

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	In this day and age with rising energy prices and the rise of the green movement, how come there is no mass transit connection between northern Colorado and Denver?
11/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I recently read the article in the Longmont Times-Call about the proposed changes to I-25 between Fort Collins and Longmont. As a CSU student who grew up in Longmont, any of these changes could have a great effect on my travels. I'm disappointed that none of the seven displays of the proposals are in Fort Collins. It seems like a pretty obvious oversight, and hopefully one that can be easily remedied. Without seeing the proposals, I would like to say that the absence of bus service between Fort Collins and Longmont would be a great addition.
11/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Where are the proposals, package A and package B, located on your website?
11/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support plan #1. Having the commuter rail into the north metro area would reduce the traffic not only on I-25 but also along Highway 287. This would give people more employment opportunities without the worry of commuting by car due to gas costs.
11/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It's been shown by many studies that adding new lanes for auto traffic actually INCREASES congestion, so I strongly urge CDOT to do more than only add new lanes. Bus Rapid Transit, light rail, and HOV lanes all make the best sense.
11/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Can I see what the public comments are to date?
11/15/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I love the idea of the commuter rail option! (option A) It appears to balance the need for connectivity between communities utilizing buses, while also looking to the future requirements of moving large numbers of people without paving our entire prairie. Thanks for all your work on this!
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	I've lived here 19 years. I've seen I-25 get quite a bit more busy over those years. I strongly support the option A that you have that improves the rail transit aspect. My worry is that the rail side of it is going to get bogged down and the highway widening part is going to be full speed ahead. And this is historical. CDOT has been widening the highways for quite a few years and they're very new in the commuter rail business. So I'm wondering, I guess my worry, at least be paced to go along at least as fast as the highway project. I saw your statistics showing a little growth in expected traffic after the widening, and I think it's going to be huge, especially when you get three new lanes to Weld County. You can fill it all up with cars in no time, the way their county commissioners will allow any development. And so I don't see the time as being that much improved by the widening. I think it will be more, three lanes of horrible traffic each way instead of two, as soon as all the new development in Weld County and parts of Larimer blend. So if I were running the zoo, I'd go with the commuter rail and the no action alternative on I-25
11/18/2008 CDOT State Hotline	Prefer option a rail. Rail will have a lasting positive impact on land development and encourages density and better use of water and other utilities. It cuts back on the carbon footprints and enhances the sense of place and sense of community. The Longmont rail stations need to be in the city. Do not place the North stop on SH66, but move it to 21st 17th or 9th Ave. Transfer station in the south must tie into FasTracks near the Glenn mill. Need to start negotiation with Brighton RR join RTD in this effort.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>I favor commuter rail by far over everything I the plan. I like the idea of incremental implementation because it can be done, depending on the railroad's mood, it can be done faster and more cheaply to focus on our real transportation problems, and that involves peak hour. We could start peak-hour commuter rail, that's why it's called commuter rail, because it's geared to commuters, and start on that and perhaps in the beginning reach Denver by way of the Boulder line without transfer. Forcing people to transfer trains costs ridership. Not everybody will tolerate the connection.</p> <p>I don't know if the railroad is insisting on a double track alignment all the way. If they are, then there's not a whole lot you can do about that. But would they be willing to do certain passing sidings that would permit a peak hour operation. The railroad calls it an operating window. In other words, would the railroad allowing a perk-hour operating window to reduce the need for all of the infrastructure up front and make the improvements as demand grows. You can fund it as you go, something like that. Prove the value of the service first, and you might find the flow of dollars to more service more easily achieved.</p> <p>Let's see. Regarding the buses, the BRT concept, the last place on this planet you want to put bus passengers is in the middle of an interstate highway, if that's what they're planning on doing with the stations. You have safety issues, the noise of passing traffic, spray when it's wet or snowy, the occasional crash that can vault vehicles or parts of vehicles over concrete barriers. It's a dangerous place to put people. Any bus stations really need to be off to the side, off the line.</p> <p>Buses will never attract the ridership the trains will. That's pretty much a proven fact. They are also very subject to weather restrictions. In a barrier separated lane, all it takes is one petrified driver to virtually bring the HOV bus lane to a halt, somebody too afraid to drive in snowy conditions. You have destroyed any semblance of speed in an HOV BRT system. Same thing, if there is a crash in an HOV lane, you also lose any advantage of that mode of travel. Buses are also far more uncomfortable than a train. And I made my Living on buses, by the way, for over 39 years, so I know what I'm talking about.</p> <p>I would say the primary goal of this would be to get some semblance of passenger rail service operating as quickly as possible. Perhaps the bully pulpit of the governor would help, not unlike New Mexico Governor Richardson, who accomplished commuter rail in basically the blink of an eye compared to the way these projects are going in this state. And I certainly hope that there is an overlap between the North I-25 corridor and the entire Front Range Commuter Rail concept to share expenses for equipment and the ability to run trains through without changing trains in Denver to go from one end of the state to the other, from Cheyenne to Albuquerque, for that matter. There are probably great savings in doing that. And the trains of this proposed service do need to travel on through to Denver Union Station. And for that matter, the idea of not running commuter rail on the Union Pacific tracks from Greeley to Denver really needs to be examined again using the same formula I just outlined for the BNSF alignment from Fort Collins to Denver. I suspect the numbers don't look good for that at this point, but again, a peak-hour service might make some sense with the cooperation of the Union Pacific.</p> <p>When I mention the idea of peak-hour rail service, it can certainly be augmented by off-peak bus services for the lighter load demands between peak hours and after peak hour in the evening, so people doesn't get if they can only use the train one way, for example. This is done elsewhere, where you don't have enough people to warrant the cost of operating a full train. A bus will suffice, tracing the same approximate route of the train. Buses don't have as much difficulty in the off-peak hours, as a rule.</p>
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>Regarding package A the current routing of commuter rail along CR7 will have a negative impact on the communities of Rinn, Wyndham Hills and individual homes. This route expands transportation corridors well beyond existing impact zones. A better alternative would be to use the hwy 119 and I-25 right of ways for the entire commuter rail route. There seems to be little benefit to extending the commuter rail line south of Longmont, rail passengers could transfer to Fastracks in Longmont versus continuing to the Fastracks station in Thornton. A third option that offers general purpose lane expansion and bus service would provide the most service for least cost.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>I live in Denver. Big proponent, package A. We absolutely need the rail piece in this puzzle. Package B, there's no rail piece, and that's a travesty, sad, I don't know. The cost of package A is shown much higher than B. There are some costs that can be changed in package A. You do not need to double track the entire route from Longmont to Fort Collins to make the service work. You can have passing sidings at each station; in other words, at every station the tracks would be split. But you can single track a good portion of that railroad right-of-way. Saves huge amounts of money in capital outlay.</p> <p>The headways will still work with passing sidings, and I'm not convinced you need 30-minute headways peak period to be successful. That's what they're telling me is the reason they're going to double track almost all of that section of track, was to meet 30 minute peak period things. Unnecessary. You can get excellent ridership, 45-minute or hour headways on that track. You don't have to do 30-minute. Save you a huge amount of money.</p> <p>The proposed new track from Longmont to Thornton does not have to be an initial part of this program. It can be added in later when demand and other financial resources are there to do that. Building new track, Longmont to Thornton, is going to be extremely expensive to put in. Those two items, the right-of-way from Longmont to Thornton, and the double-tracking Longmont to Fort Collins, inflate the cost of package A, and it could be the same or less than package B, just using those two items. I guess my disappointment is that they're showing package A so expensive that it's forcing everybody to lean towards package B, when I don't think it's the best answer, meaning they're inflating the cost of package A. It would not have to be done to be successful.</p> <p>Ridership. Historically, the experts that predict what ridership will be on rail transit systems underestimate that number. I know they use a formula, but the formula is wrong. It was wrong on every one of RTD's corridors so far. RTD's ridership exceeded their projected numbers 10 and 15 years down the road on opening day. Historically, toll roads overestimate the number of users. E-470, just in the last year or two, finally reached their projected numbers that the experts said they would have on the day E-470 opened. If in fact you were to take the toll road numbers that they're using and reduce it by 50 percent, and take the transit ridership on the commuter rail and increase it by 50 percent, it would change the whole cost estimates and, I think, be much more accurate as to what's going to happen. That would make package A much more fiscally attractive.</p> <p>I applaud the proposal for commuter bus from Greeley to Fort Lupton or Brighton, I'm not sure where it goes, in package A. Very good. Could possibly be converted to a passenger commuter rail project down the road. Existing tracks there.</p> <p>I'm a big fan of doing something. We absolutely need to expand the highways, in addition to adding the commuter rail on this project. T-REX is an excellent example of a highway widening project with a rail transit connection, rail transit link, also. And it has proven to be extremely successful. This project would benefit from the acknowledgement that the highway expansion and the commuter rail link would make this much more palatable and acceptable and successful to everybody.</p> <p>I'll close with this. Package B leans heavily on the assumption that most people will drive or want to drive to where they need to go and want to go. Package A acknowledges that there is a large number of people that either can't drive, medical reasons or age, the very elderly, the young, people like that, disabled, disabilities prevent driving. And there are people who shouldn't drive. Statistically, we have a huge number of people in this state that do not have insurance or are under driving restraint action, don't have a license. Adding lanes doesn't improve the number of safe drivers, and commuter rail system provides excellent opportunity for people that either can't don't or shouldn't drive to be able to get where they're going.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>I've had family for well over 25 years living in Longmont, however, so I'm very motivated in this area, and I'm very much affected by how the rail travels to Denver. I'm retired from the Colorado State Patrol, so I'm somewhat familiar with traffic. And I graduated from Denver High School, so I'm familiar with the fact that CDOT has actually been talking about widening I-25 since I was in high school in the 1970's north of Highway 7. It just took them 30 years to actually start doing that.</p> <p>Couple, three comments. Package A, certainly much better proposed solution. Not including commuter rail, which package B rails to include, is a travesty, in my opinion. Not appropriate to not consider that. T-REX is an excellent example of how widening a highway and adding a transit, rail transit component can be beneficial, and certainly needs to be considered.</p> <p>I am very much concerned, what I see as inflated cost in package A that makes it look unfavorably from a fiscal standpoint. Specifically, two items that jump out. One is that I don't believe it's necessary to double track from Fort Collins all the way to Longmont initially. You could get by with passing sidings very easily for a vast majority of that and double track at each of the stations and save a huge amount of capital cost. I'm not convinced you absolutely need 30-minute headways to be successful peak period; 45-minute or hour might work. And again, the saved capital cost would certainly make this better.</p> <p>I guess I'll – not trying to go too long here. I'm concerned that – I realize that you guys are stuck with formulas that somebody has determined that you use for ridership transit. The formulas that – every transit thing that's opened up anywhere in the U.S. in the last ten years that I'm aware of, the ridership has exceeded the formula, or the prediction. RTD certainly proved that. On every corridor they've opened ridership exceeded 10 and 15 years down the road on the month they opened. Interestingly enough, toll roads, e-470 specifically, has never reached it's projected – actually, they did finally. Two years ago it reached the number they were supposed to open with well over ten years ago. So if you were to change your numbers a little, i.e., say maybe 50 percent more people ride transit than you think, then maybe 50 percent less cars use toll roads than you think, your numbers are going to be much better for package A. I realize that the formulas are controlled by somebody outside, nobody gets to come up with a best guess. But statistically, where they've done studies where a bus has been put, or a train, a train usually takes more passengers by a factor of four over what rides a bus, meaning there's an awful lot of people that would much prefer to be on a train and have no desire to ride on a bus.</p> <p>I've written up some comments and other things, so I'll quit there. But I really think package A is your only solution, and I'm disappointed that package B rails to include the rail component. I guess the last thing is, you could in fact use the rail as a mitigating factor for while you put I-25 under construction for the five to 15 years it will take to do the work there. And if you had a transit component, you actually provide mitigation. And the feds usually have to give mitigation dollars for that. So consider using that. And implement it by phasing. You could start with some peak period and very little off peak right-of-way and use all the existing track with just a few sidings. There's a lot we can do with commuter rail that doesn't require it all to be built at once. Thank you.</p>
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>I want to register my desire to have package A approved so that the commuter rail, the FasTracks, comes up through Longmont, too, and goes up the 287 corridor through Loveland and all the way up to Fort Collins that way, because I just think that will impact with people. It will benefit more people, for commuters and stuff along the Front Range here, because the population center is along that corridor. And it will help the downtown areas of Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins by connecting them to Denver via a rail system. So I think that will help with all the downtown areas getting more shopping and stuff like that. That's it.</p>
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>Plan A is the logical option. Plan B requires adding lanes to the I-25 endlessly, that has not worked in CA. There is no reason to believe it would work here. Commuter rail works well elsewhere in the county, reduces traffic, reduces pollution.</p>
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>I much prefer option A. I feel that it will lead to appropriate urbanization of our town cores. Option B will encourage more satellite urbanization along the I-25 corridor. This inevitable future population growth is more appropriate at the existing town centers, as would be encouraged by the commuter rail of option A. I think excessive satellite growth will be detrimental to the success of out town centers.</p>
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>And I support package A also. I have some questions about whether things could be phased maybe differently than what you suggested here. I think there's an excellent point about what seems to be very large capital costs for the commuter rail and whether or not those could be reduced by the single-tracking, at least initially, and then later on bringing in the double-tracking. Second of all, initially when this was considered, the thought was to hook up to FasTracks and then go to Denver Union Station via FasTracks through Boulder. Is that in the picture, is that still a possibility, or is that something that's not being considered? Seems like that would give us a way to reduce a fair amount of expense initially, which is the new tracks along 119, then down to north Denver. Then long term, I think it would be good to have the connection. But I hate to see this option taken out of the picture because of the costs if we do a full thing on 119 initially. Then I also had a question about some of the presentation. You mentioned the time it took to go from Fort Collins to Denver Union Station and from Greeley to Denver Union Station. And I think it would be also very interesting to have summarized more of the intra-region trip times which, as Ms. King pointed out, are really the majority of the travel times. You have a fairly small amount of trips going directly down, from the region down to Denver Union Station. What's probably more important is the time for trips from, let's say, Fort Collins to Loveland, Fort Collins to Longmont, within the region. And I think it would be good to get some kind of a sense of the difference in those times as opposed to just the ones from Fort Collins and Greeley to Denver. Thank you.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	And I talked to Long Nguyen and another gentleman whose name I cannot remember, and they were both very helpful and informative. The subject is pavement smoothness. And I encouraged all those responsible in the laying of roads and inspection of the roads to assure that they are produced smoothly. The reasons are not just aesthetic; they are to help retain the integrity of the road surface, especially roads traveled by heavy-duty trucks.
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	<p>Tonight is the first time that I recognized, and I had a concern when I looked at this summary sheet and it showed that there are 22 miles that are still congested even after we spend several billion dollars. So now it's my understanding that the highway portion really only goes from State Highway 1 down to E-470 and that there are not additional improvements down into Denver. And that's why you see a lot of the slides that we saw that include all that congestion down there mixed with what happens on the northern end where the improvement are. SO that information is somewhat inaccurate, because there are no improvements down on that southern end.</p> <p>I also have a concern about the information in here that shows transit market share at 55 percent for package A and 50 percent for package B. And I noticed in the slides it did say commuter, but it really doesn't explain the fact that the North Front Range commuter percentage is about 6 percent coming to Denver. So the 55 and 50 percent is really only of that 6 percent.</p> <p>Also, it says that the average speed, and I kind of assumed that that was on I-25, is around 32 miles per hour for pothole packages, and that looked really wrong to me. However, in explanation tonight, I've been told that that's for all the roads in the study area, and there was a real tiny increase from the no-action plan to those. But that's certainly something different than what's portrayed in this summary of information. Also, the cost per user, which is clear down here at the bottom, I would like to know what calculation, the actual number calculation was used for that. Because I've done my own spreadsheet, and just to let you know, this says that package A, the cost per user per trip is 76 cents, and that's a daily number. Package B is 58 cents. My number for – and this is not using the annualized capital number, which I think is also very important. The only numbers you saw up here was the raw capital numbers. And in fact, case of the operating costs, the numbers on the slide do not jive with the numbers on this form as well. They're slightly less, I think. But my numbers show that for package A, the general purpose lanes, is 37 cents per user. And the transit piece of that is 59.53 a day per user. That's a huge difference. So when you glob all that stuff together, the ending number is very deceiving.</p> <p>I also have a question regarding FasTracks. I know it's extremely underfunded. And I would like to know, if that line is shortened, it probably will not come to Longmont, what will happen then? Or if it's pushed clear out to 2034, or whatever the date is they're looking at they might be able to do that extension, what will happen? It's easy for me to say that I want to have rail with BRT, but when I look at the costs, they're just huge, astronomical in fact. But I don't see where I can pick just one package. In looking at the numbers, I'd like to choose just the general purpose lanes only, because that way I could save about \$4 Billion. If you're talking a billion dollars, 4 billion, that 4,000 Million dollars. That's a lot of money. And at the same time you could take care of 98 percent of the users, because if you look at the total users of transit, it equates to about 2 percents.</p> <p>I think I mentioned the thing about the annualized capital, but I really think we should see those number, because that includes the cost of bonding, and any of these large projects would have to be bonded. Thank you.</p>
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	Thank you for presenting two alternatives both including public transit elements along with highway improvements. We cannot build out way out of congestion through increase highway capacity alone. I favor alternative A for the following reasons of great significance to Longmont. This alternative capitalizes on FasTracks with a link to that rail system. This alternative links existing town centers, strengthening economic development and providing access where people live. Alternative B in contrast would promote sprawl in communities or currently open lands to the East. Transportation links have a profound impact on land development. We should be strengthening existing communities.
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	If BNSF choose not to allow commuter rail what are your options? IE.. I-25 rail, US 287 rail?
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	My concern is with package A. We haven't discussed this with Burlington Northern Santa Fe, whatever you want to call the railroad. The problem is with FasTracks they're trying to negotiate now, and in the future you're going to have to negotiate. That's a profitable rail line from Denver to Cheyenne, with stops – my company that I work for is moving to Berthoud. We're going to have a rail stop in Berthoud for newspaper paper, and that you have to -- there's only one line going through Berthoud at this point. SO I don't know, I don't know what the explanation for a commuter line when it's a freight line only at this point. But you're going to have to look at the accessibility of going two lines at certain places, because it's just not feasible with one line at this point.
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	Biggest concern I have is in option A, where they show eight lanes north of E-470 and six lanes on I-25 south of E-470. I find that to be logically poor because if you think about I-25 coming south, you would think that the roads would widen as you went south because there's more and more volume as you go south. To sit there and go from four to six to eight, and in the most congested section of I-25 that we have now, to go back to six, I have a phrase, it doesn't pass the laugh test. It's one of those things that the public sits there and goes, this doesn't make sense. And it doesn't. I have been involved in this process through the entire time. I have told them, the state and the consultant, that that didn't pass the laugh test. And since they're still showing it, I'm going to write a written comment to the fact that it doesn't make sense. I'm a transportation engineer. This is what I do, and have done for 30 years. And that is the only part of the study that I think is flawed. The rest of it I think is good, but that piece -- and it's not an engineering decision; it is a political decision. And that's wrong, to be in this study that way, because it's not defensible.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/18/2008 Public Hearing - Longmont (11-18-2008)	My concern is the portion of the commuter rail, why it's being located along County Road 7 versus what seems to be the more obvious option of locating along the I-25 median. And previously a lot of questions were raised about this in a meeting two years ago, a public hearing at that time, and no answer, no sound answers were given. Every answer that was given – for example, they said, well, it would cost more to do it that way. When it was pressed on what the cost was, option A or option B, they couldn't say what either of the costs were. So we were challenged to find out how they could cup up with a decision on cost when they didn't have the cost figured out yet. And my concern, it seems they have a preconceived notion of what they want to do and are making things fit to what they want rather than looking at all the real environmental impacts.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	In my opinion a combination of A and B plans would be appropriate. The train is a must do. The additional proposed lane of I-25 however should be designed as a carpool or toll lane to promote ridership of the train and to encourage carpooling.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	Although there is a temporary dip to gasoline prices, it would be very shortsighted to procrastinate a mass transit solution such as the I-25 train further. We must resolve the upcoming transportation challenges, and the proposed train is an important first step.
