 where we also have variable message  
14 boards so people can see what's going on in front of them. I  
15 think that's a positive.

16 I think it's a positive that CDOT can now contract  
17 with private entities to do a quick clearance program so if  
18 there's a wreck on I-70 we can clear that as fast as possible so  
19 people can get from point A to point B.

20 What I find challenging down at the capital is a lot  
21 of times they don't know or realize that us that live in Summit  
22 County or along the I-70 Corridor I-70 is not just a road that  
23 we take to get to the ski resorts or to go hiking, you know.  
24 This is the road that we use to go to church in the morning, the  
25 road that we use to go to the grocery stores and so forth. So

1 it is our artery for our mountain communities and so vital to  
2 our industry and our way of life.

3 So in the future I want to encourage you and the  
4 stakeholders, the decision-makers -- I guess that's including  
5 me -- but we need to look at public-private partnerships.

6 I don't know if you had a reality check earlier, but  
7 the state's going to have about a \$1 billion shortfall in terms  
8 of what our funding needs are. So when you look at CDOT's  
9 budget, which is about one billion a year, and you look at the  
10 costs of doing any of these recommendations, they're not cheap;  
11 they add up awfully quickly.

12 So I think we need to look at -- you're gonna kick me  
13 off? Okay. We need to look at ways to I think include kinda  
14 public-private partnerships, but also let the public know that,  
15 Hey, we're in dire situations in the state of Colorado.

16 We need to think outside the box. I think it's  
17 important to look at some of these studies like this reversible  
18 lane. Hey, if it doesn't work it doesn't work. I know you've  
19 been looking at that. But we need to look at other ways.

20 We need to look at buses. We need to look at -- I  
21 mean, you know, there's a lot of smart people in the room. But  
22 I think we need to continue to think outside the box.

23 I think failing originally is not a problem because  
24 that will help us learn that that particular solution was not  
25 really a solution that would work. But I just encourage you all

1 to work together in a collaborative way, the way it really has  
2 been going the last few years, but to take into account the  
3 concerns the people have here and, you know, really think  
4 outside the box --

5 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you.

6 MR. GIBBS: -- because we need leaders, and we need to  
7 do that.

8 Thanks. I apologize for running over.

9 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you very much.

10 One last call?

11 MS. MORALES: I do believe we have one last taker.  
12 Just a moment.

13 MS. STROMBITSKI: Okay. Very good.

14 Thank you. State your name and address, and spell  
15 your name.

16 MS. MORALES: Ron Baron.

17 MR. BARON: I'm at 1174 Straight Creek Drive, Dillon,  
18 Colorado.

19 Our bus driver leaving Kaiserstadt near an airbase in  
20 Germany got lost. The blue line he was following turned out to  
21 be a river instead of a road.

22 He got off at a railhead and said, Don't leave. I'll  
23 be right back.

24 He then drove the bus onto a flatcar. We went through  
25 the Kaiserstadt tunnel, came out. Saved hundreds of miles of

1 driving, but cost his company a bit of money for the  
2 transportation.

3 My suggestion is to open up or start talking with the  
4 railroads, and have a way to drive your car or bus or truck onto  
5 a special car made for hauling automobiles and trucks on  
6 flatcars. And they'd get on in Grand Junction, off in Denver,  
7 and vice versa.

8 That would relieve the through traffic going through  
9 the most difficult part of the mountains.

10 We would need to improve our railroad right now in the  
11 United States. We're still running on rails that are sitting on  
12 ties made of wood where the spikes come loose every once in a  
13 while and there is a railroad track.

14 The rest of the world has gone to concrete,  
15 steel-reinforced concrete ties with spring clips that hold on to  
16 the high speed rails, and they don't give up. You'll find that  
17 in China and Europe, South America, most of the rest of the  
18 world.

19 Unfortunately our railroads won't invest in the  
20 infrastructure to improve the rails that need to be improved.

21 Right now that 245-mile trip from Grand Junction by  
22 rail would relieve the I-70 Corridor of more concrete,  
23 pollution, and danger.

24 That 244-mile trip would cost the railroad about  
25 \$21.96 for a three-ton auto. That's their dun price. An

1 additional charge for passengers to enjoy comfortable coach  
2 would be extra.

3 At 20 miles per gallon the 244-mile trip would cost  
4 \$36.60 at \$3 a gallon in gas alone. Trains get about 10 times  
5 the fuel milage of trucks.

6 This would help increase safety, prevent pollution,  
7 and lower the consumption of fuel, and help solve global  
8 warming.

9 Existing railroads need to be upgraded. We need to  
10 talk with the private industry. And maybe to subsidize them, or  
11 show them how much more business they could get. But it would  
12 take a lot of traffic off our Mountain Corridor.

13 That's my suggestion. Thank you.

14 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you.

15 This concludes our oral presentation for the evening.  
16 Please enjoy the rest of the open house, and your opportunity  
17 for public comment in all of the many ways that we've described  
18 this evening.

19 Thank you again for coming.

20

21 (Whereupon the within proceedings adjourned at  
22 6:56 PM.)

23

24

25

**AGREN BLANDO COURT REPORTING & VIDEO INC**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Martha Loomis, Certified Shorthand Reporter,  
appointed to take the within proceedings hereby  
certify that the proceedings was taken by me on October 5, 2010,  
then reduced to typewritten form by means of computer-aided  
transcription; that the foregoing is a true transcript of the  
proceedings had subject to my ability to hear and understand.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
October 8, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Martha Loomis  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

Proofread by D. Drake