11/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My first choice would be commuter rail along the existing BNSF railway. This would be most convenient for many of us who live in the original town of Loveland (as opposed to new development along the freeway). I could walk to downtown Loveland and either travel south to Denver or north to Fort Collins or beyond. This would be good for the local economy, especially original Loveland. It would reduce pollution and gas consumption. While high speed rail would be nice, it is not necessary for the commute along the Front Range. High speed would require new rail. With commuter service we can use existing rail. A first step would be commuter transport to Longmont where we can catch a bus into Denver. However, this would be more time consuming and not as many people would do this. I would love a train that goes right into Denver. While more lanes on I25 are helpful, this is not my first choice. It is time to be progressive and take real action.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	Well, I'm very much hoping that there will be train transportation, and I like the idea of utilizing the tracks that are already here in town on Mason Street. And one of the reasons that I like the train is the quality of life, that when you're riding a train for a distance, you're realizing, and you can read and relax rather than driving. And I would like to see, I just think the ideal would be a train system that goes from Fort Collins through all the towns down to Denver. And I think another plus for that is that would help with keeping the centers of towns vital. I've experienced this living outside of Chicago in the suburbs, and the train station at each town into Chicago was at the center of town. And you get off the train, and that helps with restaurants downtown and keeping the downtown vital.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	First of all, I want to show my support very clearly in favor of the train because I think it's the only safe and practical way to transport people quickly, especially when it snows. I mean, the bus seems fantastic, but in a snowstorm it's kind of out of fashion. However, I want to very strongly echo the comments of the gentleman who spoke in front of me. We're applying 20th century solutions to a 21st century situation. A train going 40 miles an hour just totally – I don't want to be derogatory, but trains go 200 miles an hour all over Europe, all over Japan, all over China, and I don't know why the Denver metro area does not embrace those technologies. I guess I know why, because maybe it's a question of money or whatever. But we're still embracing totally out-fashioned technologies. That's it.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I'd like to thank the group for giving us a chance to ask questions, because, goodness knows, I've had quite a few. And I've gotten good information, so thanks.</p> <p>I'm a proponent of rail mass transit. I say, build it and they will come. When we, my husband and I, were considering moving to the Front Range in 2004, we drove up I-25 through Denver, and I said, they're building rail. We thought, of course, any area where your population lives in a straight line is an obvious place for mass transit, and they're doing it. So, check, got that, moved on. And when we got here a year and a half later and I started reading the paper and I learned that FasTracks was limited to Denver metro, I felt gyped. And so here I am today, missing transit and the joy of taking it that I've had in other places that I've traveled to and worked and lived.</p> <p>I wanted to question that the projected mass transit commuter rail ridership seems really low to me. I understand the surveys were done like 2000, '90s. How many people like me have moved here since then and said, hey, where's the mass transit? (show of hands) Yeah. So we're here now. And then I read that Seattle and San Jose and San Diego were the comparison cities, transit systems. And if I think of one big difference between here and there, it's the weather. Seattle, it rains 300 days a year. Here we've got sun 300 days a year. Put those stations in places where people can walk and bike to and get to, and they will come.</p> <p>This county kind of diverted from the rest of the industrial world about 50 years ago by building highways and becoming a more car-based economy. And it's been a good experiment, but our road surfaces are crummy. And if you think I-25 is bad, come back to Michigan with me. It's really bad there. And the car based economy – and now people have had a credit scare like, seems to have finally hit their heart. People are conserving. And we all know there's a huge global imbalance between us as a debtor nation and other countries as a lender nation, and I would be surprised if that debtor/lender relationship works it out in time for us to ever see credit again like we've had in the last 20 years that have built the car-based economy.</p> <p>Also what came out, about the same time that the study went up on the Internet, the Global Energy Outlook report for 2008 came out, which said the fuel – oil reserves are being depleted at a rate much faster than was projected just a year ago. We also read that projects where the oil costs 70, 80, \$100 a barrel to get it out of the ground and make a profit are being shut down in anticipation of the day when oil will cost that much again. And bottom line for that report was, in 2030 they expect oil at \$200 a barrel. They think people know that. They're looking for options, and we don't have options here. We're looking for options.</p> <p>I'd like to say one thing about air quality. I was, on September 2nd of this year I was up on Long's Peak, that way (indicating), on the shoulder of Long's Peak. It was an overcast day like this, but the ceiling was high enough I could see above the cloud layer and below the cloud layer. And above the cloud layer there was that typical brown cloud that we see, thin, dissipates, you know, we've all see that brown cloud. Below the cloud layer the air was the color of mud. I looked scary. And you can't see it. It's like when you're driving into Denver, you look ahead and think, oh, I'm driving into that? But when you get there it doesn't look that bad. It looked bad. It's here. It's us. We're doing it.</p> <p>So, this being 2008, people are looking for a way to conserve, they're doing things differently. And so I would say give them options. Commuter bus from Greeley to Denver looks like a very easy thing to do. That's your cheapest option. Give those people an option, gets some cars off the road, lets people know how nice that is. Lets Denver know, hey, we're coming, be ready to start dealing with us when we do arrive en masse. Commuter rail would be my next wish. To me, it's worth it to get as close to Denver on rail, as close to Union Station on rail as we can get. So the extra distance past Longmont, to me it's absolutely worth it. And the third step would be to promote the new options as much as we can. There have been lots of studies that said when people know that other people are doing it, other normal people like me are riding the bus, you know, however normal you think I am, they will do it too. I go to meetings. Who else know that Loveland's bus ridership is up 19 to 20 percent over last year? And Fort Collins is up 10 percent. And back in 2001 – 2004, 23 of 31 ballot measures for mass transit were voted in 11 different states, and some of those people will be coming here.</p> <p>So we're missing mass transit here. If we gave that a good shot, we could then evaluate how many more lanes we need. But I say build it and they will come, and they will ride. Thank you.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I'd like to echo a lot of what everybody was talking about already as far as the lack of an I-25 commuter rail option. I'm not a proponent of build-out on I-25, and I enjoy the idea of having dense urban population centers. And I also want to echo the thoughts about the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority, because the project that's going on down in New Mexico that people have referenced is also part of a larger vision for an entire Front Range commuter rail system that would allow us to travel from Cheyenne to Albuquerque on a high-speed rail system.</p> <p>I was down at – there was a conference two weekends ago for the Rock Mountain Rail Authority which a representative from the North I-25 DEIS study was at. But one of the interesting things that they noted in their studies – they did a nice little computer mock-up of what it would be, how quickly and what sort of speeds they would be able to get by using the existing rail lines, the Burlington Northern rail lines that they talked about in this study. And they threw it out. They basically said that this isn't going to work because the speeds aren't there, and people aren't going to ride something if the speeds aren't there.</p> <p>So their main model was to, as this study sort of does, which is come out of Longmont, or either somewhere around the Frederick/Firestone area, and run a high-speed rail up I-25. The beauty of this was this was another opportunity to free up – it was one of the first times I've actually heard an interesting way for us to be able to free up these Burlington Northern lines here, and that was that they would be willing to trade time on their high-speed line that would meet on the north side of Fort Collins with the Burlington Northern lines and then reconnect with the Burlington Northern Lines down near Longmont and allow the Burlington Northern trains to get off of going through the middle of Loveland and Fort Collins and get on the high-speed line and avoid our community entirely.</p> <p>And I think that this is a great alternative, because then it does what we need to do, which is free up those rail lines for regional travel. The MPO has done studies, and you can see that a lot of Fort Collins and Loveland and Windsor and Greeley, a lot of the trips, the majority of the trips that we make are within that triangle. That triangle between Fort Collins, Loveland and Greeley is where we mostly do our travel in this area. And if we want to come up with a viable alternative, we need to come up with an alternative that helps us as individual communities to get ourselves moving forward, but it also needs to allow us the options to get down to Denver, because I do want to go to DIA, I do want to go see a Rockies game, I do want to go check out the art museums. But it doesn't need to be an everyday thing.</p> <p>The gentleman talked about earlier, I don't want to live in a bedroom community of Denver, but I do want to get there. So I would also like to echo the thought that I really just feel like these alternative really were pushing more towards a bus rapid transit and adding lanes. And I, too, have lived around the country, and I've seen Los Angeles and I've seen Chicago and I've seen some of these places where more roads and more roads means more clogging. Even within our own community you can look down the Harmony corridor, and more lanes meant more traffic and more congestion, and it doesn't do anything to free up the space.</p> <p>Yeah, and the other piece that I wanted to echo was the gentleman's comments about safety issues. I think with the first meeting that I was at for this North I-25 EIS three years ago, or whatever it was, we were in this room, and people were showing up late because there had been an automobile accident on I-25 that closed down north I-25 for an hour and a half. So it's the same idea. I believe even at that time you guys talked about how this section of I-25, for the style of interstate it is, is actually one of the more dangerous sections of roads, given how straight, and it truly is, because of the snow, because it encourages people to drive at higher speeds and therefore encourages more accidents.</p> <p>So I just would strongly encourage to hopefully look at some alternative plans to put on a rail through the middle of I-25, as the woman earlier said, before it's too late, before you put too many lanes of traffic in and we don't have any more space, and then we have to start looking at green fields and trying to take over people's properties and eminent domain, and that just not a pretty future. Thanks.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I would like people to consider the kind of investments that many of our communities have made in our Old Towns and our downtowns, and that with that in mind, that this kind of transportation system that we would be selecting tonight could discriminate strongly against the one that we have, the model we have in Fort Collins, if we chose the I-25 centric model, adding more lanes, adding bus rapid transit.</p> <p>If we look back at the function of I-25 when it was built in the 1960's industrial transportation corridor, so that we may think of this in another way as well, that maybe we want the freight moving along I-25, we want the people moving from community center to community center to keep our investment in our Old Town and downtown alive. We've been building this Old Town and downtown in Fort Collins since the 1970s. We've been at it for 30 years. We have just a fabulous destination area. We do not want to see willy-nilly development along I-25 that's driven there because of a choice that was made to add more lanes and to add a rapid, fast rail system along I-25.</p> <p>The other thing I want people to consider very strongly is that a lot of our destinations are not just Denver. We have a university here, CSU, and in Boulder there are lots of university connections. There are lots of people who are moving, if they're not associated with the university, but they may go there because of family, because they have classes there, because they have research programs that are ongoing there with different corporations and so on. So they may be going to one or going to the other. These are linked through the heart of the town, so we have lots of Boulder destinations.</p> <p>The key thing for this area in the short term is to be looking at something like our system A, to be looking to linking our communities, downtown to downtown, Fort Collins to Loveland to Berthoud to Longmont. And for the first phase, it would be a fantastic step forward if we were able to walk to the train, bike to the train here in downtown, Old Town, anywhere in Fort Collins, rather than to have to make a trip to the freeway, which would preclude a lot of us from using a system like that easily. And then in Longmont we address the situation of being able to connect up to RTD and to go wherever RTD goes. I think that's how we should break it up. We don't have that phase here in place now. We need to consider it. And I ask you to go back and to draw up, what it is, package A to include a couple of different phases so that our first real link in Northern Colorado is that easy connection to Longmont and to RTD. Thank you very much.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>Thanks for having this meeting so we can all come, contribute some thoughts.</p> <p>I think if you look at the global picture for economic, environmental, Energy resources, if you do a more global analysis than kind of the pinpoints that we're looking at tonight, and I understand those are important too, but I think if we look at this big picture and we look at a long period of time as well, it becomes very clear that rail transports of people is much more efficient, more cost-effective and fuel efficient than personal cars or buses. The railroad, a rail system is much less expensive to maintain, once it's built, than roads are. Another issue that Mr. Hoffmann touched on I think is critical for the development of the Northern Front Range is that if we encourage transit options only at I-25, that is going to pull sprawl out there, and that's going to increase sprawl and it is not going to support the revitalization of the downtown areas that are currently – the towns along the Burlington Northern route are really trying to work on now. And there's great resources there, but if we don't get the support in terms of funneling people there, those old downtowns are going to die and we're going to have Thornton and Westminster all the way from Wellington down to Westminster. SO sprawl would be encouraged by option B. It would create the same pattern of usage that we see now, which is, it's not sustainable.</p> <p>Personal automobile use, and I think that there is some – the economics are a bit skewed in the costs, because I think when you talk about people, cost of the people using a car lane, a lane to drive their personal automobile on, you're not counting the cost of purchasing the care and purchasing the gas and storing the car and driving it on side streets to get to that main road the same way that you're including the cost of the railcars and all of the stuff that goes into getting somebody from point A to point B on a rail line. So I think that that, it's very deceptive, because you're saying, oh, we're going to slough those costs off on all the people who are going to be driving their cars, so we don't have to include those. But if you're going to look at the big economic picture and look at the economic well-being of this area, I think you need to think about those costs as well. Thank you.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I wanted to speak to the mobility issue and the fact that although it's not really clear, there are actually not general purpose lane improvements on I-25 past E-470, which means that new projects will move traffic along, and then by 2030, or probably even before, the north end of Denver is basically gridlocked for 22 miles. And that provides a real distortion in the data that you see on the board, information regarding the travel time, the average speed, and the operation and maintenance costs, because those are all included for that 22-mile highly congested area.</p> <p>Now, also in this study I like to look for knowing, what do I get for what I pay. Unfortunately, you did not see any boards around that contained any cost data. And there were only two quick slides, and those slides showed only the capital cost and not the annualized cost, which you would think that for a project this large you'd probably do bonding and should include the cost for that financing.</p> <p>So I created my own spreadsheet, and using the same 2005 numbers, and I'll go ahead and just use the capital column only. And for package A, the cost per user for the general purpose lanes per day is 37 cents, comparing that with 59.53 daily for the rail and bus elements. Overall, we would spend \$4 billion more for the transit piece than we would for the general purpose lanes. And \$ 4 billion is basically 4,000 million dollars. That's an awful lot of money. Even in package B, the BRT, requiring the toll lanes, is \$2 billion more than the general purpose lane cost. And the general purpose lanes take care of 98 percent of the users, versus only 2 percent for transit. Even the tolled express lanes cost \$500 billion more to build and operate than the general purpose lanes. The toll revenue from that does not even pay for the operation and maintenance costs.</p> <p>I might think that it would be fun to take the rail, or train, down to Denver, but I really don't see how I could possibly justify those huge numbers. Thank you.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I've been involved with this process, I believe, since the very beginning when they had something at the Harmony library, where it broke into groups and we were supposed to come up with alternatives. Never once was high-speed rail offered and never once was rail on the I-25 corridor offered. They always put rail on 287, where it does not belong. Bus rapid transit belongs on the 287 corridor. SO this program has been stacked at the beginning, as the previous speakers have said, against effective public transit, and in particular, against effective rail.</p> <p>And now after, this has been going for how many years, three years now, or something like this, four years, now in the past year the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority has emerged with viable alternatives for high-speed rail. And the CDOT and the I-25 EIS, or whatever this group is called, has absolutely ignored that. We didn't hear a word about the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority here, and John Peacock, who was here earlier and had to leave – but what is going on? Are you going to try to plow ahead with this outdated technology and put in a pink elephant? White elephant? I don't know what they are. But anyway, I think that attention has to be paid, you have to get serious. This project basically is a bad joke. All it's going to do is take tax money and give us nothing back for it. So what we need is high-speed rail, we need rail on the I-25 corridor, and then if you want to supplement that with bus rapid transit, that could go on the 287 corridor.</p> <p>Additionally, the comments that – I forgot your name already – Robert made about too many stops, at worst, you could have an express service and a local service. But to have every service stop every five miles, it's like riding a Greyhound bus up from Denver to Fort Collins. It takes half the day. It's ridiculous. I mean, this is absolutely outrageous for this Front Range corridor to have no effective public transportation. If you want to get just from Boulder to Fort Collins, it takes four hours. You guys have not addressed the situation, absolutely not. I don't know what planet you're operating from, but it's absolutely, it's absolutely not in touch with the needs that this area has. So thank you. But I really do hope you'll pay attention to these comments.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	I've lived in Fort Collins since about 1974. And I would just like to make two observations about all of this. One is, I'm very proud of the way the city of Fort Collins and Northern Colorado has developed over the last ten or more years. But I'm very concerned about the effect of increased population and transportation on our health through air pollution issues. Fort Collins right now is on the verge of exceeding the federal ozone levels, and ozone is probably one of the more dangerous chemicals that we have to cope with here. Primarily on the Front Range, our biggest source of pollution is the burning of fossil fuel, and mostly through automobile engines. SO I would like to say that I strongly support the extra expense of a rail system because of that. And my second observation is, having lived in other parts of the country, as the lady just before me mentioned with respect to Los Angeles, I've had the misfortune of having to commute to work over long distances in a number of cities. In Chicago I commuted about 75 to 80 miles, very similar to what we have here. I've commuted in Boston and I've commuted in Philadelphia. And there must be some sensible reason why all of these cities survive with a rail system, other than, as in Los Angeles, by simply adding more automobile pollution. So I would like to ask us, or for you folks to look very carefully at the experiments that other cities have been doing with respect to rail solutions. And the New Mexico one that you mentioned is one we should start looking at very carefully. Thank you very much.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	I support package A the commuter rail should run through the existing downtowns of Fort Collins Loveland and Longmont. As energy fuel costs increase it is important that commuter rail services is located close to the town centers and existing population centers.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	Mainly, I want to just make two points. I've been to these meeting over the years, and it seems that even though we talk about the alternatives to driving, the psychology is towards the driving and the cars and the kind of development that that leads to, the kind of widening of I-25 that that leads to. I would like to have us think a little bit more in the future. I've lived in Los Angeles. I know what widening the roads does. And it clogs by the time you get them built, and then you have to widen more, and it clogs by the time you get them built. So I would really like to have us look at serious alternative to the driving. And having a dedicated bus line I think is probably a good idea. I do think rail down the middle of I-25 we were talking about in the 1970's. Didn't do anything then, they aren't going to do anything now. But I still think it's the best alternative in the future when we're looking at something beyond the 20th century.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	What I was telling other people, that what we can do, what I wanted to see is, I wanted to see a locally operated line along the present BN line from Fort Collins to Denver to take care of local traffic, and then to have a line which runs from Downtown Fort Collins out to the rapid transit line for Denver commuters. That way there we get the best of both worlds, we get local transit – because I would say that of the transit that goes up and down, like say 287, it's crowded, and that's local traffic, and that same local traffic can be put on a train. And those people who want to commute to Denver can take the same train. In fact, the rapid transit train that comes up from Denver could just take a turn and come right into Fort Collins, the same way the Long Island railroad does. The Long Island railroad, their trains come right off the Long Island railroad tracks and go right into the New York City subway system. That's what we need here.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I am the section foreman for the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad here in Fort Collins, so I know what we have, reason why we run particular speeds, whatever, okay. Now, to start off, I think we need some nice facts and figures about this. According to Railway Age Magazine, 76 percent of the operating costs of operating the system comes out of passenger fares. That is the most effective system in the United States. The next closest system is the New York City subway system, which operates at 64 percent. Now, we had one of the fellows from RTD come up to speak. And I asked him specifically, why did you build the light rail system down to Littleton, rather than bus rapid transit, which had an incredibly cheaper initial setup cost. He told me that, if we did bus rapid transit, we know nobody would ride it. The only thing that we felt people would ride is a train. The reason why is because it's effective. It's not involved with other traffic. It runs on its own right-of-way. So if there's an accident somewhere on I-25 well, there goes your bus rapid transit system, because you're letting people on this toll road, which the buses go on, which don't know how to drive. So there goes your transit system up in flames. Railroads run 24/7. Doesn't matter how deep the snow is; it runs. In the 50-year history we had trolley cars running in Fort Collins, There was only three days where the trolley car did not run because of the blizzard of, I believe, 1918.</p> <p>So anyway, what we do need is we need something that New Mexico has done. I don't know if any of you have heard of the Rail Runner project that runs from Belen, which is south of Albuquerque, through Albuquerque. The governor there said, well, let's dispense with all of these studies, I've got enough money to build it and run it for three years, and we'll see what we do. It turned out to be extremely successful. And now they're running – they're building a line down the I-25 corridor, down the median strip, from Albuquerque to Santa Fe. And they divert off south of Santa Fe and run on the short-line railroad called the Santa Fe Southern. Now, this system here is going to be done next month. You can ride a commuter train from South of Albuquerque to Santa Fe.</p> <p>Now, our great fear here on the railroad is that the RTD light rail system, and possibly this system here, will be studied to either. Now, last year we had – RTD hired some woman to come, not bad it's a woman, but they hired this group of women to do a historical study. They come from Sand Diego to do a historical study on the line which is affected by RTD FasTracks between Denver and Longmont. They spent like five months doing this, and they had a person working with them being a flagman so they didn't get run over by trains. Now, all they needed to do was ask me or Ken Jessen, and I could have told them exactly where it was and they could have saved millions of dollars.</p> <p>But this thinking here is turning into a cash cow for people who love to do studies. Just do like New Mexico did; build it. End the studies. These guys here come up with all these things about the initial cost. Yeah, rail was initially a cost. I don't know if you remember the slide that was up here. Down in this lower part there (indicating) you saw some railcars. Those are RDC cars; stands for rail diesel car. It's basically the predecessor of the DMY. Those were made in the early 1950s and they're running today. Do you see any 50-year-old buses running in regular service today? The wheels are good for several million miles.</p> <p>Now Also, let's talk about the cost efficiency. Now, it takes us 1.4 horsepower per ton to move a train between here and Denver. Now, I don't know if a bus can move at 1.4 horsepower per ton down to Prospect street. And that might even be downhill. But the whole idea is this 1.4 horsepower per ton turns into fuel savings. It also turns into less maintenance. You can also electrically power a commuter train, whereas you cannot electrically power a bus. Plus, if you double-deck the commuter trains, like Florida has done around Miami, your cost per seat is cheaper than that of a bus. Your initial cost of course, is like double tracking, signaling, things like that, that you would have to do. But what is the cost per mile of adding an extra lane onto I-25? It doesn't work.</p> <p>We need trains, like you say, down the middle of I-25, express trains running. But we also need something that's local too. And I've always been a purveyor of running just a local type commuter train or a light rail type service between Longmont and Fort Collins to take care of the smaller spots. So if you live in Berthoud, you can take the train down to, a commuter train or whatever, down to Longmont and get on the RTD FasTracks and continue your trip to Denver.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>Use both the commuter rail of Package A for the existing urban centers for Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont, and the BRT of Package B for those of us East of I-25. I would love to ride commuter rail to the city but as it is it would be very inconvenient to drive from Windsor to a rail station then take the train south, keep the HOT/HOV lanes along the entire stretch of highway. See if these plans can be coordinated with what rock mountain rail is doing. With help reduce traffic but neither really saves time which is what I know high speed rail would do. Who would run the commuter rail trains? CDOT? An RTA? Private company? It is ridiculous that Salt Lake and Santa Fe Albuquerque have better rail than us, Shanghai China France and Germany all have rail running at 200-250 MPH even our northeast corridor is only 100MPH We have wide open spaces lets take advantage of them.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>I've been following this a little bit, but I haven't – I missed your presentation today. I was coming from work, driving in traffic. (Laughter) But nevertheless, I do want to comment on this, because I have lived in Los Angeles and in New York and in Madrid, Spain, where the rail systems are just really phenomenal. And they do arrive on time, even though it's a southern European country. That's the only thing that arrives on time, is the trains.</p> <p>But it is really – what you see is that when there's any kind of vision made for how their communities are going to grow, everything includes consideration of rail. And it's an option that is always, it's always there. It's assumed. It's not something, do we do this or do we do that. And it's because—and they build their communities around that, they integrated their transportation systems around being able to tie into the rail systems. And you can move so efficiently to really anywhere you need to go. I lived there for three years the first time, two years the second time. We never owned a car. There was no need to own a car to go anywhere in the city, much less anywhere in the region.</p> <p>Obviously, we're not going to get there in Northern Colorado overnight. But I think we need to, as we're thinking about how we want to grow and what kind of communities, what kind of community we want to be and how we want to connect ourselves to each other, this has to be on the table at every discussion.</p> <p>The previous speaker spoke to the question of speed, and this it, I think, a very important issue. People aren't going to use it if they can't move quickly. So you need that, you need to be able to move through, move to Denver in a quick way. But I don't want to – I have concerns also about moving everything out to I-25, because then our growth moves out in that direction in a way that may not be good for our city.</p> <p>So I just want to throw that out. I know it's much more complicated than that, but I do think that rail needs to be a part of our future. Thank you.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>After reviewing what you have up there, it seems like that you're trying to get the train alternative to fail. (Applause) The travel time is absolutely – it's just impractical to go from Fort Collins to Denver in 93 minutes, expect people to do that every day, and then turn around and have to connect with some sort of transportation mode in the Denver area, because we realize that everybody doesn't work in downtown Denver or around the Union Station area. Just go to DIA you'd be looking at over, it looks like over a two hour ride. And again, there's no way a car, no matter how bad the traffic is going to be within the next 20 years is ever going to take you two and a half hours to get to DIA. So to catch a flight, your looking at about four or five hours to leave Denver, which means a 6:am you'd have to leave Denver at 1:00am train, which isn't even running.</p> <p>The whole transit thing looks like too many stations involved once you get south of the Longmont area. We're far enough from Denver, it's got to be redesigned so we're an express train up to Longmont, or maybe one stop below that. And then if you're going to design the train system not as a local train, like a light rail, where in Denver it stops at numerous stops and picks up people, but the distance is short, here you're talking 50 miles to go from Fort Collins to Denver in 93 minutes, that's less than 60 miles an hour. I know somebody in here said they worked – and I was raised on Long Island. The commuter train there does 80-100 miles an hour. And you're talking about a train that's going to go 45 miles an hour, maybe, plus stops. That's totally outrageous.</p> <p>Also it looks like by changing I-25 before a rail line gets in, you're actually encouraging people to move out of the Denver area, to move up here, so they so they can turn around and commute down to Denver. And that's not what we're supposed to do in the 21st century. You're supposed to live closer to where you work. And therefore I think the rapid rail system should come in, of some sort, before we consider increasing the capacity of I-25, (applause) We should be discouraging the use of I-25, discouraging people to move up here to travel down that far distance. It's ok if you want to somehow develop a system, a road system to go maybe Fort Collins to Loveland, maybe, max, Longmont.</p> <p>But this idea that people – when I first moved to Fort Collins, I know I'm oddball, but I was a pilot flying out of Denver, still am, and I was in the Guard in Cheyenne. Well, there was restriction on how far I could live from Cheyenne and serve my Guard duty, and Fort Collins began to reach that limit. SO I picked Fort Collins. And when I mover here, I'm not an old resident, but 1984, I never had a neighbor that ever commuted to Denver. Now Fort Collins is becoming a, shall we say a bedroom community of Denver, which it should never be, number one; number two; the distance is too far, the pollution levels. Everything is just turning against it, and we've got to maybe reconsider that. That's my comments.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>Please, please please! Solving transportation issues cannot rely solely on more lanes of traffic. Transit be it BRT or Rail alternative must be implemented concurrently with more general purpose lanes and HOT/HOV lanes. We cannot build enough lanes to handle traffic forever. There must be reliable efficient effective and timely travel choices to increase mobility between northern Colorado and the rest of the state.</p>
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	<p>Rail service is long over due in Northern Colorado, we need to decrease the amounts of automobile and parking lots. The train should have both local and express service. Trains are more fun. In this study I'm in favor of Plan A or Package A. However there needs to be an express train, a fast train to Denver. So perhaps an express lane to Denver and a local to Loveland, Berthoud and Longmont. Thank you.</p>
11/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>Commuter rail (any transit improvements) belong in the us 287 corridor where there is adequate density for success. Transit in the us 287 corridor supports our downtowns and core communities has fewer environmental impacts, reduces carbon emissions, maintains air quality and allows individual communities to better maintain community character and identity. In contrast improvement proposed for the I-25 corridor do just the opposite. Worst of all they will encourage greater urban sprawl and the merging of cities. At that point no one will want to live here, Signage will read.... You are now entering Meaderiejohnstownwillikenberthoudwindsorlovelandtimnathfortcollins.</p>
11/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>We need to have light rail from ft collins/loveland to denver - the traffic is getting worse and we need to save energy and take care of the environment. it's the answer. they're doing it in new mexico - from santa fe to albuquerque. they are laying the tracks right in the median of 1 -25! lets do it</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/19/2008 Citizen Planners	Commuter rail is the most sustainable choice for transportation between Fort Collins, Loveland, Berthoud, Longmont, and Denver. Uses less fossil fuel to move the most people and things; going through the various community centers will fuel downtowns economic stability and development; Development patterns will be infill and close and non-sprawl development as opposed to I-25 focused transportation; Socially and productively more work and relaxation will be available on commuter rail; Rail connections are possible throughout northern Colorado region in the future; Public transportation serves all income groups and visitors; Air pollution is a concern regarding fossil fuels.
11/19/2008 Public Hearing - Fort Collins (11-19-2008)	I support Package A. This package includes the two critical pieces of new infrastructure needed; First and most important is the commuter rail from Fort Collins to Denver and second promoting the bus transit linkages between city centers. Building larger roads doesn't help anyone just look at I-25. Improving I-25 interchanges should be secondary to the first and second priorities listed above. The trains need to be quick and convenient and allow for bringing bicycles along with you. The rail needs to connect existing city centers. The main thing to keep in mind is to promote connections of existing city centers.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I believe that the initial cost of rail will be high but in the future those cost would be minimized compared to road improvements. The air quality would defiantly be improved using rail. Rail transports more people than busses can one can always add another rail car, light rail will have more of an economic impact on the communities and it would eliminate sprawl because the density would create near rail service. Plan A seems to be the most viable, economic, environmental impact less than Plan B.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I am so liking proposed package A. We so desperately need a system that is accessible, convenient and environmentally superior to our present "hop in the car and drive" mentality. Package A connects the whole north Colorado front range in a way that would make our part of the world a leader in business and quality for life. I see that either plan A or B modernizes the intersection of the I-25 and highway US 34, we often avoid using that one now because of it being dangerously designed (back in the day of optimizing easement before safety) When we moved to Loveland in 1990 I had to bicycle and bum rides to my job in Ft Collins when my car broke down. Now I can ride a bus M-Sat 6AM to 6PM. Now the company I work for is relocating from Loveland to Longmont and I would really like to be able to just hop on a train. Not normal, But I'm a fan of public transportation.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	Prefer option A, strong user-ship will be realized with bringing the rail and bus services through the population centers 85 corridor and the 287 corridor. Option A also will strengthen the community design around a transit oriented development design models. Transit oriented development and transit stations will have a stronger impact for the positive rather than feeding users to the I-25 corridor please assess the access and usability rather than up front capital costs.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I am firmly for least carbon footprint. The public transportation down I-25 which has grown commercially and residentially as Colorado's spine. Fort Collins to Colorado Springs and west from I-25 to Vail.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	If all we do is add more lanes what we will have is just more congestion and future repair. We need to commuter rail through the front ranger communities on existing rail. This will be extremely cost effective. The economic growth that would occur in our downtowns will help pay for the development and we reduce congestion on I-25 reduce emissions and expand transportation options for consumers.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I will attend the public hearing to learn more. I would be in favor of a rail system with an DIA connection.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	And the first time I talked to anyone about rail service along the Burlington Northern line was in 1995. And they at that time had a person who worked for them nationally who was trying to promote passenger rail on their existing lines. Since that time we haven't done much about it. But they, at that point they were very interested in promoting it, sent the guy to Fort Collins, we had a meeting with him. And so I've been thinking about being able to ride that line into Denver and DIA for a long time. I hope that it's not going to take another 18 years. But my comments focus around rail service on the existing rail lines from Fort Collins to Denver. It makes the most sense. It is the heart of option A. And anything else could go away in option A, if that happens, and we would have a real improvement in transportation for the Front Range. That's all we have to do, and we could see amazing, good changes to our downtown areas, to the safety of the people going from here to there. Rail safety is so far above anything the highways have ever been able to do that I don't know why anyone doesn't mention it. If you look at rail safety and you look at CDOT's even, and I've examined that point to point down I-25, there's no comparison. Rail is so much safer. You can do something while you're riding, and your saving energy, you're helping our air quality. It's so convenient. The cost per mile, per passenger mile over a 20 – year period is just so much less than any other way you're ever going to get from Fort Collins to Denver. And I agree that the way package A and package B are set up doesn't show what a great solution passenger rail on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail is. So that's what we need to do. That's maybe all we need to do.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	No action is simply not an alternative; we have begun to learn the impacts of a transportation system that provides almost exclusively for auto travel only. Alternative A is a good mix of upgrades and new services. I question if all of the infrastructure improvements are needed; it seems wasteful, for example, that the interchange at Harmony would need a re-design when that interchange was upgraded in recent years. The reality is that while expensive, rail is the most appealing option in terms of ridership. Enhanced bus service simply won't appeal to the public. I'll pay \$28 roundtrip to take a train to Denver without hesitation. We'll gain that investment back in improved environmental quality. Toll roads, etc. just keep us in our cars. I don't support that. We have to think outside the box in terms of how we get around. It can't be auto-dependent; that is a head-in-the-sand approach in my opinion.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I prefer package A with commuter rail. The on-line place says the existing single rail in downtown Loveland will not be widened to useable rail due to the negative impact on the historic depot building. If that is so, why can't the building be purchased, moved and used for the commuter rail stations?
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	This area will only continue to expand and will need a train at some point. Best to do it now.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I just wanted to give my support of option A for the rail system through the downtown areas of Berthoud, or Longmont, Loveland and Fort Collins. That's both personal and as a business owner in Berthoud. The community of Berthoud, the Chamber of Commerce of Berthoud, we support the option A. 85 percent of the residents of Berthoud commute to their workplace
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We need high-speed public transit--either commuter rail or bus rapid transit--from Fort Collins to Denver and Boulder that runs 24-7 7 days a week. More lanes will only temporarily fix the congestion problem and do not fix the environmental problem. High speed public transit allows those with a long commute to use that time productively rather than simply spending that time navigating a car. Public transit needs to be affordable, clean, safe and efficient or people will not use it. Traditional trains do not work and regular buses do not work well for inter-city transport.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	1) Would like to view summary of Option A and B online--where? 2) In principle, I would like to see Option A advanced, but would like to see details before completely supporting it.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	A train to Fort Collins would be awesome!!! Full support!! Please make it possible to take pets with you...
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to go on record as preferring the BNSF to RTD choice for future transportation. The tracks are already in existence, which would save money, and a train will be better for the air quality and for seniors, physically handicapped, and others who cannot or would not drive on I25.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support Package A in the EIS. Rail transport from South Fort Collins transit center would be a great way to improve travel between Denver and Ft.Collins/Loveland.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	Thank you. And I'm here speaking as an individual this evening. But I have, I would like to urge the adoption of most of option A as the primary alternative, mostly because of a lot of the other reasons that have been stated here already and were stated in the last couple of meetings the last couple of nights. But I want to add one more thing here tonight, and that is the economic impact that commuter rail would have through – for all of our communities. A lot of our communities – Fort Collins has already spend a lot of money, Longmont has spend a lot of money, Loveland is in the process of taking a look at spending a lot of money on our downtowns, in order for us to be able to create a viable and economic downtown to all of our cities, the heart and soul of all of our cities. Commuter rail through the downtowns would have a great economic impact to it for our cities and would just ensure and help ensure some of that economic viability that we're looking of in the downtown areas, in the core areas of all or our cities. And with option A we get kind of the best of both worlds. We are looing at expansion of I-25 and upgrading I-25 as well as the commuter rail through the Front Range. And so you get the best of both worlds with option A. Whereas with option B you are really taking a look at just the expansion of I-25. So for me, option A makes a greater deal of sense economically in almost every way. So that's why I'm urging the adoption of Option A. Thank you.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	And I came here from a meeting with my broker, which is kind of a sand thing to do today. And I see our nation as in big transition. And we don't know where that's going to sugar off yet. We won't know for a while. But we have been a profligate nation, profligate in our energy use and our borrowing and spending and running up of debt as a nation, and as individuals. And that whole house of cards is collapsing right now. Its hard to predict where it will come down. But there's going to be a big shift. And my broker is s saying it may be 2010 before we see any turnaround. When gas prices went sky high, people learned to do thing in a different way. They actually tried riding the bus and riding their bicycles and walking and doing anything they could to conserve money. And they found out that they can do it. The prices came down, and they may go back to the old way. But if they do, prices will go right straight back up again. So people do adjust and they will adjust. I'm a big believer in maintenance, and I think all our highways need to be taken care of. I drove to Maine and back this September, the highest prices of gas. And one of those places, I think it was Ohio, as we went through, it was almost impossible to dodge the potholes in the road. And I'm glad my car isn't out of line, but I'm amazed that it isn't. With the market down, people are paying off their debt and saving money for the first time in a long time, and the era of profligacy is over. So I'm wonder how accurate your assumptions are based upon figures from several years back, a few years back, not a lot. But I think, given the changes that are coming for individuals that plan A is our future, and plan B looks to me like so yesterday.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	<p>Thanks for letting me speak. And first a general comment about the comment period itself. Given the complexity of both the problem you're trying to solve, we're trying to solve, and of the various alternatives and the comparisons, and given that this comment period extends not only over the election period that just concluded but also several holidays, major holidays, I would really like to see the comment period extended by a month to the end of January. I think that would be much more reasonable because, again, given the complexity and the amount of information in the documents, the looking – I've taken a cursory look at the documents that are available on the web, but I have not had a chance to digest them. It's going to take a little while. And I think you really want to make sure that you do a good job of this. So I would urge that to be longer.</p> <p>At a glance, one of the things that I note is that the coupling of the various packages, or the way the packages are contrived, tends to lead to certain comparisons which I think bias the conclusion towards package B. And I think that's very unfortunate. I think when you look at, for example, impacts to air quality, you look at costs, and there are some other factors driving those cost differences as well that I'd like to cover, but I think that that's very unfortunate, especially the inclusion of the expansion, a major expansion of I-25 with the rail option. To me, that seems like an unfair bias towards the outcomes, so towards your list of comparisons that I've seen there. And a lot of people will just really look down the list and see where the checkmark is in the column. And where that is today really predisposes somebody to say, package B must make sense. I think when you really look at comparing, for example, BRT with rail, the gentleman for BNSF has already touched on some of those things, but I think really we ought to compare apples to apples. And that's something that we should do.</p> <p>It's possible that as ridership on the rail lines take off, we might need less investment in the highway itself. Generally, the transit times comparison should look at the timing such as – other timings, for example, Loveland, downtown Loveland and points south and compare that as well. I think just looking from a south transit center, as again, the BNSF rep noted, is a little bit unfair and misleading in terms of overall transit times.</p> <p>Related to that, I'd like to see – understand the transit assumptions especially as they pertain to the bus theater lines that will have to support a BRT. Now, I can tell you as a resident of Loveland, and in having talked to a lot of people in Fort Collins who use the transit up there, most of the – many of the users of the Fort Collins bus system, local bus system, is terribly inadequate. But it's head and shoulders above what we have in Loveland. There's been very little local commitment to local transit. So I'd like to see what the requirements would be and who will pay for those to make that successful and to provide the kind of ridership that rail would obviously offer.</p> <p>I would like to say that I'm glad the record of decision and the preferred alternatives will really consider a phased implementation. I think that's especially important in terms of rail. One of the things that bumped up the cost, I noticed from a previous version of the packages to the subsequent one, that actually pushed the cost to nearly a half billion dollars of difference, have more – high for package A, was the inclusion of the link from Longmont down to Union Station. And I would like to see that treated as if that's a phased implementation. It may be the right solution long term, but we don't know what's really going to happen with RTD. Right now there is ongoing discussions. I think we really need to focus on completing the first segment, with the assumption that RTD will probably be involved in a long-term solution from Longmont south, and take the half billion dollars back out of the equation. The costs become roughly comparative.</p> <p>There really – I want to point to something, I'm not sure if the analysis covered it, but there's been a major investment in Fort Collins and in Loveland, in our communities generally and of valuing downtown, and investment in that. Fort Collins has developed the Mason St corridor plan. Clearly the BNSF oriented line would tag right in with that, that whole concept of investment as well. I think we don't want to do, the last thing we want to do is undermine the downtowns by sending a market signal that all transportation is centered along the I-25 corridor. Terrible, Terrible mistake in terms of the communities overall.</p> <p>It was mentioned about rail crossing times, and I think that was very misleading, by the previous speaker. Clearly, we're not talking about freight lines and freight, long freight trains that move and take several minutes of our time at any crossing in Fort Collins. It's a bigger problem than here in Loveland, but it's enough of an annoyance. We're talking about ten-second passage times for commuter rail. And I think it's something everybody needs to keep in mind. We're talking about perhaps freeing up vehicle traffic time on the highways, as people that can use the rail would use that, and I think the inconvenience would be fairly minor.</p> <p>Another quick point is that the technology for rail really makes sense in terms of our energy picture globally and nationally. It's so much more readily adaptable to changing energy technologies, oil is, that is, as compared with rubber tired transit, and especially, or course, compared with automobiles. The reason for that is the relative number of units that you have to address in terms of changing the configuration.</p> <p>Also, I'm especially concerned about the long-term maintenance costs. We ought to consider that. Right now we're in a sudden dip of oil prices. I don't think anybody believes, in the energy field, this will last. The cost of pavement and of maintaining highways is going to only increase over time. Notwithstanding this little dip we've got going on right now that everybody is very grateful for, we're going to see the long-term picture increasing the cost of oil products, and of course asphalt being a part of that and rubber tires being part of that as well.</p> <p>I'm also concerned, and I hope we'll give thought to, the air impacts of the comparative transit operations as well. Obviously you'll cut down on the ozone somewhat, and some of the emissions, by using transit of any kind. But again, part of the problem is rubber tires on hard surface; the particulate aspects of that need to be considered as well.</p> <p>I know I'm taking a lot of time, but thank you. I'm going to be submitting my comments in writing. I would encourage other people to do that. Thank you very much for hosting this.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	<p>I'd like to comment real briefly. I'd like to follow up regarding the comment period for the draft EIS. I'm a member online of the SmartTrips website. I really engage in alternative transportation in Fort Collins. And I didn't hear about the comment period beginning until today on an e-mail in Fort Collins. There are a lot of us that are having that happen. We've been very engaged in the general election coming up into early November, and a lot of people have been caught off guard. So I would like to mirror Roger's sentiment in extending the comment period until January 31, 2009, for the draft EIS.</p> <p>One of the big keystones of the need for process is the public involvement, and we need to do a better job of reaching out to our communities. I haven't received on e-mail from any of the alternative transportation groups in Fort Collins regarding the process. So we really need to do a better job of reaching out to these communities, getting more of the young people engaged who are a lot – people who are very interested in projects like this, and getting us to these meetings, getting our comment letters out there.</p> <p>I'd like to briefly share an experience that I had. In the fall of 2007 my wife and I became carless. We sold our only car and were going to make a go of commuting without one. However, I work for a nonprofit that works statewide. And I commute to the Denver/Boulder area five to ten times a month. I'm not exactly the everyday commuter that programs like SmartTrips appeal to, where you're paying a fee for a seat in a van five days a week. Unfortunately, programs like SmartTrips don't accommodate people who only commute, let's say, one to three days a week. It doesn't make sense financially for us. And unfortunately, there's not an alternative program there.</p> <p>So I tried every option out there. I tried to steal a seat on SmartTrips from friends that commute, and they weren't comfortable doing that. I tried riding the Greyhound, which is the great bus service that we have to Denver right now (laughter), at noon on the way south and at midnight on the way home. So my wife, my fiancée at the time, was none too pleased when I had a business meeting in Denver in the afternoon and would crawl into bed around 1:45 in the morning, if the bus was on time. Other options I attempted were the bus line to south Loveland and then getting on my road bike and taking that to Longmont, where I could hop on the regional RTD system into Boulder and then hop on another bus into Denver. So that was another option. I also tried one other option where I would commute at 6:00 in the morning with other friends who commuted to Boulder and then again wait until midnight to come back on the Greyhound bus.</p> <p>So we really don't have a viable alternative transportation or a mass transit system between Fort Collins – really between south Loveland and Longmont is where the bulk of the gap is. And I find that hard to believe and disappointing. And I'm really excited to see that we're in this process to where we're making positive progress.</p> <p>As telecommuting and flex scheduling grow, there are more people coming into situations like me and like many of my friends. We need an option to get us all to Boulder, we need an option to get us all to Denver for our jobs, but not everyday. Perhaps we're traveling two to three days a week. So people like me are only growing.</p> <p>And finally, to discuss the financing of the project, I appreciate the in-depth financial analysis by the young lady over here in the corner. I would say that it's important to balance the expense of a program like this. And as she pointed out and as many people pointed out, a rail system is a more expensive option immediately. The long-term costs, however, diminish significantly versus other mass transit options. And quite frankly, the service is much improved. I don't know how much time a lot of people have spent riding regional buses. They can work really well and they cannot work really well. Regional rail transit, however, is oftentimes extremely efficient, extremely comfortable, and extremely cost-effective. And I'm willing to pay that higher service cost for a mass transit rail system in our region.</p> <p>So with that I'd like to close by just saying that I plan to submit more detailed comments after I have time to review the draft EIS, and I plan to spread the word throughout the Fort Collins community so we can get more people at these meetings and more people engaged. Thank you.</p>
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	<p>In reviewing plan A I am puzzled that the eastern buses do not head west on Highway 7 to the transit center so passengers can ride the rail on into Denver? This would cut down on bus traffic to Downtown Denver and maybe riders to catch the train earlier. Also why doesn't the connection from DIA head to the Union Station Transit center? And then riders can choose which direction they want to go from there? Thanks Obviously I favor A as it has better long term solutions for more people from Fort Collins to Denver and points between.</p>
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	<p>I also would urge you to look at option A as the best solution, long-term solution. I don't see option B as being a long-term solution in terms of pollution, population centers, population growth or cost. A train system and not widening the freeway causes less – brings less pollution and runs through the existing population centers. As Cecil was just saying, we need to concentrate in our urban areas rather than sprawl more than we already have. Density in downtown urban areas should be increased, rather than increasing sprawl outward from those centers. The long-term cost – the gentleman who works for the railroad was saying it's cheaper to run the rail longer than it is to buy new buses and build new highways every ten years. You have fewer cars going down in the Denver basin, which helps with the pollution, and also fewer cars running up and down the north corridor here, and that will help our brown cloud. I really appreciate that earlier comments were heard and we no longer would have to go to Boulder to get to Denver. I appreciate that the line has been zigged to the east and on down south. I think that makes a lot more sense. The only comment I would add was, instead of taking the bus from Brighton that go from Greeley to Brighton on down into Denver, take them over to the transit center on Highway 7 so those people can get on the light rail sooner, there are less buses and less traffic down into the center of Denver. Those people have the option sooner to take – get off at the other transit centers and take buses east and west of the corridor. And I also would urge that you do the rail first. I think, again, build it, they'll come. And if we do the rail first, we may see that we don't need to do quite as much expansion on I-25 in terms of highway. Thank you.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	Having reviewed the summary of alternative evaluation it seems package A has been set up to fail. Having seen the cost breakdown we don't believe the number, we need justification of how costs were derived. We also need an independent firm making an analysis of the figures. It seems fair to think we can continue with the process of automotive commuting in these times. In CA Caltrana discovered that the more highways they build the more congestion occurred.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	Very important at this time to come forward with a plan for commuter rail. My feeling is that it is the "little person" who supports public transportation. The Big Money isn't along railroad tracks but out on the interstate. Leaders must look into the future. Even the west cannot continue to rely on gas powered vehicles and more lanes of road.
11/20/2008 Email	Rail transport of people is more cost effective and more fuel efficient than personal car or bus. The rail system is less expensive to maintain once built than roads. Sprawl would be encouraged by option b and would not support the revitalization of original downtown areas along the BNSF line.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I live two blocks from the existing freight RR line in Loveland. I still believe we need light rail from Denver to Wyoming. Buses should be used to take to rail line. I don't believe at all in bus or feeder traffic to I-25 I don't believe widening the I-25 is the solution. We need to decrease over use of CARS and fuels we have to think long term and globally. Look to Chicago, Look to Washington DC. But we need safe quiet zones like Chicago. Would still be able to ride bus through from I-25 toll lane road.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	<p>So tonight, package A or package B, that's the question. And we really have no other alternatives. I have a little analogy about how that might be. It's like we have this big bucket of ice cream. You add in 2 percent horse manure. Now, ice cream has it's pos and cons, horse manure has it's pros and cons, but when you mix them together and you say, pick which half, it's really unacceptable.</p> <p>I don't like package A because package A costs 2 billion more than package B. But you have to dig through all the big books back there on the tables to find this information, because there's no cost information on any of the boards. And the slides that were used only show the raw capital costs. And I think that you all would agree that if we're going to pay taxes, we're probably going to have to also pay the financing. So the annualized capital cost plus operation maintenance for package A really comes out to a total of over \$7 billion. Package B is over \$5 billion. Package A could meet the needs of 98 percent of the users at a cost \$4 billion less by just building the general purpose lanes. But that's not an option. The general purpose lanes, annualized capital cost plus maintenance, is 3,240,000,000.</p> <p>I don't like package A because it will cause more traffic congestion and approximately 60 highway rail crossings from Fort Collins to Longmont. SO if you don't like stopping at the railroad crossings now, you'll have much more opportunity to do so. I don't like package A because it causes 59, residences, 33 businesses to be relocated, possibly requiring eminent domain. And that's considerably more than package B. I don't like package A because it requires fencing of the railway from Fort Collins to Longmont, and that will create a physical barrier through your cities. So if you think about down by the depot now, especially when you have community events, there's a lot of people crossing across the railroad tracks, that will be fenced right up to where you cross the street.</p> <p>I don't like package B, because overall, including the BRT, it costs 2 billion more than simply using the general purpose lanes, meeting, again over 98 percent of the users needs. But that's not an option either. I don't like package B because it costs \$500 million to build, plus the cost of BRT, to satisfy only 2 percent of the users. I don't like package B because I don't like paying tolls where the tolling revenue will not even pay for the overhead maintenance of those highway lanes.</p> <p>Now, I also like to think about business needs. And as you know, much of the transit does not take care of any business trips. I was unable to find out tonight, but there is a question, will the tolled lanes accept any kind of business trucks, any kind of semi tractor trucks in those lanes, or will they be stuck along with all of the rest of us in the general purpose lanes if we choose not to pay the toll?</p> <p>The bottom-line cost, if you want to look at cost per user, I did some calculations, and for package A, the daily cost per user for a general purpose lane is 37 cents. The daily cost per user for the rail part of that package A, or it's actually all of transit in package A, is \$59.53. Now, if you take the annualized costs. Because that's just the raw cpital costs, and I was comparing that with what CDOT has put together, and if you take the annualized capital cost, that number then becomes, through the general purpose lanes, 82 cents per user per day versus 96.64 for the transit elements in package A.</p> <p>So we can either choose to spend 7 billion for package A or 5 billion for package B, with the majority of the users going to be going slower down to Denver by the year 230. Today we travel an average of about 58 miles and hour. Package A drops that to 50 miles an hour. Package B drops that to 49 miles per hour.</p> <p>So maybe the best choice is just to do nothing, take the no-action plan, save a lot of billions of dollars, and guess what, it says we'll still be going 48 miles per hour, only one difference than package B. Neither package A or package B are acceptable.</p>
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I prefer option A. I believe option A would provide better transit options and less environmental impacts I would prefer high speed rail. I don't think CDOT is thinking big enough. I don't think the travel time estimates for option B are correct. On roads it only takes one crash or even a stalled vehicle to stop traffic. Having commuted to Colorado Springs once a week for four years I know this all too well. The trains then need to head up I-70 into the mountains.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It would be great to have light rail from Ft Collins to Denver. I would much prefer light rail over toll lanes. I would foresee using light rail to attend sporting events, concerts, visit museums and go to the airport.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	My friends, family and neighbors in Berthoud and I are all excited by the prospect of light rail connecting our town to larger regional centers. Berthoud contuse its commitment to the walk-ability and livability of our small town and there has been great public support for widening town sidewalks. A rail station n the enter of town would connect our historical position as a railroad center with the future we all hope for one in which highway miles are reduced saving energy and reducing carbon. Package A looks great to me.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in full support of a train between Fort Collins and Denver!!! Build it!!!
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	<p>Good evening.I am the section foreman for the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad in Fort Collins. I've got some comments to offer and some realities to offer. I'm a proponent of rail transit. Number one, the estimated 72 minutes on the bus route from Harmony Rd to Denver is kind of unfair thing, as compared to the train, which I believe too 112 minutes. The reason why is the train leaves from downtown Fort Collins and goes to downtown Denver. This bus rapid transit route will go from Harmony road. So it takes about 30 to 40 minutes through rush hour traffic to get out to Harmony bus station from Fort Collins. So that kind of rounds it out right there.</p> <p>Number two, the route can be made a little bit faster, right now the line is capable of handling trains at 60 miles an hour, right now, without any adjustments whatsoever. Now, there are places where we have curves, and the thing is, the curves kill speed.</p> <p>Grades, or course, kill tonnage. Somebody came up with the idea of running a commuter line down I-25 and possible using that for freight too. Well, because of berth and given all the other stuff, it creates a problem with hauling direct freights. But I am in favor of using the Front Range rail line through Fort Collins, Berthoud, and down in Longmont to connect up with the FasTracks system as a local rail transit system.</p> <p>But as far as rapid transit is concerned, something else has to be done, because of all the towns, all the stops, and things like that. What I would propose is to build a line down I-25, rapid transit high-speed line down I-25, with direct lines that go into the various urban areas. Now, of course any kind of rail construction has an extremely high cost to it, as opposed to building roads. Well, their proposition for bus rapid transit is to go head and allow cars to also use it as a toll lane. That's allowing a bunch of idiots who don't know how to drive in your dedicated rapid transit right-of-way. Now, that is not going to work. The second you have a car accident down there, your rapid transit system goes to heck. Your multibillion dollars goes out the window. There's always a daily wreck on I-25.</p> <p>Next problem is that rail transit is all-weather, so it's going to cost a little bit more. But the price you pay for a rail transit system is well worth an all-weather system, rather than paying a little bit cheaper price and having a fair-weather bus system.</p> <p>Now, I was at the Fort Collins meeting last night, and I was asked to come down here and speak. Now, I've listed the problems on that. Also, of course, is your fuel economy. To take the train from Fort Collins down to Denver requires 1.4 horsepower per ton. Now, that's quite a fuel savings. I don't know if a bus will handle that at all. Also, your infrastructure costs are high in the beginning, but they're cheaper in the long run. I've worked on this section of line for 30 years, and there are some places that I have not had to work on it in a maintenance mode. It lasts that long. There's a picture over there (indicating), says the welcome thing there, if you notice, there's a couple of railcars down there. Those are budd RDC cars. They were made in the early 1950's and they're still running today. Can you find a bus that's nearly 60yers old running? I don't think so.</p> <p>So anyway, another problem is that I'm kind of worried about the RTD FasTracks system. And what the problem with the FasTracks system is, I believe they're wasting the money on unnecessary research. And I hope this is not the same thing here. I wonder how much money went into this easel development over here. (Indicating) And it might be in the millions of dollars. Well, if it's the millions of my taxpayer dollars, I'd like to ask, where's my train? The gentleman over here said he'd been working on this project for 15 years. Now, from my understanding, that the Rail Runner project in New Mexico was conceived about seven years ago. I've got a picture of the project here. (Indicating) They're building track down the middle of I-25 between Albuquerque and Santa Fe, a high-speed rail line. They're doing that now. Bill Richardson basically said several years ago that, I've got the money to build this line and to run it for three years, and we'll see how much of a success it is. It turned out to be a screaming success. Now, you go down to Denver, Take RTD light rail. RTD light rail has the highest operating ratio of all of the light rail system in the county. 76 percent of each operating dollar that is cost to operate that line comes from paying passengers. The next closet is the New York City subway, which goes at 64 percent.</p> <p>Now, I asked the head of the bus here in Fort Collins, how much passenger fares actually pays each operating dollar? 24 cents. That means 76 cents is paid for by us. Now, I also asked the head of the RTD, who came up to Fort Collins, I says, why didn't you build the South Santa Fe line in bus rapid transit, which was cheaper than light rail? And he told me, if we build a bus rapid transit, nobody would ride it.</p> <p>That's all I have to say. My time is up. Thank you.</p>
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I would support the alternative A with the rail. I learned recently that in the Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico, that the Rail Runner system will be up and running as of December 15th, running from Santa Fe all the way south through Albuquerque to suburbs south. I think it's about an 80-mile stretch. And I guess my feeling is, if New Mexico can pull it off, certainly the Front Range of Colorado can do it as well. And I think, I think the New Mexico project was pulled off in a relatively pressed time period, which makes it even more impressive. And I think they had to actually lay some new track. I don't think they ran it strictly on existing freight line, freight track. So anyway, we absolutely have to look at alternatives. I think that we could certainly add lanes to I-25. It will only be a matter of time before they're congested again. Even in this period of declining fuel prices I think that we have to be wary that the cost of oil is going to go up again. Have to continually keep our eye on alternatives. I think that's it.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	The most important factor to me is providing for mass transit. This meets many needs, which have been discussed at length already. Package A provides mass transit in a much preferable way than package B. As I see the route is preferable, it is safer, fewer emissions, not impacted by weather, more comfortable to ride. The capital investments is higher but more lasting, so the long term cost would probably be less. In contrast I see negative effects from package B including, more traffic emissions, impacted by bad weather or accidents, as area grows would probably have to add even more lanes to I-25 Package B chains us to concrete road.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	I lived about 40 miles west of Chicago for 25 years. I still visit there often. The rail system is essential for transportation in that area. I have lived in N Colorado for 26 years now. We need to make use of our rail system. It is a wonderful way to move people easily and quickly please approve package A ASAP.
11/20/2008 Email	We need package A this will provide more efficient transit from the state line to Denver. Commuter rail and bus services will best serve seniors who need transportation services. Building more roads is only a short temporary fix.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	And I came straight from work and didn't prepare anything, so I'll speak off the top of my head here. I think one thing we really need to look at is the future and our carbon footprint. And more vehicles and more fossil fuels, the more we're really damaging everything we have that's great here. I think if we look at Option A and we look at light rail, this is the way of the future. And anyone who's lived in Colorado for a lot of years knows what I-25 used to be like. Way back when I was a child I remember going to Cheyenne, and there was hardly anyone on the road. And you look at it now and it's bumper to bumper. If we continue to widen and widen, what are we doing here? It makes no sense at all. You look at – everyone wants to be a visionary and if we look at successful communities, they have mass transit. We need to have some sort of transit. If we decide ten years from now that's the right thing to do, it's going to be too late and it's going to be too expensive. We need to find a way to do it now. It's the smart thing to do for the future, for the people who want to commute and leave their cars at home. And I think we need to find a way to come up with the money, because it's going to be too difficult and too expensive later. Thank you.
11/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am commenting regarding the EIS statements regarding the 2 options for northern I-25 (Plan A and Plan B). I support Plan A, which includes widening I-25, but also a commuter rail line that will join with another (FasTracks), eventually linking Denver all the way north to Fort Collins. I was born and raised in Denver, went to CSU, and now live in Berthoud. Over 20 years ago, when I was at CSU, there was discussion about the expected growth in northern Colorado, along with recommendations for a commuter rail line from Ft. Collins to Denver. Now the growth is here, and we have no rail line! We must implement this option, as well as the others in Plan A. Commuters WILL use this line, for convenience, cost savings, and to avoid the dangerous drive on I-25. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	My name is Jim White. I'm the Town Administrator for the town of Berthoud. I made some of the comments to the court reported earlier, but I thought it was important for the record, for those of you who took the time, our neighbors who came out to talk about this, to identify the official position of the Town of Berthoud First, and then I might make some personal comments as well. The official position of the Town of Berthoud is to support option A. our town has been involved in this process for five or six years, watching it as it's evolved and paying more attention as it's getting to the point where the options are being limited and pared down to the two that are present, three, I guess I should say, that are present tonight. SO with that our town board passed a proclamation, or issued a proclamation on Tuesday night, on the 18th of November, and they plan to strengthen that resolve and that support through a resolution on December 9th, coming soon. So with that, that represents the official position of the town board. And this is a new town board predominantly, via an election that occurred in April of this year. Prior to this, our other board also endorsed the same option, option A. So it's a pretty consistent and confirmed option in the Town of Berthoud officially that that's our position. Stepping now to the personal side, I grew up in Chicago. There's obviously rail from, great distances from the downtown area to bring people into the downtown to keep it vibrant, still allow them to live away from the city. I've spent some time traveling in Europe, not a lot, but enough to enjoy both the convenience and the comfort of the rail in that county and some of those countries in Europe that I visited. And also I've seen some places here in the United States that have had tremendous rail services. And I think that, I was happy that our town has supported this option. I certainly do personally as well. Thank you very much.
11/20/2008 Public Hearing - Loveland (11-20-2008)	Jim White, Town Administrator for the Town of Berthoud. For the record, I just wanted it to be known that the Town of Berthoud Board of Trustees, on Tuesday night last, I don't know what the date is, the 18th, on November 18 passed a proclamation in support of plan A of these proposed transit options that are remaining on the table. They also indicated at that meeting that their intention is to strengthen the support for plan A through a resolution to be forthcoming, hopefully in the month of December, hopefully in the month of December 2008.
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am happy to see you addressing the issue on a regional level. I vote for commuter rail (high speed monorail?) as the backbone from Cheyenne to Pueblo and DIA to Vail. Raised monorail would have the smallest footprint and the smallest impact on environmental systems and wildlife. It would probably be the safest, too. High speed commuter rail would move the most people the quickest with the least fuel. In addition rail service is more enjoyable than bus service. Adding more lanes to I-25 will just perpetuate the existing problems as population increases.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As a resident of Weld County, living 2 miles from I-25, I would not like to see it continuously widened. I drive from Golden to Loveland twice a week, and even where there are already 3 lanes, the driving is still crowded and stressful. I want to be able to sit and relax on my way to Denver/Golden or to Loveland/Berthoud. If I could catch the train from any northern Colorado city into Denver, it would make my life much easier. Also, since most of the traffic on I-25 lives in communities like Berthoud, Loveland, Fort Collins, Longmont, Greeley, etc, why not have a commuter train that goes through each of these communities? Imagine how simple and stress-free that commute would be? Initial cost wouldn't be to expensive either, the tracks are already there. Safety in commutes would increase as well, as vehicular accidents are more and more prevalent with more and more crowded highways. Also, a train that stops in each of these towns will boost the economies. The easier it is to get to the downtown areas, the more likely consumers are to go there and spend their money. I know Berthoud and Loveland are struggling with keeping their downtowns up and running. With a train bringing hundreds, possibly thousands to these towns a day you can see the benefit. Another lane on a highway does nothing for these communities except add stress, and more construction to drive through. Look at Europe. Switzerland has a train going to each little hamlet it its country, and all of them are thriving due to the ease of getting there. Please consider economics and ease of commute instead of drive times and only vehicular traffic when you plan Northern Colorado's future.
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	A commuter rail or light rail system between Fort Collins and Denver would be great. I prefer the train over buses, due to speed and comfort. The only problem with a I-25 line is that ignores Boulder/Longmont/Loveland and the existing light rail plan to connect Boulder to Denver. This may be another viable option (Fort Collins to Boulder).
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am VERY interested in commuter rail along I25. I think it is a GREAT way to link the front range and make it more accessible.
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We should have had a rail system along the Front Range years ago! The traffic is out of control, and when you consider the number of drivers who are drinking and driving on their way to/from major sporting events, etc. it adds to the problem that is I-25. I recently saw the rail system going up between Santa Fe and Albuquerque. We should be able to do a similar project here and I know of many people who would take advantage of being able to travel along the Front Range in such a way.
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I prefer package A for the alternatives.
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to express my opinion and vision for the regional transportaion system in Colorado. I believe a rail is the best solution for commuter traffic for several reasons: 1. It doesnt congest an already congested expressway. 2. It is more convenient and comfortable therefore will likely be used more frequently than a bus. 3. It is a model for 21st century transportation.
11/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	While more lanes to I-25 are inevitability necessary, I believe a rapit transportation method that operates independent of the traffic jams on I-25 is necessary, such as a train. In order to be effective and useful, adequate numbers of trains, frequent schedules, and broad hours of operation are necessary. Trains to the airport, downtown, and to major venues in Denver would be well used.
11/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Good afternoon. I'd like to express my support for options you are considering that include a mass transit aspect (light/commuter rail or Bus Rapid Transit). Over the many years I've lived up in NOCO, traffic has continued to expand beyond our ability to create new roads/new lanes. Furthermore, at some point we will reach a saturation level, so I believe we need to begin investing now, at least laying down the future capacity for mass transit, before it it too late an too expensive. Thank you.
11/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Any commuter rail system from Northern Colorado to and from Denver can only improve existing the problems of:congestion, pollution, hwy costs and accessibility.
11/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Hi, I currently live in Fort Collins and commute to work in Boulder 5 days a week. I have been a resident of Fort Collins for about 4 years, and made a conscious choice to continue living there rather than move because I feel the quality of life is better for me I am looking at this process from two perspectives: one as a citizen of northern Colorado, and one as an expert in environmental policy. Citizen view: Driving is stressful, expensive (car maintenance, gas, etc), and can be unpleasant in certain areas along that commute. I'd give my left foot to be able to relax on a train and do my work while riding to Boulder and home each day. I could save putting wear and tear on my car for other things, rather than just getting to work. Environmental policy expert view: Putting in a train that would run from Fort Collins down to Boulder and Denver is the right choice because it will bring further economic vitality to areas that don't see much traffic, such as Loveland, Berthoud and Longmont. People could move to areas that are more comfortable for them, spend money, and yet continue to work where they choose. Furthermore, air pollution would be reduced several times over because the number of people who commute from north to south and vice versa who would instead ride a train is more than enough to displace the byproducts produced by a train. The studies that were done and have been presented do not take into account the recent growth in the area or the number of people that do not use Hwy 25 for their commute. The train could be run electrically, on steam, or by using a cleaner form of diesel. Think about what it could do for the economy up here and how it will help us clean up our air quality. Putting in a train is the right choice for northern Colorado.
11/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I vote for plan A and plan B. I would love to be able to read a book on my way to Denver because I was riding in a train or a bus, instead of increasing my chances of heart disease from the stress of driving in I-25 traffic!
11/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am strongly in favor of commuter rail to the South Fort Collins Transit Center.
11/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am very much in favor of Plan A, we need light rail deperately. Our region needs mass transportation!

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
11/25/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have a comment relative to commuter rail alignments: I believe it is of critical importance to have stations located at population centers and not along interstate freeway alignments for several reasons: Freeway alignments usually have very low pedestrian densities outside of major metropolitan areas, they serve auto and not pedestrian oriented uses, they require more intermodal (car/bus/train) changes than will happen at urban stations (pedestrian / bike / kiss and ride), they require more parking capacity for single uses (commuters). Fort Collins will flourish and the rail will succeed if the alignment connects through the heart of the city and is not relegated to the far fringe of the community. I would be happy to be able to have further input.
11/26/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please note that these are my personal opinions and not necessarily the opinions of the LCGPC as a whole. It is imperative that we take the long view when developing transportation infrastructure. To that end, I believe that Package A would be more sustainable and more environmentally friendly than Package B. Therefore I am very much in favor of Package A. The use of rail along the BSNF corridor, as opposed to increasing the use of internal combustion engine vehicles on I-25, is clearly more desirable. We must move in the direction of disengaging ourselves from foreign oil supplies, as they will become more and more volatile and scarce in the future. While I do understand that rail transport still may use petroleum fuels, it does so more efficiently. Additionally, the increased development of commerce and services along a rail line would create a more congenial urban environment than to place all north-south transit along the I-25 corridor.
11/27/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We need to quit expanding I25 after this last phase of having 3-4 lanes. We need a commuter rail that uses the existing BNSF line. It would help the economics of downtown economies and create a parallel transportation system that decreases the traffic on I25 and the feeder routes. Keep more \$ local and helping ALL communities both financially and more importantly with their quality of life. If you can get off in the downtown area you usually decrease your travel impact by 1 mode of transportation. No more traffic lanes on I25! Let's move to commuter rail on an existing line, BNSF. Let's say yes to a mode of transportation that does not use Petroleum.
11/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	accidental injury leading to lay-off? working nightly, with c-dot and aggregate industries.
12/2/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Hello, I just wanted to submit my comments in the hope that it will help with this effort. I live in Fort Collins, and for the last 8 years have had to commute to either Denver or Boulder for work. I use the VanGo program based in Fort Collins, which has been a huge help. But I think that the long-term vision needs to be toward getting a high-speed train line going from Fort Collins through Denver, all the way to Colorado Springs, and it would be even better if there was also a line from Denver to Boulder!! I am more than willing to do anything I can to help make this happen, so please feel free to contact me if there's anything I can do!!
12/2/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My wife and I support sustainable mass transit alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle. We would like to see commuter rail using the existing lines - it's a practical use of existing resources and makes good sense. Thank you for your consideration.
12/2/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I want to encourage quiet zones or better rules on train horns. Some engineers are courteous during the night hours and others are loud and long. Huge impact to our neighborhood and quality of life (and sleep)! Increased train traffic will only make a bad situation (already) much worse. This should be addressed for the current situation - but resolved completely before additional trains are added to the system. Overall, we support the concept of rail - and alternative transportation, but the sleep deprivation must be tackled.
12/2/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Tables 2-2 and 2-9, summarizing the interchanges, appears to have switched the descriptions of Crossroads and US 34. The tables show Crossroads currently as a substandard cloverleaf and US 34 as a substandard diamond. Crossroads is a diamond, not a cloverleaf. US 34 is currently a cloverleaf. Thanks and good luck
12/4/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I wanted to comment on the draft North I-25 EIS options. I live and operate a business in Berthoud. I feel that option A, putting commuter/light rail down the existing rail corridor as well as providing mass transit along the Hwy 85 corridor is the preferable option. The communities that have developed west of I-25 including longmont, berthoud, loveland and fort collins are in proximity to the rail which would help greatly in supporting the idea of mass transit in Northern Colorado. To place the primary N/S mass transit corridor along the interstate creates a requirement for each community to build infrastructure to accommodate commuters from the community to the interstate. More roads, parking lots etc. I feel strongly that Option A will increase the success of this project long term as well as supporting the health of the communities in Northern Colorado. Thanks.
12/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Using existing freight rail lines would be the cheapest, and most popular amongst urban and suburban dwelling commuters. Take the freight traffic out east rural, make all urban lines passenger rail. Save billions of dollars and billions of tons of CO2 emissions. Make the trains bike friendly.
12/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A with rail along 287.
12/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to express my strong support for Option A of the North I-25 project, especially the rail line. Thanks

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/5/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to express my preference for an option that includes rail service on the front range especially using the corridor already available through the towns of Fort Collins, Loveland, Longmont and into Denver. My dream is to someday take the train from my hometown of Loveland into Union Station in downtown Denver, attend a Rockies game and come home the same way. What a pleasure to not have to drive that trip at all! I am a newly reformed mass transit commuter on the Transfort bus system between Loveland and Fort Collins. I have been riding since March 2008. The stress reduction is definitely worth the extra 30 minutes on my one way commute. A similar opportunity to commute between the downtown areas of the front range communities would make day or weekend outings so much more pleasureable. Not having to drive out to the present I25 corridor, but bicycling or walking to the downtown rail station would be another plus for me and my wife.
12/6/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Hello I would be in favor of commuter rail with DMU's being used as the trainsets. DMU's can be used in favor of locomotives pulling passenger cars. DMU's are quieter and more fuel efficient than conventional locomotives. DMU's are by far less expensive to purchase and operate when compared to electrical light rail trains. DMU's although diesel powered, are capable of meeting Tier 2 and 3 pollution compliance. With great advances in research on bio diesel, a fleet of DMU's can be easily converted and flexible fuel capable. DMU's can also be more easily maintained compared to conventional locomotive passenger consists, as a work force familiar with maintaining bus fleets, can maintain a DMU, as the engines in a DMU are similar to what is used in a bus. Both BNSF Railway and Union Pacific have shown they are willing to co-operate with commuter rail agencies, by sharing trackage rights. Let us not squander this chance, while the host railroads are willing to help. Thank You.
12/6/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My husband and I strongly support Option A,as commuter rail provides the best long term solution.
12/7/2008 North I-25 Web Site	To say that this process is moving at a glacial pace would be too kind. I started working with groups 15 years ago trying to get Front Range passenger rail going, and people have been asking for it louder and louder since then. Still it doesn't seem to be any closer now than it was then. This has been studied to DEATH, and the money that has been spent on these studies could have bought used locomotives and cars, and we would have service NOW. Bill Richardson became governor of New Mexico, and when he found out how long and how expensive it was to get the feds involved just did it on his own. Within a few months New Mexico residents had the rail service out of Albuquerque they had been asking for, using and upgrading existing tracks. It will soon be extended to Santa Fe, and NM has asked CO to join in, but we are dragging our feet with study after study. When will we quit throwing all this money away on studies and just do what the taxpayers have been asking for for at least two decades? New Mexico has shown it can be done without having to study it to death and make it all so unnecessarily expensive and difficult!
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Would like to support Option A
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We need this, the sooner the better
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am strongly in favor of a commuter rail system stopping in Berthoud. I would make use of it several times a week and depending on exactly where it stops would even use it for my daily commute to work.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in support of Option "A" for a Commuter Rail System from Fort Collins to Denver with a stops in Loveland, Longmont and in Berthoud !!!
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I wish to urge you to choose Option "A" for the Commuter Rail System from Fort Collins to Denver with stops in Loveland, Longmont and Berthoud. This "Golden Corridor" of vibrant cities/towns is gaining a great reputation. Fort Collins & Loveland have both received high marks in many of the "Best Towns to Live" publications for various criteria. This commuter rail system will solidify that reputation and enhance the entire corridor for the Northern Colorado economy. It is by far the best option. Thank you.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would recommend that you go with DMU (Diesel Multiple Units) technology as opposed to buses.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am writing to voice my support for Option "A", a Commuter Rail System from Fort Collins to Denver with stops in Loveland, Longmont and Berthoud. I have been a resident of Loveland and Berthoud for 34 years and a builder and developer for 10 years. I think this project is very important to our area and would be a great addition to the transportation system in Northern Colorado.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to support the train option instead of further widening of I-25. Wide freeways are the past and will be obsoleted oil reserves are depleted this century. We need to invest in the future and I believe electric trains are part of it. I have traveled in Europe and hate to see them so far ahead of the US in this and other areas. Jim
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in favor of option A.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Thank you for exploring two mass transit alternatives for travel on I25 north, and for encouraging public input. I strongly recommend your option A - the addition of commuter rail to current options. Japan and European countries have demonstrated the effectiveness of commuter rails, with high-speed, light rails. It is time for the US to catch up. Not only will this option be best for the environment, it will add jobs to our economy. Thank you.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in support of Option "A" for a Commuter Rail System from Fort Collins to Denver with a stops in Loveland, Longmont and in Berthoud !!!
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Option A is my preference.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Option A for the North I-25 Project
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I feel this would be a great service to all the front range communities. It would especially help students and the elderly who otherwise are unable to commute. Rhis would certainly improve Front Range economy.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to see Option "A", with stops in Longmont, Berthoud, and Loveland.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Option A re commuter rail service between Denver and northern Colorado, including Berthoud.
12/8/2008 CDOT State Hotline	Both husband and wife prefer package A
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'm hearing talk of commuter light rail between Fort Collins and Denver. True? What's the timeline?
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'm writing to express my support of Option A for a commuter rail system which stops in Berthoud
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Option "A" for a Commuter Rail System from Fort Collins to Denver with a stops in Loveland, Longmont and in Berthoud !!!
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I prefer alternative A, primarily because it begins moving toward light rail, which I think is the primary direction for mass transit in the future.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The section of I-25 between Longmont and Fort Collins is just plane scary . . . ways to make it safer would be greatly appreciated - I currently avoid it at all costs. Merging traffic and trying to take the exit at Centerra is putting your life at risk. Would love to see things safer.
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Would love to use a commuter system!
12/8/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly recommend that a light rail system be implemented in the North I-25 corridor with a stop in Berthoud. Light rail works very well where already in place in Denver, as well as in other cities around the country. This is the most far-sighted option.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Passenger rail through Berthoud to the Denver metro area would reduce traffic flow on I 25 / US 287 / etc. reducing pollution, traffic congestion, and traffic accidents which result in injury or death. It would also reduce the demand for Denver metro parking; allowing areas used for future parking to be developed for commercial, residential, open space or public parks.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	For the record.... This issue of commuter-bus vs commuter-rail is a NO-BRAINER! When you set short-term funding aside, commuter-rail is the very best choice for the following reasons: 1) It permanently removes commuter congestion from the I-25 corridor. 2) Rail service is: fuel-efficient, dependable in all weather, faster, and safer! 3) This service would provide a positive continuing benefit to each of the cities served, not to mention the public in general. 4) The institution of this service would provide incentive to the Regional Transportation District to honor their promise to the taxpayers of Longmont and Boulder County to provide commuter-rail service to our region too.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Great idea, This would remove a need for more lanes on I-25
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Having a commuter rail line on existing tracks that go thru the cities seems more logical than sending buses out to I25.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I, as a business owner in Berthoud, would like to see the commuter rail completed with a stop in the township of Berthoud. The commuter rail will provide greener use of our state's energy than will motor vehicle use only. Thank You for considering Option "A" for the I25 northern region.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please bring rail services that easily connect with RTD to the communities along the North I-25 corridor.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The rail option is the way to go. This is the easiest way to move people. It will also reduce the amount of cars on the road. Save fuel and reduce conjection.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I urge you to adopt Package A--the commuter rail option only. This will not only reduce congestion, but reduce gasoline useage and improve safety. We don't need more roads, we need more public transit!
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	i am in support of a lightrail or gold line route going north - especially to Berthoud!
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As a resident of Loveland and a professor of Environmental Studies at UNC, I would to promote my support of the the CDOT Northern I25 Draft Environmental Impact Study (NI25 DEIS) PACKAGE A. This is a long overdue plan for easing the transport problem of the I-25 corrdor between Denver and the north -central Colorado Communities. I know personally from using light rail in other cities(both U.S and internationally) how it eases not only transporatation problems, but also promotes movement of the people in outlying communities to the city, thus invigorating the whole region. Many thanks.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am a Longmont resident and I prefer Package A for the following reasons: * It will create transit-oriented development (TOD) opportunities in Longmont and all other communities with commuter rail stations. These TOD's will be very close to, if not in the town centers of each of these communities, resulting in a more economically vibrant town center. * Because the stations are in town, many driving miles/year will be saved vs Package B where commuters are required to drive or bus several miles to I-25. * It will create a more direct rail route (than Fastracks) from Longmont to Denver, for all communities from Longmont north. * It will tighten community ties for all communities connected by rail. * The right-of-way and at least one rail is already in place. This saves years of work and lots of money. * Rail cars being manufactured in Ft Lupton will create jobs in a rural community. By contrast, Package B will encourage increased traffic on I-25. This continues the positive feedback loop of more traffic, build more lanes, more traffic, build more lanes, etc.. This mistake has been made in many cities across the nation, and I hope that CDOT will study these cases and not repeat these mistakes. Industrialized countries throught the world depend on rail as a link between city centers, and the stations themselves as centers of commerce. Let the Front Range be a leader in commuter rail in the New American West.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to see a rail system built to ease the traffic on 1-25. I know I would use the system to go into Denver and also to the airport. Coming from an urban area (Washington DC) I would love to see alternative transportation methods in Colorado.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As a resident of the Front Range, I strongly support option A for North I-25. I believe having the commuter rail system for public transportation along the Front Range will not only be best for the environment, but it will also be best for business and commerce. It will attract businesses along the rail corridor near the stations. Riders will be able to reach their worksites, as well as restaurants, retail centers and entertainment venues with minimal environmental impact. Thank you for your consideration.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have lived in Colorado for 17+ years and traveled from corner to corner with children in travel sports. My children are in college and essentially out of the house, but my desire to take the time to explore the front range has grown. I don't want to drive with one or two in my car when I could sit back and ride a train. I was an army brat growing up and have lived and visited around the world. The transportation alternatives were wonderful where I could take advantage of trains and subways. It is also healthier for the environment as well as the body. I support option A with the train stations centrally located where the people live. My parents live in the Northern Virginia area and with the expanded train services there they rarely take a car into DC. It is so convenient. Thank you for an opportunity to comment.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I think that transportation issues will vastly impact all areas of our lives. I think we need a fast moving, rail system that ties into true needs of our citizens.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I read an editorial describing two options for I-25 transportation improvement. Option A was described as a rail project, connecting northern cities by train. The other was a 'park and ride' idea. I am greatly in favour of the rail concept, as it sounds like something I and many people I know would be able to use frequently. America needs to utilise rail lines more frequently and more efficiently for passenger use, as has been done so successfully in Europe. Thank you for your time.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'd like to convey high support for Option A adding lines for commuter rail to I25. It uses existing rail corridor and connects towns where people already live. Thank you for your hard work on solving tough problems. I'm a senior citizen and need reliable non-car transportation options.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We are definitely in favor of the commuter rail, Option A, alternative.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I urge that you support Option A in the transit proposal.It is essential that we have commuter rail along the Burlington Northern Sante Fe rail corridor.
12/9/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I encourage the adoption of Package A. I live in Loveland, but my employer is on 119 between Longmont and Boulder, and I have long wished for a mass-transit option between Loveland and Boulder. I think that Package A would be welcomed by many commuters who travel among the northern front range cities. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on this EIS.
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Why is there just the two options, A & B? Why can't you just widen and do basic improvements as you have done north to Longmont?
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I believe we are 10 to 15 years behind where we should be in moving people in N. Colo. Our plans should include passenger rail using the Burlington line running from Ft Collins to towns along the front range to Boulder and Denver. Additionally we should be looking at high speed rail running from Wyo along the I25 cooridor into New Mexico. We should never consider an additional highway bypassing the Front Range communities to the east. This would only add to urban sprawl. If Europe can build a "Chunnel", we can build a tunnel under the Continental Divide, connecting to Summit County and beyond. We need to think about something like a phone network for rental cars which would allow people to "subscribe" to means of traveling beyond mass transit stations depots. The sooner we get development projects into thinking about centralizing versus sprawling, the better.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Doing nothing is not an option. Demographic projections indicate a significant population increase in the north Colorado front range in the next several decades. We must plan accordingly. Which ever solution is arrived at, the process at arriving at the solution needs to consider the long term operating cost of each alternative and identify the funding mechanism for each well in advance of moving forward. It is unreasonable to create a "mass transit" only scenario for the northern segment of I-25 but then expect the users of that mode to bear the entire cost of the provision of that service and not provide an alternative that allows a choice - ie individual vehicle useage. I fear that the inclusion of one alternative at the expense of another will only serve to degradate the quality of life in northern Colorado by making travel in and out of the region unbearable. More lanes need to be added to I-25. The rail or bus alternatives are interesting but will the proposed rail/bus system be comprehensive enough to be seen as a "useable" alternative to automobile travel and will it be seen as cost beneficial? I don't see how the discussion can be held about selecting an alternative from one known mode and two unknown modes without studing the cost resistance effects of each mode.
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	NFR travel plans - as someone who travels from Denver to Ft. Collins for business and to see family, I feel strongly that we need alternative forms of transportation. The latest lane addition to I-25 is now congested and people travel 80 - 90 mph - making it a dangerous stretch to travel. In addition, the use of the train and bus are readily implemented ideas and will avoid the costly and challenging highway construction projects. This would provide a greener approach as well - encouraging people to avoid more pollution. We are becoming a big metro complex with many webs - so lets step up and use the train/bus alternatives that many bigger cities already have incorporated into their plans. Please accept my strong vote for a train option - espically with the expansion of the light rail, a train using existing tracks would develop a web of excellent routes for travel. I strongly support Package A, with proposes passenger rail service using the BNSF rail corridor that presently connects Fort Collins, Loveland, Berthoud, Longmont and Denver Union Station. It also provides for commuter bus service between Greeley, Denver and DIA as well as improved local feeder bus service and a new vehicle lane on I-25. Thank you.
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I believe mass transit system is in the best interest of all communities, rail and bus.
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I spoke at the meetings at both Loveland and Ft. Collins. It seams that the overwhelming opinion was to have rail transit and that the taxpayers were willing to pay for it. The fair weather bus system may be cheaper to build but it does not provide as much economic stimulus as rail transit. Dr. Beverly Scott, general manager and CEO of Metropolitan Atlanta Rail Transit Authority notes that studies have shown that every dollar invested in rail transit generates six dollars in economic return and every billion dollars invested in rail transit creates 35,000 jobs. Rail transit ridership has grown by 32% since 1995. My source is the November 2008 issue of RAILWAY AGE Magazine. My fear is that so much money will be spent on studies that most of the money will be consumed to the point that there will be only enough money to build an inferior bus system contrary to the public desire. The news that I heard about FAST TRACKS is that so much money was spent on studies that the completion of the rail system can not be completed as planned. They say now that the line can not be completed to Longmont as planned however will end at the Flatirons Mall in Broomfield, some 24 miles short of goal. This may doom the whole project to failure and cause taxpayers to reject future rail transit plans. End the studies and stop wasting taxpayer money. Just shut up and build the rail system that the taxpayers want.
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	More than anything, I would love to see a fast train running from Wyoming to New Mexico -- or at least from Fort Collins to Denver or Colorado Springs. My husband and I live in Fort Collins and almost never go to Denver because of the drive. And I can only imagine how hard it is for people who have to commute daily. A train would provide a way for people to quickly get to Denver without polluting in their cars. It would certainly get people off the road and it would also let people read or sleep or talk, without worrying about other drivers. A fast train really makes sense. Do it now, while you still have room down the middle of I-25. Otherwise, Colorado will go the way of California -- adding lane after lane to their freeways and only increasing traffic. What a disaster!
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have looked at the proposed changes to the US34 and I25 interchange and I believe that the public would be better served if the phase 1 and phase 2 proposals were swapped. I say this NOT based on timed traffic flow, but on safety. Merging 25 mph traffic into and out of 75 mph traffic in such a cramped and busy space as the cloverleaf (designed for 1960's - 1970's traffic volumes) is just asking for severe/fatal accidents. I would personally like to see that interchange blown up tomorrow so the rebuilding could start sooner. I don't think waiting 20-30 minutes to get through the current phase 1 intersections is that high of a price in order to save lives. Thank You.
12/10/2008 North I-25 Web Site	This opportunity to comment was brought to my attention by Milan Karspeck. I strongly support OPTION A because it revives passenger service on existing RR which passes through the centers of Longmont, Berthoud, Loveland, Ft Collins, and CSU. Why the passenger cars can even be manufactured in Ft. Lupton not China! We must plan for the future when private automobiles will no longer be the dominant form of personal travel. It was possible until the late 1920's to take the tram from Denver to the CU Boulder campus and to Eldorado Springs. The opportunity looms large that massive government funding of infrastructure will be available from the Obama Administration and OPTION A is just the sort of project which will be funded.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/11/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As a resident and business owner in northern Colorado I strongly support option A, which includes I-25 lane additions, interchange rebuilds and commuter rail along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail corridor. This rail line will connect the centers of our communities, allowing people to conveniently visit family or friends, conduct business or dine and shop in other areas by taking a train from town to town. I've learned that a critical factor for the success of a public transit system is the number of people that live close to the transit stations. This clearly favors option A, which includes a rail station in or near the traditional downtowns of Fort Collins, Loveland, Berthoud and Longmont as well as at other strategic locations such as CSU. Option A saves taxpayer money by utilizing the existing rail corridor between Fort Collins and Longmont to reduce right-of-way acquisition costs. Option A supports vibrant downtowns with people traveling on foot or bicycle past shops on their way to and from the transit stations. Option A encourages transit-oriented development near the rail stations, further adding to commerce in the downtown areas.
12/11/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would definitely like the commuter train to come to Berthoud. I live in Loveland and would use it to commute to work in Berthoud.
12/11/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would MUCH prefer the rail option, it gets more vehicles off the road, reduces emissions and brings the options into the towns along the route. Rail transportation has worked around the world it can work here too.
12/11/2008 Mail in comment	Please consider option A in planning the future of public transportation between Northern Colorado and Denver. Option A will be much more convenient for people to use because it will bring the rail lines to town. I will save taxpayer money because of using existing rail lines. I will promote downtowns and areas in town where the stations will be placed. Please opt for option A.
12/11/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to see Commuter Rail put in first. It may reduce additional capacity on I-25, is more eco-efficient and will save money in the long run.
12/11/2008 North I-25 Web Site	CDOT has pre-selected only 2 proposals for the public to choose from. Each includes very expensive mass transit that only a tiny % of the commuting population will use, according to CDOT's own projections. Why must these automatically be included? Clearly, the public is voting w/ their transportation choices, so why shove terribly expensive bus & light rail down our throats?
12/11/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Are you considering a sound wall on 25 south of 20 ? (just south of 34.) Any increase of sound would be detrimental to our right to peace and quiet
12/12/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Can I get a print quality computer file of the Berthoud rail station artwork for publication?
12/12/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Yes, we need I-25 widened asap. As the current projects wrap up, let's get the next phase or 2 designed and built immediately! Sounds like option A is the best. Can we start by widening I-25, which is needed NOW. We can plan for bus/trains now and build them when they are more economically feasible. Thanks.
12/13/2008 North I-25 Web Site	sorry, submitted first w/o comments! As a trans-planted Californian I really appreciate the problems of traffic congestion here in CO. To me plan A makes the most sense. I believe rail transit is the most effective way to move people (see Metrolink in SoCal) altho most people think it's too expensive. It is a must for us. Also do believe express buses (BRT) and on freeways are essential. I feel that initially express bus service be provided to show people the benefits of rapid transit as most people don't know too much or care much about it. Am very excited about your plans and really believe you are on the right track (pun intended). Thanks for "listening"
12/13/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Strongly support Package A with rail service. Multiple sources of transportation will help us all.
12/13/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I want to see a railway plan put in place from Wyoming to Denver. I would definitely commute back/forth on a train from Denver to Loveland if rail service was an option. I also think the speed limit on I-25 needs to be lowered to 55mph. 75mph is way too high and contributes in my opinion to more accidents. I don't drive I-25 very often because of the high speeds.
12/13/2008 North I-25 Web Site	If we assume that the population of Northern Colorado is going to continue to grow, then transportation by rail as specified in Option A will eventually be needed. It will be cheaper to start now rather than to wait and pay in inflated dollars. I urge acceptance of Option A.
12/13/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We strongly support Option A for improving transportation in northern Colorado.
12/14/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I believe that Package A is the right solution. I-25 is a polluter and dangerous. We need some rail as the population grows.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/14/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The League of Women Voters of Larimer County would like to express its support for major components of Package A in the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) North I-25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (I-25 DEIS). We believe the Northern Front Range would benefit immensely from the economic growth that would result from infrastructure investments of (a) commuter rail connecting cities along Highway 287 (b) bus transit connecting Greeley and Denver and (c) feeder and local bus transit that facilitate access to commuter rail. The National League of Women Voters and the League of Women Voters of Colorado support the addition of mass transit to connect our communities, support internal development, minimize air pollution and sprawl and give residents and workers a safe and economical means to travel regardless their age, physical ability or income. Leagues policy is to promote social and economic justice, and the health and safety of all Americans and so we value access to transportation, transportation systems that afford better access to housing and jobs, and energy-efficient and environmentally sound transportation. Taken together, these contribute to the health, well-being and self-sufficiency for individuals and families a future that LWV of Larimer County would wish for everyone in the Northern Front Range. We feel that components of Package A listed above best meets these goals. Spokesperson League of Women Voters of Larimer County 2651 NCR 29 Loveland, CO 80538 970-667-5077
12/15/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please do not put 6-lanes lanes on I25. The interchanges are becoming more congested and dangerous, and additional lanes will only make it worse. However, three lanes to Cheyenne will benefit in streamlining the drive. We are fervent advocates of placing a light rail system, with different trains times and stops at all the towns between Denver and Cheyenne; and various times to accommodate only major cities between the two capitols. (I have used the rail system in southern CA between LaVerne and LA and it is time and cost saving.) We have lived in Loveland for the past 40 years and have seen the congestion on I-25 from Cheyenne to Denver dramatically change over the years. My husband drives from Loveland to 38th Ave 5 day/week and this has dramatically changed in the way he drives to and from work. Thank you.
12/15/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am very excited about the north I-25 plans, especially plan A with rail service to Denver and points between
12/15/2008 Mail in comment	This letter is to urge the Colorado Department of Transportation to choose Option A for the future of the 1-25 corridor. Commuter rail transit has a much less adverse impact on public safety, public health and the environment than continuation of the same old solution of more lanes and more cars. The rapid transit and toll lane alternatives already operating in the Denver area have not been very effective due to insufficient use. So why construct more of them? On the other hand, commuter rail systems around the world are usually used by more people than the preconstruction estimates project. They are safe and people find ways to make them more convenient for their personal use as time goes on. The per person per use cost comparison of \$57.00 for Option A versus \$0.27 for Option B is misleading and somewhat like comparing apples with oranges. It does not account for the ever increasing real costs of air pollution and the ever increasing health care costs from such pollution or from more vehicle accidents as more cars use the roads. Furthermore, Option A includes the capital costs of the rail cars in ,its \$57.00 per person per use calculation while Option B fails to include the capital cost of the individual driver's cars as the actual transport vehicle used on the road. Consequently, the \$0.27 cost per person per use asserted for Option B is grossly underestimated. If there is no option to individually operated cars as the transport vehicle and more cars use the 1-25 corridor as the front range population increases, the cost calculation of \$0.27 per person per use for Option B becomes even less and further misleading. The long range future of the Front Range will likely involve continual increases in energy, pollution, public safety and population growth costs. The same old solutions to transportation needs have been and will continue to be inadequate. It is time to make public investments that actually solve problems rather than assuring there continuation to future generations. It is time for broader vision and implementation of commuter rail service in Option A.
12/15/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please put me on the list for notifications. I am in favor of the rail system
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am writing in regard to the mass transit options A & B for the front range. I would ask you to support Option A for commuter rail service on the existing rail line. I also think this should be persude first exclusive of additional work on I-25. It seems to make sense to see just how great a response in the way of use is on the rail system before poring more money into added lanes on I-25. As a Denver native with all my family still in Denver and as a senior citizen, I will be deeply affected as I grow older in that my options for going to Denver will decrease along with my ability to drive. Also, I do business in Denver and would have to abandon my good life here in Loveland and move back to Denver if I am to continue to see my family and do business. The eastern corridor of our continent has it all over us for public transportation. We already have the rails. Let's use them ! Thank you for your time.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support any rail system to service the front range. Commuter rail or light rail, anything but more auto traffic.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A, CDOT N I-25 DEIS for northern Colorado. Just more lanes on I-25 will not take care of our needs now or in the future.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am all for pkg. A, this is long overdue.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am a Colorado native. I grew up in Littleton and when I was very young I recall boarding the train at our depot in Littleton, and riding the train to Union Station in Denver. Our existing train tracks could be very easily utilized for commuter traffic and for day trips and vacations to other cities along the Front Range. I would love to board the train in Loveland and take a trip to downtown Denver to shop, visit a museum, or to watch a play. I also think that this option would help to promote the many smaller town along that route - particularly Berthoud. I also worked for a British company in a small town located about 35 miles south of London. It was commonplace to board the train to take a day trip to London. It was convenient and allowed me to avoid the numerous traffic snarls on the motorways. It was a relaxing and safe way to travel. I also am in support of making the much needed repairs to I-25. Currently, it almost life threatening to drive between Berthoud and Fort Collins on I-25. The interchanges at Highway 34, Crossroads Boulevard (in Loveland) are very inefficient, and are also dangerous. Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions and concerns!
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Aims Community College has made a commitment to provide expanded access and programs throughout the region, including the purchase of 40 acres at the intersection of I-25 and CR 56 in Berthoud. In a market survey preceding that acquisition, the College learned that one of the community's expectations was to have Aims provide a transportation hub at the new College site. While in dialogue with CDOT and NFRMPO, the College learned of two alternative plans for proposed mass transit along the I-25 corridor, including the intersection of CR 56. The College would probably have a slight preference for Plan A; however, either proposed plan would be advantageous to Aims and our students. We look forward to working with transportation entities to provide essential mass transit opportunities.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in favor of Option A with an exception. Initiate the commuter rail from Fort Collins to Longmont immediately. Do not add any additional lanes to I25. Only perform safety additions to I25. Downtowns need the economic stimulus which rail will provide and that's where the people live (can bike to train). Suggest the train have room to transport the bikes also. This is what the Obama/Ritter administrations are seeking -- green transportation not more pollution. The front range is already over EPA standards for smog. By adding more blacktop, we will be contributing to this problem and injuring population health.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A for the north I 25 project. It will take this part of the state into the future as transportation costs increase and space diminishes.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It is vital to create a readily accessible and convenient rapid mass transit system in Colorado. The connection of Front Range towns with Denver by a rail system is prudent and environmentally sound. Why should Denver and Colorado be so reliant on autos when better solutions are available? Package A and commuter rail will bring Colorado to a greener and more commuter friendly era. I used to commute from Connecticut to New York City and Boston by train and there is nothing better.
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	yay, we need this!
12/16/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes.
12/17/2008 Mail in comment	We strongly support a commuter rail along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail corridor. We do not support lane additions to I-25. One needs only to go to southern California to see what we are becoming. However, we seem always to have to give car and truck lovers something they want or else we have no hope of getting convenient, tax-supported public transportation. Therefore, I suppose we are compelled to go along with lane additions and interchange rebuilds—all of which encourage people to drive—in hopes of getting a rail line.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support Option A that will connect the centers of our communities and I hope you will give your strongest consideration to this option.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please hurry and get this done! I would love to have some sort of public transportation between Fort Collins and Denver, preferably train like Denver's light rail!!!
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support option A. I drive to Denver at least twice a week and I would support commuter rail along the BN-SF rail corridor. Thank you.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	SHUTTLE TRANSPORTATION THAT DIMINISHES PERSONAL VEHICLE USE IS ALWAYS THE BEST USE OF TRAVEL PATHWAYS
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to voice my support for option A for the North I-25 Environmental Impact Statement. Rail is a much better option than buses.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A because it includes commuter rail. I commuted from Fort Collins to Denver on I-25 for 15 years. No number of new lanes will ever make that a good way to commute. A rail connection would vastly improve the quality of life in northern Colorado, and is the only option that makes sense considering both global warming and the cost of gas (which will go up again!)
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in favor of option A because it includes rail service to important Front Range communities without the need for connector bus service that will likely drive down ridership. We cannot expect riders to accept multiple transfers which option B would surely require. Instead, we need the transportation solutions to be integral with population centers as in option A.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support Option A because it includes alternative routes to I25. A rail connection between Fort Collins and points south would give us a way to travel that did not include I25. If everything is routed via I25 then it is a total choke point which could be disrupted by any change of traffic patterns. Once critical element of a commuter/passenger train service is easy connections to destinations in Denver such as the sports arenas, the airport, and business centers. Thank you.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	WE STRONGLY URGE THE ADOPTION OF OPTION "A" FOR THE NORTH I-25 PROJECT
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	After reading an op/ed in the Coloradoan this morning, and then reading section 2.2 of the EIS, I agree with the op/ed author that option A is the preferred approach. Option B would, in my opinion, do little to reduce miles driven. I also believe light rail would be embraced - having done only limited commuting to Denver, it's enough that I would not seek employment but within a limited range of home. Light rail might provide more opportunity and flexibility for Northern Colorado families. In the end, a 20% price premium to get light rail and upgraded I25 infrastructure seems a reasonable price to pay for the flexibility it will provide and the chance to reduce miles driven. Thanks.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I like Option A as described in today's Coloradoan. Milan Karspeck Soapbox article also likes it. More Interstate lanes and rail along the current BNSF rail corridor
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to see the I-25 northern Colorado train, option A, implemented. A train from Fort Collins into Denver is a serious need. Thank you.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor commuter rail options. As I understand it, option A contains commuter rail and therefore I favor it.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	North I-25 EIS: I support Commuter rail alternatives A and G. These two connect the largest population centers in Northern Colorado. Placing stations in locations central to concentrations of population yields the highest convenience of use. This also enables linking to the largest number of other local transit options. I believe the USA is past due to develop viable transit alternatives to private automobiles. Thank you.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	More lanes and rail. I actually prefer high speed rail like I've used in Japan and Germany. Why not?
12/17/2008 Mail in comment	I am writing to lend my support for Option A. I have long dreamed of having commuter rail service along the Front Range. I feel that rail service will have a much higher utilization than bus service for a number of reasons. The fact that rail will connect city centers is much more convenient and desirable than having to drive to a Park-and-Ride out along I-25. This is much more consistent with the definite trend towards more pedestrian communities where people desire to live in town close to work, shopping, and transit. Also, an inescapable fact is that bus travel has a decidedly negative stigma whereas rail is viewed by the public positively with this positive view steadily increasing. I know for a fact that personally I would use rail often but would rarely, if ever, use a bus service along I-25 for these reasons. Another major benefit of Option A would be the positive economic impact of the presence of the rail transit stations in the city centers. There is no doubt that they would stimulate economic activity and development near the stations. Another example of markedly positive economic impact has been the dramatic increase in property values near the rail stations in Denver. I am not aware of a situation where bus service has had a similar effect. Option A would clearly be more energy efficient than Option B. This in and of itself warrants adoption of Option A. I feel that Option B would do little to slow the growth of vehicular traffic along I-25 whereas I feel that Option A would. I also feel that Option B would only serve to encourage urban sprawl whereas Option A would have the opposite effect. I view Option B as nothing more than a perpetuation of our anachronistic status quo. It would just be a gilded dinosaur in a time when we so desperately need a fresh, enlightened, approach to transit. Option A is that enlightened approach and it is long overdue. Thank you for considering my comments.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A and strongly recommend light rail on existing rail-rights-of-way as a part of the transportation plan for the Northern I-25 region
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I feel that a commuter fast train system linking all of the front range cities should have been started 30 or 40 years ago. It is high time for the United States to follow other countries around the world by building fast trains. Construction on our highways is always out of date before new lanes are even completed. Fast trains with station business hubs - rental vehicles, shuttles, taxis, food and shopping - would be a great way to make travel safer, clearer and less stressful. And just think how many new jobs would be created with the building and maintenance of a fast train system. Let the Colorado front range become a great mass transportation model for the rest of the country. Let's be first!
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have long been a supporter of a more effective mass transportation system along Colorado's Front Range and I write to express my support specifically for commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. Thank you.
12/17/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As an over-40-year resident of Fort Collins, I am frustrated by the lack of public transportation on the front range. Traffic congestion keeps growing, yet we do not have adequate, or sometimes any, means to travel within or between cities. Specifically, commuter rail from Fort Collins to & from Longmont is a crying need. Please adapt to 21st Century needs!
12/18/2008 CDOT State Hotline	I have attended some of the public meetings however I missed the last one. I have a lot of interest in package a. I would love to see some thing high tech for the rail. I feel that the estimated travel time of 120 minutes to get to Denver is too long to get people out of their cars on the rail. Also rail will dump everyone in the same place. A bus moves more freely and offers more variety on destinations. In the future we could have a cleaner running bus. Also with trains it takes additional time to transfer where a bus would leave you right where you want to be. I have ridden trains all over the world, like the train in Hong Kong. The trains being considered are too slow. The goal should be to move people from down town Fort Collins to Denver as quickly as possible.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please don't let light rail die an untimely death in northern CO. Longmont has been paying its fair share, and it's the gateway to the rest of northern CO.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	It's time for commuter rail! I only support the bus as a temporary measure until the rail is up and running I do not support expanding nor building more roads at all!

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'm hoping to hear more about the plans and am hoping to see a light rail from Ft. Collins to DIA and Denver.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It only makes sense to have a light rail going to at least Ft Collins, and maybe even to Cheyenne. The traffic is getting so congested between Denver & Ft Collins that it definitely needs attention. I believe people would use light rail if it were available.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	The future for our community is to invest in mass transit. I completely support and vote for changes in the ways we transport ourselves.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Front Range passenger rail service is far preferable to adding ever more lands to I25. Serving city centers it will help reduce sprawl which not only gobbles up productive ag land, but contributes to wastefulness overall.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	We need a reliable commuter rail connecting Denver with North Colorado Communities! (Sooner rather than later)
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Most people don't live along I-25. They live closer to hwy 287. Therefore more mass transportation potential users would find something closer to 287 rather than I-25 more user-friendly. Also, it needs to be quick, rather than stopping every 5 minutes at many cities.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Commuter rail into Ft Collins, N Colorado and Denver will encourage constructive growth and positive interactions between the cities and their comities. This will lead to new and interesting businesses and opportunities to enrich everyone.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Implementing an economically feasible mass transit system along the I-25 corridor is more important now more than ever. This would relieve pressure on I-25 eliminating the need for more lanes or road ways. The U.S. is decades behind in mass transit compared to the international community. This need to change.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Thanks for taking input. I favor option A. I don't see how our increasing density in NO-CO can be dealt with efficiently without rail as (at least) a part of the solution.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I think that to meet the needs of our growing community that the I-25 North project should include a bus line to Denver now and a commuter rail in the long term. I believe increased public transportation options will better meet our needs and be better for the environment then widening I-25.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Given the concerting trains in our economy and with global warming it's vital that we act in creating a better public transportation system linking Northern Colorado.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	A bus line to Denver now and a commuter rail thru Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont to Denver in the long term.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to express my support of Package A.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I support the development of a northern front range commuter bus like between Fort Collins and Denver. A long term priority should be a commuter rail along the same corridor and DIA.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the rail option of transporting people from north of Fort Collins to the Denver area. The traffic on I-25 is too heavy and fast plus the road has to be under constant construction.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I've traveled around the world and have seen better public transportation solutions nearly everywhere. How can the richest county in the world also remain the dumbest?
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Public transportation, not more roads, is the answer to the mess we call I-25!
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I strongly support light rail from Fort Collins to Denver especially not if placed close to I-25. Highway 287 is preferable.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Commuter rail is the only answer to transportation issues along the I-25 corridor. We need to start developing these now and not wait any longer! The number of people who commute to Denver is growing all the time and changes are that they're living in Fort Collins because of all of the green nature of this small city. So what better way to encourage eco-friendly lifestyles? Money of these people would take advantage of such transportation, especially to catch a quick nap before work!
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I want commuter rail through Fort Collins
12/18/2008 CDOT State Hotline	I prefer option A over plan B. I am a lifetime homeowner and resident of Fort Collins and I feel very strongly that rail be built ASAP. Project is very much needed. It needs to be built now, I cannot wait another lifetime for it to be built.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Commuter buses to Denver would be helpful in the short term. Ultimately, commuter rail would be a great help to transportation on the Front Range.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I would like a temporary, 2-3 year, bus line established along the I-25 corridor from wellington to union station, Denver until a permanent light rail system can be built.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Tell CDOT that we want a bus line to Denver Now and a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland & Longmont to Denver in the long term
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	In my opinion it is past the time when this should be an option. I am very interested to see light rail and other more efficient forms of transportation available now!

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Our family prefers the commuter rail alternative. Lets strengthen our city centers and not add to sprawl along I-25
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Please run light rail all the way to Denver / DIA. Not the interstate! No more money for I-25!! We need light rail.
12/18/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor plan A which includes a rail link to Longmont. I much prefer public transportation and I have family in Boulder. I believe a train is faster, more comfortable, safer, and more convenient than a bus since it will go through city centers. A train is also more reliable in bad weather. Thank You.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	My husband commutes to Denver 2-3 times per week, we want a bus line to Denver now or commuter rail through Fort Collins to Denver as a top priority.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	I would like to take this opportunity to express my opinion on my preferred option from those set forth in the October, 2008 Draft EIS. I strongly support Option A, the combined rail/bus/auto option. We are facing a future of higher fuel costs and probable restrictions on transportation related air emissions, and I believe Option A will provide the best opportunities for Northern Colorado in such a future. It will strengthen existing communities, both along the US 287 corridor and along the US 85 corridor, rather than encourage sprawl in the less developed areas along I-25. If all of the infrastructure development is centered on I-25, the existing communities will be drained of vitality as new development moves to I-25. Option A can provide a direct link between the state's two major research centers at UC-Boulder and CSU-Fort Collins. It would also provide a direct link and enhancement to RTD's efforts to bring passenger rail transportation to the northern Denver Metro Area. Governor Ritter has invested in promoting a New Energy Economy as the future for Colorado. Option A opens the door to a New Transportation Future for Colorado. Option B would help keep that door shut. For all of these reasons, I urge you to adopt the Option A plan. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Get a light-rail for God sake! Look to the future not the past.
12/18/2008 Mail in comment	Any and all measures to reduce congestion in and around Fort Collins are much needed and needed now. Any delays will only increase development costs. Anyone opposing these measures are short-sighted and surely enjoy less congestion on our roads and the cleaner air to breathe that comes with this.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor rail service through the Front Range city interiors because of greater rider accessibility from the city centers. This should greatly help ease increased commuter traffic between Wellington and Denver.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support both the commuter rail line using the existing infrastructure and the bus rapid transit that will hopefully connect this main line to the outlying communities. I think ot is important to use the existing infrastructure to both lessen the construction costs as well as revitalize and maintain the downtown areas that it will connect. Hopefully many bus lines will connect this main commuter line to many outlying areas. I am pleased to see that public transit options are being considered to give commuters other options than their automobiles when considering travel.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A because it includes a rail station in or near downtown FC.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We need to think of the future and make this a permanent fix, by putting in light rail.It will be less expensive in the long run. the other alternative is another set of railroad tracks from Pueblo to Cheyenne. Let's do it right, not cheap.How I wish this could happen tomorrow.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the commuter rail and bus rapid transit options. I believe that by using the existing lines for the rail that it will save money by using the existing infrastructure and accommodate transit across the front range from Fort Collins to Denver. The rail option also contributes to the health and sustainability of the downtown areas that it runs through. I hope that the bus rapid transit will allow for connection between the rail systems and outlying communities. I am pleased to see that such needed public transit alternatives are being considered if not for our generations, then the generations to come.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I hope you will only consider the plan to use the rail lines going through Longmont, Loveland and Ft. Collins. This will enable people to get to the heart of these towns without having to use other transportation. Using a bus system along I-25 is really a poor alternative. Please get us 'on track!' Thank you!
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We think that plan A is the best solution and is worth the cost. It provides the most and best options for citizens living in N.E. Colorado to interact in a responsible way with the rest of the state and for the future of our environment both locally and for the whole planet. As our population ages we need to provide suitable transportation options to get all people especially older folks a reliable means to get around. Driving becomes a very challenging experience to people at an old age. We need a reliable way to get to shopping centers and doctors offices in a safe manner. Many city officials have expressed the high cost of rail, but if we brought businesses and manufacturing to the area that produced rail products we could increase jobs and decrease the public cost to install and maintain the system. And also perhaps sell some of the many homes that have been built to new residents. We cannot all work in retail at places like Centera.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A. I believe that it would be the healthy choice for our planet.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please make it clear in the documents that the use of roundabouts at the exit ramps on interchanges may be a viable option in some locations, subject to final design considerations. The Centerra Metropolitan District is currently helping to fund construction of roundabouts as an interim improvement at the Crossroads Interchange. Throughout the design process we have been assured by CDOT representatives that every effort will be made to try to preserve this investment when the full reconstruction of the interchange is done in the future. We understand this is subject to final design considerations. However, we think it is important that a reference to roundabouts as a potential component of reconstructed interchanges be more clearly stated in the documents. Thank you.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My wife and I think that the A package would be the best option. We think it would get more use.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have two overarching concerns with the DEIS: There does not seem to enough consideration of the impact of Peak Oil and future high energy costs and or shortages. Secondly, there does not seem to be any incorporation of the study underway for high speed rail. (Which is also funded by CDOT.) That said, I generally prefer Option A since it incorporates commuter rail that serves the main population centers along the Front Range. The BRT on I-25 element of Option B would drive new urban sprawl away from the existing population centers. However, I also like the toll lane concept (without the BRT) of Option B. Having growth pay for the additional capacity seems like a fair and quick way to build the extra lanes. Thus, I would like to see the final EIS include; commuter rail on the BNSF corridor, new toll lanes on I-25, and high speed rail service as determined by the study underway for the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority. And, I would recommend that the final EIS to have a section on emergency response to potential fuel shortages. Some of the energy literature now forecasts that the current recession will inhibit development of energy supplies (traditional and alternative) and thus hasten a shortage situation. In that case, a rapid response of additional transit will be necessary and this EIS should envision how such a response would be coordinated and planned. Thank you for your consideration.
12/19/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As time goes buy the need to make I-25 wider and wider will continue with population growth. To continue to support the freeway only is becoming more and more rediculous. It is time to bit-the-bullet and put in a rail system that would serve allColoradoans and tourists. It's a quality of life issue as well. I want to see a Wellington (or better yet Cheyenne) to Denver (better yet Colorado Springs) railway before you spend another cent on I-25. I say this being an I-25 user average 3x per week.
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It is my ardent beleif that the future of Colorado will benefit much more profoundly by a backbone of commuter rail than by expanding highways. Please pursue Option A and mark my vote as such!!
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We support option A of your Environmental Impact Study. Commuter rail is important for Longmont and northern Colorado
12/20/2008 Mail in comment	With regard to the draft version of the North I-25 EIS we strongly support option A. We have lived in Fort Collins for 40 years and we are in our 80's and can no longer drive to Denver as we used to. Option A in our judgment affords the most effective convenient and efficient method of solving or relieving the very serious traffic condition on I-25. The commuter light rail along the existing railroad corridor makes a great deal of sense, especially by continuing the center of the communities affected. It will also facilitate commercial development in the down town centers. Than k you for letting us comment. Public input is always important and worth while.
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Even though I live not far from I-25, I strongly support option A for transportation to northern Colorado, including I-25 lane additions, but also commuter rail along the BNSF rail corridor to Fort Collins.
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I wish you to support Package A in the CDOT North I-25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (I-25 DEIS). This would offer better service to the people in the North Range and help to prevent sprawl along I-25. Thank you.
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	A light rail system or a rail system with its own tracks makes the most sense to me. People can change, and frankly, I-25 is a nightmare and more lanes will just bring more vehicles. Public transportation is safer, more efficient, less polluting, and brings community together. One of the characteristics that has harmed our society is the anonymity of suburbs and highways. Downtown Loveland is a treasure because of the small businesses, the community involvement, the arts. Efficiency does not a community make, and our solitary vehicles and crowded highways are not conducive to quality of life. Please have the vision and foresight to think of the generations coming up. We cannot continue this way. The near collapse of the auto industry that has ignored reality for 30 years ought to be proof of that. We must make changes, and a rail system that allows people to park their cars or take buses or jitneys to the stations where we can then read, stare out the window, do work, or communicate with our neighbors would be a vast improvement over our dysfunctional highway system now. And this doesn't even take into account the pollution and diminishing of oil reserves. I want to say, Come on, Americans, let's be the innovators, the pragmatists, the visionaries we know we can be. Thank you.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Since we are talking about a transit system that will carry us well into the future we will need a system that will not need replacing in just a few years and will not be outgrown in a few years. Commuter rail transit has been successful in metropolitan areas for over 150 years. Larger metro areas have replaced bus routes with light rail and rail commuter routes because of efficiency. We need a transportation system that leaves as small carbon foot print as possible for the future. Rail transit meets those needs. On page 22 of the December 2008 issue of RAILWAY AGE Magazine is an interesting pie chart. The chart shows rail efficiency compared to all other land based transportation mediums including water. Rail transports 40% of all freight in the USA. Trucks carry 30% of all freight. Water and pipeline each carry 15% of all freight. In the energy consumption chart trucks use 65% of all energy used to transport freight. Water uses 18%. Pipeline uses 9%. Railroads use only 8% of the energy used for country's transportation needs. Since a bus is basically a truck that carries passengers and a passenger car is just a fancy boxcar that carries passengers. The same energy savings and lesser carbon footprint can be claimed comparing bus to rail transit. Electrification through third rail powered by Colorado's wind farms can reduce the carbon footprint for rail transit to near zero. Third rail electrification has been successfully used in the New York area for over 100 years. Third rail is cheaper to maintain and has no height restrictions. In my opinion, Bus transit is just a stop gap measure until it is outgrown by increasing population and is replaced by rail transit. Let's grow up and build it right from the beginning and not waste time, money and energy on a stop gap measure that will be outgrown in a short period of time. Thank You.
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Another comment about concern about wildlife being effected by increased commuter rail traffic. Two months ago I was sent to South Owl Canyon (North of Wellington) to change switch ties under a switch frog. A frog is where the two rails cross and is the noisiest part of a switch and takes the most beating. In a hollowed out part of the tie, directly under the point of the frog was a mouse nest. Thousands of wheels clatter over that frog every day with no seeming effect on the residents below. I run and fire a steam locomotive at the Colorado Railroad Museum. When we were running the steam engine last October we were trying to use up all the coal in the tender so it would be clean for the winter. At the bottom of the coal pile in the air spaces between the lumps of coal I found 5 mouse nests. Obviously, riding around on a tender of a steam locomotive didn't bother them either. Thanks.
12/20/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Hello- I would like to put my vote in for North I-25 EIS Package A. There are hundreds if not thousands who commute from Fort Collins, Loveland and Greeley to Boulder and Longmont. I know that I would use the rail system if it were put in place. Either way I don't think the No-Action Alternative is a REAL alternative because the traffic on I-25 is becoming horrible. Thanks!
12/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As a resident of Northern Colorado frequently traveling to Denver, I support Package A of the CDOT NI25 Draft EIS. Commuter rail and improved bus service to our northern communities is a wise and effective investment for the transportation needs of the growing population of the I-25 corridor.
12/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor a combo of HOV lanes, commuter train, fast track. we must reduce emissions and congestion on I-25
12/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to see rail (electric preferably) all the way up to Cheyenne and down to Trinidad with TOD stations and opportunities for all the towns and cities along the route. Let's tie this state together with ribbons of steel. Up to Ski country too!
12/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It makes sense to me to enhance the existing transportation systems, update and enlarge them rather than start all over again. I would suggest before you do, talk to organizations for the disabled to gain their input because it is important to ensure that they have easy access to public transportation.
12/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A proposal
12/21/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support Option A as I think it is critical to have transportation in the city centers when at all feasible. I do not favor moving housing and businesses to the interstate highway. It then becomes a local road and another inerstate is then needed. It is best in the long run to invest in inter city transit and convenience. If we use the interstate we then need huge parking lots to encourage people to drive to the interstate to take a bus/train. within the city this is less likely if there are buses that go to local stations. Now is the time to get started on such a program.
12/21/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I support Package A because it provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved air quality and decreased reliance on hydrocarbon-based energy and foreign and domestic oil.• Improved safety and quicker access for emergency response vehicles.• Inter-city connections which supports downtown revitalization and in-fill development along Hwy 287.• Low-cost transportation to residents of the region can not drive due to age, income or desire to conserve funds or the environment.• Decreased congestion on roads for those who continue to drive.• Continued mobility even with projected 43 percent increase in population and 36 percent increase in employment by 2020 in north 125 Front Range corridor. <p>I believe very strongly in the value of public transportation having grown up on the east coast. I used it regularly until moving west. Once the infrastructure is in place, and people see that it is convenient they will use it.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support mass transit along I-25 from Cheyenne to Denver. I live in Loveland and I would go to both Cheyenne and Denver if there was mass transit, especially to Denver. With the current lack of mass transit on I-25, I don't go to Denver. I would be willing to pay increased taxes for the project.
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Downtown to downtown connectivity with option to carry bicycles on board. Cleanest most efficient use of fuel, best for the environment and public health.
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I forgot to mention in the previous message: I support the use of the BNSF rail lines for downtown to downtown connectivity. Trains are the best most efficient way to get around.
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The need to improve the commute along I-25 is real. It is time to look to the future and the eventual population growth. Our environment is suffering from the congestion along the I-25 corridor. Now is the time, actually the time was 20 years ago, to begin a mass transportation project. I strongly support a rail system that would lessen the vehicles on the road, decrease of fatal and non-fatal accidents and time to travel from point A to point B. The project should be a blend of government and private enterprise.
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly prefer Option A. Commuter rail will move people using less fossil fuel and creating less CO2. It also will revitalize towns along the route and promote development in an already developed corridor. It requires acquisition of very little land, and that land will only become more expensive as time passes.
12/22/2008 Mail in comment	<p>The draft design for the East Frontage Road between Mulberry Street and Prospect Road bends east and becomes a dead-end cul-de-sac across Lot 1 of the Lee Minor Subdivision, thereby making this plotted lot undevelopable. In order to provide two points of access to this and other properties fronting I-25, including the Interchange Business Park, this East Frontage Road should remain in a North-South configuration, connecting Mulberry Street and Prospect Road. (Copy of Dec. 8 '08 letter to Thomas W. Anzia, elaborating on above comments is attached.)</p> <p>Dear Tom:</p> <p>Please recall that we met early in the evening of the Public Hearing for the North I-25 EIS, held at November 19 at the Fort Collins Lincoln Center. We discussed my concerns regarding the current draft modification to the East Frontage Road between Mulberry Street and Prospect Road. I have submitted a Comments Form to Carrol Parr at CDOT (copy attached), and wanted to elaborate my concerns to you directly.</p> <p>As currently depicted, the frontage road would no longer connect Prospect Road and Mulberry Street. To the north, it would follow its current configuration, but end with cul-de-sac bending to the east on Lot I of the Lee MLD in which my company owns an interest. The rationale for not continuing to connect Prospect Road and Mulberry Street with a frontage road is not apparent, and one would think that continuing to provide two points of access from the frontage road to both Lot 1 and other properties to the south currently facing the frontage road has merit.</p> <p>Moreover, ending the south-extending leg of the frontage road as currently shown on Lot I is ridiculous. Much of Lot 1 is in the FEMA floodplain and floodway. Such a cul-desac could significantly undermine the already limited development potential of Lot I and render this property non-developable. Additionally, ending the Frontage Road on Lot I would be extremely confusing to motorist who would understandably be expecting the Frontage Road to continue south. Basically, the draft design takes a functioning and logical condition of connecting the Frontage Road to two arterials and replaces it with a condition that would 1) promote errant traffic to a dead-end road, 2) force local traffic between Prospect Road zrrd Mulberry Street onto Interstate25,3) significantly burden Lot I of the Lee MLD and 4) restrict to one point of access future development along the Frontage Road, including Lot I.</p> <p>I would certainly like to meet with you, a representative from CDOT and whomever else you recommend to discuss whatever the rationale may be for not continuing to connect Prospect Road and Mulberry Street via the Frontage Road and to explore alternatives to the current draft design. Thank you for your attention to these concerns.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/22/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I support Draft EIS Package A for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COMMUTER RAIL!• Favors mass transit over roads.• Better distribution of services; bus service from Greeley to Denver, 1-25 for vehicle traffic,• commuter rail for the people-if you build it, they will come!• Commuter rail line would connect to FasTracks line in Thornton which, in effect, extends• commuter rail all the way to Denver Union Station.• Commuter rail line would connect to FasTracks line in Longmont, go through Boulder to• Union Station; would make taking the train convenient and efficient for more people.• More choices; bus, vehicle, rail• More reduction in vehicle traffic• Less traffic noise• Less impact to threatened and endangered species <p>I do not support Package B for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No commuter rail• Most traffic is still concentrated along 1-25.• No services from Greeley to Denver. <p>In my opinion, people are more inclined to use commuter rail than ride a bus. I urge you to identify Package A as the Preferred Alternative for the project. There is no time like the present to make the right choice for the future. Thanks for considering my comments.</p>
12/22/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Passenger rail (package A) is an already existing BNSF rail line and easily utilizes access for our established townships west of I-25 from Fort Collins on South. Especially Fort Collins, Loveland, Longmont Lafayette. Each old town center has an historic rail station. that serviced our needs from conception to the time when rail traffic was no longer subsidized. All depots have parking lots adjacent to them not being used. Our Old Town centers are quaint restaurants and shops that would benefit from commuter traffic. Our town centers are vital to our townships identities with galleries and cultural attractions. A Fort Collins College student could catch a Broncos train to Denver instead of a bus or a day trip for downtown Denver to Union station for a Rockies game •without driving. This impact is mutually beneficial to Sports fans and commuters on a daily basis. I enjoy visiting my daughter in Denver and would love to catch a train to Union Station for her to pick me up to shop and lunch. The depot is within walking distance of my residence in Berthoud. A Senior Rail Pass price would be great incentive to retired folks to visit the big city along with a student ID pricing for Kids. The "main street fund" may have a way to help with revitalizing this depot idea as it's main purpose is to boost old town main street areas. Parking Garages as new ventures independently.</p> <p>I have utilized rail commuter lines from suburbs of Chicago for fun and Seattle from Portland to go to an art festival with the whole family sight seeing. It is so worry free compared to 1-25 driving especially after dark or at rush hour. The train goes right to your stop no missed exits, no traffic jams, and so much cleaner air than RTD bus rides that I have taken. Please stay away from the 1-25 IDEA. The BNSF line is responsible for our townships existence and is a much better way to easily access rail traffic. Much less driving for our population centers on the west side of 1-25 and insures the rail usage.</p>
12/22/2008 Mail in comment	<p>For decades, we've known we needed fast commuter trains from northern Co to Denver. Why do we keep adding more lanes instead of trains when so many other states have gone down that road to their peril: impossible pollution, dangerous highways, and it is never enough.</p> <p>I used to live in NJ where they kept adding lanes to the turnpike. They could never add enough and the cancer rate and respiratory problems continue to raise as the air quality deteriorates. They also neglected to develop sufficient fast commuter trains and seem caught in the same no win race we are in the early stages of. It is so very hard to reverse as California has also found.</p> <p>We have an opportunity now to make a very important decision to give the next generation cleaner air, less costly and safer transportation, and help with global warming. Everyone I've talked to wants commuter trains from Ft Collins to Denver. It is so clear that it is the only thing that makes any sense.</p>
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I support Option A and would like to urge its adoption</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/22/2008 Mail in comment	<p>The only one which includes passenger rail on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe lines is Package A. Package B includes adding lanes to I-25 and bus service to Denver. Package A also includes additional lanes.</p> <p>We are advocating the implementation of the passenger rail ONLY from package A. Rail service from Fort Collins to Boulder and Denver will significantly decrease air pollution, gasoline usage, and increase passenger safety for commuters. There are countless other good reasons for commuter rail, mention your favorites.</p> <p>Citizens for Smart Transportation</p> <p>It is of my wishes that CDOT implement the Passenger rail ONLY from Package A.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This would increase passenger safety (no more lanes of traffic on I-25!)2. Decrease use of cars this less pollution and less gasoline usage3. More accessible transportation for senior citizens/children4. Can be a very cost effective mode of transportation
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I'm all in favor to develop a commuter rail system. We need to look in the far term and not make decisions for just the near term.</p>
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I believe that Package A is the only feasible option if viewed with a community development perspective. The critical element of Package A is the commuter rail. I presume that a vast majority of Northern Colorado residents already live within 1 mile of the historic and current primary north-south travel corridor, that being US 287, which happens to parallel the BNSF rail line. This corridor was the basis for most, if not all, urban development in Larimer County, and Northwest Boulder County. Smart growth principles encourage transportation solutions to be built where people live and work. Because of the comp. plan density goals of most of the municipalities in Larimer County and NW Boulder County, Package A would not address only a current transportation need, but also a future one as well. Package A will help relieve auto dependency, save money on future road infrastructure costs, and help facilitate sound economic redevelopment in the older parts of Longmont, Fort Collins, and Loveland. One way to relieve pressure on I-25 is to lessen the demand on the highway, and not just increasing the supply provided by the highway. Thanks for taking my comments.</p>
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed Package A. I believe this package does the best job of addressing the long-term transportation needs of Northern Colorado. Adding both commuter rail through municipal downtowns (phase 1) and two additional non-tolled lanes to I-25 (phase 2, if necessary) will dramatically increase the mobility of our regional workforce--particularly lower-income workers. We've heard time and time again from local employers that the lack of workforce mobility in the region makes it very difficult to attract an adequate number of employees--again, particularly lower-skill, lower-income workers. With Package A, and in particular the commuter rail element, land use and economic development would shift some growth back toward urban centers. Package A supports vibrant downtowns and established business centers by offering a multi-modal system of transportation that encourages new commercial and residential development options in urban cores. I am very excited about the possibility of bringing commuter rail through the heart of many NFR municipalities. According to recent American Public Transit Association statistics, commuter rail ridership has increased by 5.4% through the first half of 2008 versus the same period in 2007. And, significantly, ridership has historically not been too responsive to fluctuations in gas prices. The commuter rail element of Package A will likely involve the installation of railroad quiet zones through population centers. Establishing quiet zones along the BNSF rail crossings in Loveland has become a top priority for citizens. Unless enough public pressure is applied to the federal government to overturn its 2005 law requiring stricter requirements (including sounding the train horn for more sustained periods of time at each crossing) the issue of quiet zones will continue to be a major concern for the urban residents of the NFR.</p>
12/22/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>Be Creative! Use existing train tracks for the rural areas & add light rail for already populated areas.</p>
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>As a resident of NOCO who travels by auto to Denver nearly weekly, I strongly support making safety upgrades on I-25, as well as the mass transit components of Package A. I am also in favor of a commuter rail system using the existing track, to connect communities from Fort Collins to Longmont. We need solutions now that do not involve building more lanes of pavement.</p>
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	<p>A commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland, Longmont and Denver would be more beneficial than an expansion of I-25. A rail would alleviate congestion, provide for better air quality and alleviate the cost of gas for Northern Colorado residents. In addition it will allow for less stress and a better way of life for commuters.</p>
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Please help alleviate our air pollution and traffic, which is already significant and will be unbearable by 2030 which is already significant and will be unbearable by 2030. By creating a bus line to Denver ASAP. As a citizen of Fort Collins, if I also had the option of a commuter rail to Denver, I would use it frequently and would drive there almost never. We must become more progressive with our transportation!</p>
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Developing commuter rail lines to Denver will take a while. The time is coming where fuel prices will be prohibitively high and people will want other means of transportation. That is why we must begin the investment in rail now. In the meantime, bus transportation would be an economic solution. We need to keep Colorado Future minded! We want bus and rail lines now.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I support the planning and implementation of a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont. Please consider that we should develop mass transit over enabling individual cars to reduce emissions and build a stronger community by providing affordable transportation for all in the future. Additionally in your plans do account for including Denver international Airport without having to travel directly into Denver proper. Thanks!
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	We want a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver not expansion of I-25.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I support a light rail on existing tracks as an alternative to expanding I-25.
12/23/2008 Mail in Comment	Our family would like to see a light rail system from Fort Collins to Denver, not more lanes on I-25.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I WHOLEHEARTEDLY support a commuter rail along I-25!!!! The energy, money and pollution saved will be astronomical. It would greatly increase my options of living, working, and studying in Denver, not to mention many of the smaller, growing communities between Fort Collins and Denver. Please PLEASE pursue this concept and give us the rail system that will change the way people move around Colorado.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	A commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver NOT expansion of I-25 is a wonderful idea! We are in full support as we believe it would be the most cost effective with the least impact on our community. Thank you.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I would strongly support some form of public transportation from Fort Collins to Denver. I oppose expanding lanes on I-25.
12/23/2008 Mail in Comment	Despite the recent reduction of fuel costs, it is imperative that the long neglected plans for mass transportation be developed in a timely manner. The need for mass transit will only grow greater and more expensive the longer this issue is put off.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I urge you to address congestion along the I-25 corridor by building a commuter rail system between Fort Collins and Denver. There are already existing tracks that travel through the heart of Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont. Large number of people, including those that work at or attend CSU, would be able to walk to in town light rail stations. In addition, commuter rail doesn't degrade our air quality in the way that auto traffic does. People will drive less, conserving natural resources, but only if viable public transportation alternatives exist.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am totally in favor of the norther light rail all the way to Longmont. I believe it will be heavily used.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	The Colorado Department is considering three more alternative I believe the building commuter rail fits the growing need for sage southbound traffic. I-25 has become so difficult to use. Heavy traffic at high speeds is so dangerous. The increased pollution that comes with all that traffic is ruining our environment. Light commuter rail solves so many problems without costing as much as trying to add lanes to I-25. I-25 expansion will always be out dated before it is completed, the safety issues during construction are always a concern. And the final product doesn't actually solve any of the problems.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I do want a light rail transportation system that runs through the center part of town.
12/23/2008 Mail in Comment	I support the idea of a commuter rail passing through the cities of the Front Range rather than down the I-25 corridor.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	It's essential that our state have efficient accessible and sustainable transportation along the Front Range. Please use existing track to develop a light rail system between Fort Collins and Denver by 2015. I strongly support this initiative and I vote.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	As a resident of Northern Colorado, I ask CO DOT to provide opportunity for public transit in the area, especially between Northern CO towns and Denver. My preference is rail, but any economical option would be of value. Thank you.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	It is both crucial to our environment and the long term vitality of the Fort Collins economy and culture that a commuter rail be built on existing thru town corridors. There is an undeniable explosion of population and development all along the northern Front Range. If we simply think in traditional and out dated terms about how to respond to this growth, and it's resulting transportation needs, we jeopardize the very aspects of the Front Range that have attracted residents from all over the country: pristine wilderness, farm lands, and breathtaking views of our mountains. It is our responsibility to think and plan progressively, looking forward to the future of healthy, safe, and environmentally responsible communities from Fort Collins to Denver. Please initiate a plan to start a commuter rail system to serve Coloradoans along the Front Range immediately. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I support the idea of improving air quality through the implementation of a commuter rail (through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver) that does not expand I-25.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	We need a commuter rail from FTC to Denver especially instead of added auto lanes to I-25. Cost wise better, green, wise important. Colorado has always been a leader in having a healthy community and green activities. Please, at the time with global warming in the center of attention, make the choices that will benefit the future generations.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/23/2008 Mail in Comment	Please start seriously considering better public transportation services such as commuter rails and bus routes between Fort Collins and surrounding areas and Denver. It would be beneficial for working class citizens, travelers, etc. and also help our environment. If Northern Colorado is one of the fastest growing urban areas, we need Public transportation to go along with it.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I want commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver, NOT EXPANSION OF I-25.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	We want commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont to Denver. Not expansion of I-25.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We strongly support option A which includes additional interchanges and a rail line along the I-25 corridor from Ft. Collins to Denver.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	We would love to see commuter rail connecting Fort Collins with Denver, and also to DIA. Whenever we are in other cities or countries with trains or metros, we use them for our transportation needs. Commuter rail should be a priority before it becomes more difficult with all the growth along the I-25 corridor. Rail makes sense to get from one densely used area to another, especially the places where parking is already tight. Rail is also easier to figure out than bust routes and provides service for elderly, handicapped, and younger people who do not drive. We live and work downtown, walk to destinations frequently, and have a son who does not drive. He uses the bus and walks. I am very tired of seeing so much of our local transportation planning directed to bicyclists at the expense of pedestrians or ignoring the disabled and elderly. Regional transportation is very important, too, and it would be great to see Northern Colorado trying to meet those needs in ways that help environmentally and communally - we don't need more roads or lanes for trucks and SUV's with few passengers. Please make it a goal to have a public transportation system that is easy for all to use, and we won't need to have all those additional lanes and interchanges for...Even if there is a time savings.
12/23/2008 CDOT State Hotline	My wife and I are in support of your north I-25 DEIS and specifically super supportive of transit component of package A, most specifically package A, most specifically the commuter rail connecting city centers, Fort Collins to Longmont that would connect us to Denver metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. I think now is a perfect time to do that and it gives us good jobs here, good maintenance jobs and service jobs for people who run it. And of course saves on gasoline and energy and all that kind of stuff as well. I think that would be excellent to put in the front range, I hope you will support that and come to that conclusion. Thank you.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I sincerely believe commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont to Denver would in the long run be the best decision. Mason would be a very good choice.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Would rather not have rail down I-25.
12/23/2008 CDOT State Hotline	Im a big supporter of package A. Ive lived here for 45 years and using the existing rail is the best option for Fort Collins
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I have a friend who lives in Denver with no car. He is able to get around metro Denver no problem, when he attempts to come here the bus is over sold and not accessible. Please make mass transit a possibility for many people who need to make the commute.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I would like a rail in town. And we need no more development on I-25.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I want a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver, not expansion of I-25 to reduce the pollution that hinders our view of those beautiful Rocky Mountains and to help with the spiral of global warming that is upon us!! It would be such a pleasure to ride into Denver with my family to see a show, tour a museum or attend an event without the hassles of driving!
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I believe it would be great to have commuter rail through Ft Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Opening up commuter rail from Fort Collins to Denver would dramatically impact my life for the better. I grew up outside of Chicago and am very used to taking the train into the city for ball games, museums and shows. Also we could open up CSU as a commuter University to a huge portion of the Front Range. Putting a rail line through the heart of Front Range downtowns allows us to leave our cars at home and it connects communities. Don't build out on I-25!!
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	With the population of Northern Colorado ever increasing, there is apparent need to explore alternate transportation modes. The state of our economy and environment commands that we keep pushing for public transportation to connect our cities. I have always been inclined to support a rail line system and believe action needs to start rolling before we use up all our space.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I support commuter rail using the highway 287 corridor. I DO NOT support rail service along the I-25 corridor. Using I-25 is a nightmare at present. And it is a detriment to the communities along the Front Range to pour more money for expansion into that corridor.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I would like a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver not an expansion of I-25. This could utilize existing tracks.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I feel in these hard economic times we need to focus on methods of transportation that support a sustainable future for Northern Colorado. I believe a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland, Longmont to Denver would alleviate this not expansion of I-25.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Improving mass transportation between large population centers in Colorado should be a top priority, and the state should utilize existing rail lines which already run through town centers. This plan can be implement immediately.
12/23/2008 CDOT State Hotline	Strong supporter of package A. Rail is the way to go, more lanes on I-25 is not going to work in the long run. We need to catch up with the rest of the world and put in rail.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Please increase train and light rail along the Front Range. Freeways are expensive. Thousands of lives are lost due to traffic accidents and many more are maimed. Patrolling roads, upkeep, and snow removal are all expensive. Sand is taken from tax roles as lanes are increased. Our air becomes more polluted. I just returned from New York City. The New York Times reported that, despite population growth, Auto use and pollution have decreased as people use more trains and subways. I rode three subways from Grand Central Station to my daughters in Brooklyn, and it took 25 minutes. A drive would have taken much longer and cost more. Raise gas taxes (a percentage of price?) to pay for rail. Please lead the west in passenger and freight rail. We could avoid war by not needing foreign oil. People are flocking to light rail whenever it is introduced. Thank you.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Forgive me, I just submitted a comment, but forgot to specifically support "option A." Thanks.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We MUST look to mass transit for the I25 corridor. I approve of all mass transit, but especially a train through the downtowns of Ft. Collins/Loveland/Berthoud/Longmont/etc. Also having a bus transit (the one that is similar to light rail) along I25 will be largely useful. Merely adding lanes to an existing highways has been shown, time and again, to relieve traffic for only a short time, if at all. Thank you very much for all your efforts.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Package A is the BEST way to go! Please, please go this route!
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As a commuter rail activist for 30 years, a board member of the Colorado Rail Passenger Association, and a co-founder of Citizens for Commuter Rail, I wish to strongly endorse Alternative A for the North I-25 DEIS. Commuter rail from Fort Collins south to Longmont via the BNSF rail corridor is not only a logical alternative to further traffic congestions and more highway construction, it is also a logical northward extension of RTD's FasTracks program for commuter rail in the Denver-Boulder-Longmont BNSF corridor. Ultimately, the Larimer County rail corridor will become part of a commuter/heavy rail service running from Cheyenne to Albuquerque (where commuter rail is already operational). Decreasing oil resources, spiraling fuel costs, environmental concerns, and the wear and tear on the human psyche cause by traffic congestion and commuting by automobile, are all good reasons to support the implementation of commuter rail--as outlined in Alternative A--at the earliest possible date. In the future, commuter rail should also be considered for the UP's Greeley-Denver corridor.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in support of the DEIS Package A. The Northern CO area needs commuter rail, not more congested highways.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I prefer a rail, but keep it off I-25!
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Please don't build a light rail on I-25! I don't want an 8 lane highway.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I support commuter rail service, it is simpler, less expensive, and form myself would be handy to use. I live in Fort Collins and regularly go to downtown Boulder, near their main bus terminal, for work. I would love to have public transportation between Fort Collins, Longmont, Boulder and Denver. If there were better public transportation to Denver I would enjoy going to more cultural events there.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	It is past time that Northern Colorado plan for population growth with a sustainable transportation plan. I am in full support of a commuter rail using existing economic and social resources along US 287 rather than build more roads or adding lanes to I-25 which will only increase congestion, pollution, and sprawl. Hopefully plans for a commuter rail will utilize new technology for renewable energy.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	<p>As conceptually appealing as a commuter rail system is, I do not see it as pragmatic approach to the north I-25 transportation corridor. The public, government officials, and politicians are often swooned by the wonderful idea of an environmentally conscious and efficient public transport system promised by commuter rail, but once implemented, the convenience of personal motor transport most often remains the choice individuals. A well documented example of this phenomena occurred with the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) in public voting the project received overwhelming support, because individuals anticipated that usage of BART by others would clear the freeways for them to conveniently speed to speed to work in their car. The reality is that the outlying areas of BART experience low rider ship and the freeways remain overly congested. Even in the high density of the Bay Area commuter rail has had limited success. In the urban sprawl of the Front Range it is even less practical.</p> <p>Moreover, I am dumb founded by the proposal to locate a portion of the commuter rail line along County Road 7. All other portions of the proposed rail line run along existing multi lane highways and rail lines. CR 7 is a two lane county road with limited right of way and significant residential development in very close proximity. The existing EIS contains several inconsistencies to which I have sought answers. At public hearings in 2006 and again in 2008 I requested explanations to some of these issues, but the EIS representatives were unable to provide information to support the draft proposal.</p> <p>Cost</p> <p>I've been told that it is more economical to run the line along CR7 than along the I-25 median, because of the cost to bring the rail into and out of the median vs. a single crossing. However, when questioned about the cost to build these structures as well as all the controlled crossing at the dozen or so county roads and HWY 52 that intersect the proposed rail line, and the noise barriers through all the residential areas, I was told that those costs were not available. How then can it be determined what the more economic option is?</p> <p>Noise & Vibration</p> <p>When presented with the question of impacting residents with noise pollution and vibration, representatives responded that an equivalent area is impacted whether the rail is located along CR 7 or the interstate. This is a wholly unsatisfactory answer. The area in proximity to the freeway is already impacted, and the addition of a commuter rail will be marginal; whereas, a rail line along the two lane county road will have a horrendous impact to potentially thousands of individuals. Imagine a diesel locomotive rumbling through your neighborhood every 30 - 60 min from 4 am to 1:30 am, blowing its whistle every ½ mile as it intersects cross roads. In addition to the lack of a reasonable answer, the EIS grossly understates the impact. The EIS depicts one single small zone along CR 7 that would experience a negative noise impact and require sound barriers, and it states that only 167 residences would be impacted. In just three subdivisions along CR 7 Rinn Valley, Wild Flower, and Wyndam Hill there are easily 300 residence in close proximity to the proposed rail line, as well as dozens more individual residences the border CR 7. There is almost no portion of this route where residents would not be impacted by the noise and vibration of a commuter rail line.</p> <p>Eagle & Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>The EIS plan depicts several eagle nests the precluded a number of rail line options. Oddly though, the bald eagle pair that nest in the vicinity of CR 7 were not considered. Again, when questioned on this inconstancy, EIS representatives were unable to provide a direct answer stating that an independent consulting firm had provided that data. Offsetting a commuter rail line 1-mile west of the freeway along CR 7 essentially doubles the area of environmental impact in this sector. This is not consistent with the study's concept of Least Environmentally Damaging Practical Impact (LEDPA). Whereas locating the line along the I-25 median has little to no additional environmental impact to an area that is already impacted by 6 lanes of freeway traffic.</p>
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Please no development on I-25. Prefer use of existing tracks.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	We would like commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver with No expansion or development of I-25 Thank you for taking time to read my comment and concerns.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I want a commuter rail that runs through the downtown areas of Northern Colorado not an expansion of I-25. It is the most sustainable, environmentally conscious and affordable option. Developers have their own interests and are not considerate of farm land, the environment and our existing economy. Thank you for your consideration.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I support a rail system in town (centrally located)
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Please don't develop on I-25 use existing rail for Denver commute.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Public regional transportation along the front range from Wellington to Denver is very necessary. Increasing expansion of roads, lanes will not ease the problem. A commuter rail using existing tracks or the right of way would be better than expansion of I-25.
12/23/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We relocated to Loveland 11 years ago, and we were shocked at that time at the resistance to light rail. We lived in the metropolitan areas of Chicago, Cleveland and New York City. We utilized the rail systems available. We endorse 125 DEIS Package A. We were particularly impressed with the plan to use the existing rail line between Fort Collins and Longmont before connecting to the FasTracks and RTD lines in the Denver area. We do fully support changes needed to I-25 for safety reasons.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	As a commuter to Greely, I would love to find an Alternative to Driving down I-25. Alternative transportation would save on gas prices as well as cut down on air pollution. But most importantly it would cut down on the growing congestion that accumulates on I-25. Please consider the alternatives.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	If you expand I-25 it will only allow more exhaust from cars and pollute the air, it will only help with community for a short time. Building a commuter rail will not only help decrease the toxins from so many cars but it will provide a more reliable form of transportation for people to have the steady job that Fort Collins, Longmont and Loveland could not provide. Overall it's a win / win solution.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	Please do what ever you can to reduce roads, widening of roads, auto mileage and carbon reduction. Thank you.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I would rather have this located on 287 to deter more urban sprawl along I-25. It will also be more convenient.
12/23/2008 Mail in comment	I would rather have people enjoying the stops along a track that followed 287. Riders could see the quaint beauty of Fort Collins, Loveland, Berthoud and Longmont. I-25 near Loveland is already turning into generic sprawl. 287 would sustain Downtown areas that are what I am proud of.
12/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	WE STRONGLY SUPPORT COMMUTER RAIL WOULD BE HAPPY TO PAY TAX TO PAY FOR PROJECT
12/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to have rapid transit along Interstate 25 from Ft. Collins to Denver so I could easily and safely to Denver to benefit from places in Denver including the Zoo, Botanical Gardens, Cherry Shopping Mall, 16th Street Mall and a lot of other places in the City.
12/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Our group wishes to express our preference for Option A of the North I-25 study. We would like to see that most resources go for mass transit, preferably rail using the current rail beds.
12/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We need more rail. There are already tracks and a right of way from Fort Collins to Denver. It is TIME FOR RAIL. Duh!
12/24/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I have reviewed the North I-25 Environmental Impact Statement, and offer the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support Package A - providing a balance of multi-modal improvements including highway lane additions, commuter rail on the west, commuter bus on the east, and bus feeder connections - as the preferred alternative. 2. Modify the proposal for commuter rail in Package A by terminating the north end of the line at the Mason Corridor south terminus. <p>My reasons for making these recommendations are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While some differences exist, the impacts related to air quality, water resources, wetlands, wildlife, vegetation, floodplains, visual quality, historic preservation, hazardous materials, parks & recreation, farmlands, energy, public safety and construction are similar for both Package A and B. • The land use implications for the two options are very different. Package A supports a more sustainable development pattern resulting in reduced sprawl and less auto-dependant development. • While more costly initially, commuter rail provides a better opportunity to recoup the required investment due to the potential for transit oriented development to result in expanded business revenues, increased property values, redevelopment opportunities, public/private development projects and a higher tax base. • Because it would be located within developed communities, commuter rail results in the need for less park-and-ride trips than for a bus rapid transit line located along I-25. Park-and-ride use involves short auto trips with cold engine starts which make up the most polluting part of the driving cycle. • Package A provides more relief to parallel arterials than Package B, resulting in greater mobility and reduced road maintenance needs. • By providing transit options within urban centers, commuter rail promotes public health benefits through improved local air quality, increase walking/biking associated with transit use, increased pedestrian safety and support for neighborhood design that promotes active living. • Terminating the commuter rail line at the south end of the Mason Corridor eliminates the need for some single-track service north of CSU and provides an important regional link as well as cost savings for the commuter rail system.
12/24/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support commuter rail service along the I-25 corridor that connects communities' downtowns and provides access to additional alternate transportation. Wouldn't it be wonderful to not need a car to get to work? It is much better for the environment and encourages community as opposed to sprawl. It also allows people to have access to more employment opportunities and makes people's lives more productive and enjoyable when they don't spend hours driving every day. Think of how much it would improve our quality of life!
12/25/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the BNSF (commuter rail) downtown to downtown connectivity described in Package A
12/25/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I believe the option that includes rail service for Northern Colorado (Option A, rail transit) is best. Not only from a congestion relief standpoint, vs. more vehicle traffic on our roads, but from a safety and mobility standpoint. In addition, rail transit will use less petroleum, and will preserve the nature of our communities in Northern Colorado (Loveland, Longmont, Fort Collins, etc.). I do not want to see the automobile dominate the evolution of the landscape in Northern Colorado, and result in a situation like Los Angeles. I also do not believe that (more) bus traffic on I-25 is a good thing, or increasing the capacity of I-25 in general. This highway is a race track, and is already too dangerous. Please minimize the emphasis on I-25 in Northern Colorado. Thank you!!
12/25/2008 CDOT State Hotline	I support option A

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/25/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As an older person who makes frequent trips to Denver, I feel that an alternate form of transportation is essential!
12/25/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support any option that includes commuter rail.
12/26/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I like project A because it will put into place a light rail or alternative transportation system regardless of future growth including increased traffic in the affected areas. The goal is to reduce vehicular traffic and pollution and now is the time to do this while there is money for the project. Plan B would help for a while but like similar fixes in California, Texas, etc., increased growth would eventually overcome the additional lanes and routes. Having the rail in place will help commuters get to where they are going with out the having to deal with heavy traffic, accidents and lengthy travel times during poor weather conditions and/or accidents.
12/26/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to voice my support for Project A for several reasons. First, I believe commuter rail offers a much more environmentally benign mode of moving people than increasing toll lanes and continuing the reliance upon cars as the primary mode of transportation. Second, I prefer Project A because it distributes the traffic load between three corridors, rather than continuing to shuttle everything via I-25. Thirdly, because Project A includes multiple corridors, it allows for better access between west-east points rather than focusing exclusively on the north-south corridor. Thirdly, while both projects have environmental impacts, Project A offers the most bang for the buck, so to speak, in that it will move more people more efficiently over time than either Project B or no action. Finally, I think the investment in commuter rail and bus service, as opposed to bus lanes and HOV/toll lanes, will draw more growth to urban areas and allow for less suburban development/sprawl. The result will be to preserve more of the farmland that still exists in the I-25 vicinity. Project A takes a longer term look at the needs of the area and provides a better solution for the long term. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
12/26/2008 North I-25 Web Site	PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE option A! Since 1999 when I was commuting to Littleton to help care for my ailing father, I have hoped & prayed for some type of rail connection between Ft. Collins and Denver! YES, I would use it!!!
12/26/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Commuter rail is long past due and a win-win for everybody. Yes, it is expensive at first, but unlike never ending road construction it will pay for itself in a few years...not only monetarily, but environmentally.
12/26/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I vote for option A. We have the existing tracks that are underutilized. Having been to Europe and truly realizing the benefit it provides over there, I realized that we Americans are behind the 8 ball over here. Commuter trains are absolutely needed now.
12/27/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the mass transit components of Package A, especially the commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track between Ft. Collins and Longmont, there connecting with DENver Metro Fast Trcks and RTD bus routes.
12/27/2008 Mail in comment	I favor option 1 with rail lines to and from Longmont. If need be I could walk to an in town rail location.
12/27/2008 North I-25 Web Site	26 years ago, I graduated from CSU after having grown up in Longmont. I have been excited and proud of the growth of Fort Collins as an important Northern Hub of Colorado. BUT, I've been very dismayed and frightened by the dangerous and burgeoning amount of traffic going north on I25. You can almost predict the "speed surge" just as you come north of Longmont's city limits and traffic starts zooming at well over 90 miles an hour. I can curse the lack of safety, but really, it's about alot of people trying to go north in record time. Widening I25 simply won't solve the problem, and certainly at most, only temporarily. A train, on the other hand, would solve many problems at once: Safety, environment, convenience to commuters. And, as with all mass transit the decisions have to be forward thinking. Anticipating the fact that present problems only get worse, and very quickly. The decisions need to be made on a "yesterday" basis. Here's one native of Colorado who is urging the addition of a Northern Train to Fort Collins, protecting our beautiful state's environment and providing excellent, efficient and convenient opportunity for growth to our economy! Thank you!
12/27/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support necessary safety upgrades on I-25 but more importantly the mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont and from there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. This type of transit is both economically and environmentally the best solution.
12/27/2008 CDOT State Hotline	Rapid growth in Colorado is an issue that must be addressed in a responsible and progressive manor; and is deserving of a transportation solution that benefits all Coloradoans as well as our environment and resources. In this way Option A is the obvious and best choice for the development of transportation in Colorado. We would appreciate our voices being heard in the support of Option A.
12/27/2008 Mail in comment	I strongly support option A. I believe the addition of mass transit will do much to connect our communities. It would give residents and workers a safe economical means of travel. Thank you for your support of option A! P.S. I'll bet you don't get may letters written on this kind of paper! Our computer is down.
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	RTD light rail is needed to Longmont and beyond to Ft. Collins. How else can we begin to quit our dependency on foreign oil in sufficient numbers to make a difference?
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	CDOT's Package A - YES. Public transportation to Denver - bus or rail - long, long overdue and DESPERATELY NEEDED.
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We support commuter rail(Package A) due to the number of deaths and injuries on the nation's highways.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	OPTION A IS BEST
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	In connection with Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) North I-25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (NI25 DEIS) and to provide viable transportation choices for the movement of people and goods in the Northern Front Range (NFR), I support: necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. It is no longer rational or sustainable to create transportation infrastructure that promotes a "car culture." Further widening of I-25 serves only to encourage more driving and more cars. Climate change demands mass transit for most transportation needs, especially for commutes to and from employment. We can hope for and invest in alternative fuels. However, there is no reason to believe that they will materialize in the near future. The ability to create mass transit along the northern Front Range that connects with FasTracks is available now.
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am strongly in support of having commuter rail that connects the city centers along the front range. I grew up in Chicago and rode the train into the city all the time. I would use many more of the services in Denver if I could hop on a train to get there. It also makes the downtowns of Loveland and Longmont more accessible for me as well. Also, since I work at CSU, I think University classes could be opened up to a whole lot more people who would commute to campus via train. Please, please get this commuter rail going. Not doing it now, turns us into another big, metro area that did not get on board early enough. We'll need rail eventually, we might as well get started now.
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to request that CDOT adopt option A which includes rail to the project
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	North I-25 EIS Project Team, On behalf of the Mummy Range Institute, I would like to convey the following comments regarding the North I-25 Draft EIS. Of the alternatives listed, we support Package A. However, Package A must be reworked to avoid serious environmental harm and set a precedent for rapid transit in northern Colorado. Specifically, we are concerned with the estimated decrease in air quality and diminished wetland environments compared to the no-action alternative. Package A should offer an improved future for air quality and wetlands over no action, and this is easily attainable by reducing or eliminating the proposed expansion of I-25 in favor of increased commuter rail service. The commuter rail portion of Package A, as described in the DEIS, is little more than a "token" move toward regional rapid transit. It will not be sufficient to mitigate the environmental impacts of increased travel, nor will it be convenient enough to significantly change behavior among local commuters. A commuter rail package should not only reduce environmental impacts of regional travel, but shift preferences from individual vehicle travel. A package truly centered around commuter rail would have the secondary benefit of economically strengthening the historical core areas of Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont, whereas a package relying on I-25 expansion will encourage new and unnecessary development along the interstate corridor to the detriment of the downtown regions. Thank you for creating a vision for rail-based rapid transit in northern Colorado, but please modify Package A to make it a meaningful one. We look forward to viewing the Final EIS.
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	ABSOLUTLY focus on the commuter rail alternative. All weather transportation - safer - cleaner - ability to add seats in a hurry - supports TOD. Use busses as feeders like (I hate to say it) California has done successfully.
12/28/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support commuter rail for the I-25 and/or US 287 corridor(s). The cost involved will eventually be considered minor, compared to the alternative of worse gridlock, fuel consumption, and pollution.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am really excited about Option A for the NI25 Project and am writing to express my support for it. This option mainly uses existing infrastructure to bring transportation options directly to where the major population centers are in northern Colorado -- along the rail line -- and thus supports existing communities. It has the potential to help revitalize many ailing downtowns, including those in Berthoud, Loveland, and Longmont. It also allows the maximum possible number of people to walk to mass transportation services instead of needing to drive to get there. I am opposed to Option B because it would require people to drive to the I-25 corridor to access mass transit there. This would keep more cars on the road, thus increasing pollution, and is much less affordable and accessible for all families, but especially those with low enough incomes to make car ownership impossible. It also seems unlikely to alleviate congestion in the long-term. As more people move to this area, we will continue needing more and more lanes on the interstate to keep traffic moving quickly during rush hour. While option A is more expensive, its support of current, compact development in town centers is likely to pay financial dividends over the long term by avoiding new sprawl along the I-25 corridor, with all the new public services that would require. Please choose option A to improve transportation along the I-25 corridor. It is the clear winner for northern Colorado in protecting and improving our environment, communities, and quality of life. Thank you so much for giving us this option and for considering my comments.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A (allowing for much-needed expansion of I-25, plus possible future railroad transit).
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	It's nice to see Greeley included in Package A. I understand that in Package B there would be an efficient service for getting people from Greeley to I-25 vis HWY 34, however Weld County has grown significantly and if this continues, an efficient alternative mode of transportation will be crucial along HWY 85. Students and professionals spend hours commuting along HWY 85 between Greeley and Denver. However, if a commuter bus service along HWY 85 is not going to be faster than driving a car, it doesn't make sense to spend the money. I think that commuter rail service from Greeley to Denver is the ultimate goal for the long term.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support commuter rail for the North I-25 corridor.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support option A including light rail through the downtowns of Fort Collins & Loveland. We need to look toward the future and provide a means for escaping the urban sprawl of Denver with an environmentally friendlier option than more interstate.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	In connection with Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) North I-25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (NI25 DEIS) and to provide viable transportation choices for the movement of people and goods in the Northern Front Range (NFR), we support: necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. My family would welcome this step in the right direction. It is past due. Let's get up to speed with the rest of the developed world in regard to mass transit.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Plan A over the others. It will do the most to offer multiple transportation alternatives as the population of northern CO continues to grow.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support express toll lanes with more regular lanes being my second choice. Toll lanes place some of the cost on users.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Strongly support tolled express lanes with second choice being additional regular lanes.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please do what is necessary to provide commuter rail to all communities to the north. thank you
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I live in Fort Collins and commute to Denver 5 days each week for work. I currently participate in a VanGo vanpool. While I believe HOV and/or Toll lanes would improve congestion along I-25, I do not feel this is the best course of action. Real, forward-thinking mass transit solutions (such as rail or bus rapid transit) represent the best opportunity for long term impact. In the court of public opinion it is also important to make the distinction between "commuter rail" and "light rail" - these are not necessarily the same thing. If light rail is economically unfeasible, that does not mean the commuter rail concept should be abandoned as well. Beyond all of this, I think it is important to consider the question: is it absolutely necessary for all of these people to commute on a daily basis? Perhaps part of this study (and any publicly funded solutions) should consider ways to incentivise telecommuting for employees and employers alike. This would most directly address the root issue - too many people commuting each day.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I prefer Package A because it provides the most versatile solution to the I25 traffic problem, would tie the Northern Colorado cities' centers together, and would result in less congestion on I-25.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My wife and I would like to lend our support to package A of the North I25 Draft EIS. We feel strongly that rail options need to be pushed forward now. It is such a natural fit for the growing populations in nearby communities along the Front Range. While we would like to see these along I-25, E-470, and through the older urban corridor, we understand the high costs and so it makes the most selective sense to put it from FC to Longmont. It is too bad that the options page does not stress that this connection will readily link with all of the other plans being made in the Denver metro area. We would frequently use such a connection for work and pleasure travel to Boulder and Denver, even to link in the future to DIA. As a last point, we wish for some way to please integrate travel to the airport from the north into the plan, a way that would encourage use of the system versus auto travel (e.g., only 15 minutes longer and a lot more relaxing, safe, and fuel efficient). I make up to 15 trips a year to the airport (perhaps more than to Denver alone) and I suspect there are thousands of others in the Fort Collins area who do the same.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'd like to see the commuter rail option implemented - we've been waiting a long time for it!
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I believe it is essential to emphasize mass transit as the first priority in the improvement of this corridor. Widening I25 will compress the commute time, but the traffic will still be horrible. Light rail service connecting the major cities along the northern front range would be a benefit to all.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A of CDOT North I25 environmental impact study
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	About 30 years ago, there was a "study" as to the feasibility of a light rail along I25 from Ft. Collins (or even Cheyenne) to Pueblo. A committee was even sent to Japan--at great expense--to look at their system. I don't remember anything happening after that--except to say that it was too expensive! What a shame. We should have had a rail system for commuters as well as recreational travelers in place by now. Don't waste any more time. Adding more lanes to I25 will not solve the problem! We need a light rail system!
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I don't think rail is practical unless you're speaking of high speed rail. Include this along the I-25 corridor along with HOV lanes, if any expansion of I-25 north of HWY 66 is considered. Lightrail connections along Hwy 14 and 34 from the center of town can round out the picture. For Greeley, a similar scheme, only connecting to Denver along the HWY 85 corridor.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My husband and I would VERY much like to see I-25 expanded to three lanes up to or past Fort Collins. We'd also approve of a rail transit linking the city centers and would be likely to use that as well. We believe the additional lanes and rail line will make I-25 safer for our commutes and our children will benefit from those improvements!
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I want to vote for plan/package A before Tuesday. How do I do it?

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My husband and I strongly support both the bus rapid transit and the commuter rail options. Having lived in the San Francisco Bay Area we know how much these two options can do to improve traffic and support healthy economies while improving the livability of the cities being served. We strongly oppose the private toll road option and adding more lanes to the already dominate freeway.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Thanks for the opportunity to comment and pose a few questions: Comments 1. Package A is preferred because it focuses on population centers with commuter rail along US287 and regional bus service along US85. 2. I wish this planning effort could be re-named the "North Front Range 2030 Transportation Plan". Right now the initial impression for the average citizen is that the plan is about the interstate highway itself. In fact, it will have broad land-use and transportation impacts for the region as a whole. 3. I am concerned about the absence of attention to modern freight transportation planning. A critical need for future North Front Range transportation will probably be a modern freight corridor that avoids population centers. Questions 1. Relative to Package B can trucks pay tolls and use the TELs? 2. When comparing Package A & B, what are the transit travel times forecasted for BRT vs. commuter rail not just between Fort Collins and Denver, but between other pairs of cities such as Fort Collins, Berthoud, Loveland - Longmont, etc? 3. For which transit mode (BRT vs commuter rail) can capacity be most economically expanded to serve future increases in demand. 4. What if a peak oil future causes a large shift from diesel truck freight to inter-modal rail freight. Which package could more favorably accommodate such a change?
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I wanted to file a comment on NI25 DEIS. I would like to say that I support mass transit components of Package A and in particular the commuter rail connecting the city centers. Those of us in Fort Collins are still waiting for a good alternative transportation option to get to Denver.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support commuter rail for the North I-25 project. Preferably high speed commuter rail, consistent with any technology used for the Front Range and I-70 High Speed Rail projects.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The commuter rail approach to public transportation challenges facing northern Colorado--and specifically the core-to-core option--is easily the most feasible and most forward-thinking alternative for us to adopt; I strongly urge CDOT to do so. Additionally, given the fact that it will take a great deal of time to implement fully functioning commuter rail service between the communities of the Front Range, there are some critical short-term issues that need to be addressed in the interim, such as the provision of commuter bus service between Wellington and Denver. The money spent in the interim will help re-orient the general public's attitude toward public mass transit and promote greater ridership as the rail system is being built and comes on line.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'll lived in Colorado since 1964 and watched toll roads pay for themselves in a short period of time in the Denver area (Broomfield to Boulder). The growth in the Denver area and Larimer County is such that driving is a great stressful hazard on I25. The light rail in Denver has had a huge impact on commuters and citizens using this great system. In Fort Collins and north of Denver the need is eminent to have the same type of rail for many reasons. 1. impact on the environment would be positive. 2. travel by car on I25 is a mess with constant heavy traffic and large freight 18 wheelers which contribute to the wear and tear of the roadways and people's stress levels. 3. We should start training the young people and future children how to use rapid transit instead of relying on the automobile solely for transportation. 4. More people would go into Denver for business, culture, sports, art sand other reasons if there were an easier, more efficient way to get there and back. 5 We NEED mass transit up in Larimer County.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am in favor of light rail between Ft. Collins and Denver. I would also like to see light rail connecting to DIA and also west on the I-70 Corridor to access the mountains and ski resorts. It is expensive, but so needed to relieve future congestion.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please select Package A which includes commuter rail. Any other solution would be foolhardy.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Option A: expand lanes & add light rail service to Fort Collins
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor option A. I like that I-25 will be widened to 3 lanes each direction from Denver to Highway 14 (Mulberry St. in FC). Further, Option A creates a mass transit rail system connecting Fort Collins to other cities along the Front Range, including Longmont & Boulder, as well as connections to Denver. I think it is short sighted to create a bus system in Option B. I feel that most people would prefer train transit to bus transit and would therefore be liklier to use this alternative form of transportation. Besides, the bus system would use the highway lanes & contribute to overall traffic congestion. I think we need to be forward thinking and prepare for a time when our communities will require efficient ways to be connected to one another that don't rely on the highways. The "do-nothing" approach isn't an option at all. We must address this issue now! Thank you for hearing my comments.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the expansion of I-25 to three lanes each direction from Denver through Fort Collins, and, furthermore, support the construction of rail transit along existing rail roads, to connect the city centers of Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to one another. Given Colorado's commitment to reduce dependence on fossil fuel and clean up the environment, we will need better mass transit options to accomplish these goals. If such a system were in place, I would opt to use that rather than driving my car to these locations.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support package A of CDOT's North I-25 environmental impact study. In particular I would encourage transportation links between the universities and community colleges since students are commuting between the various institutions day and night and also to their part-time or full time jobs. It is possible to read or study on commuter rail and save time by not seeking parking spaces around campus.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am supporting the I25 DEIS Package A proposal that recommends commuter/passenger rail between Fort Collins and Longmont on the existing BNSF rail. I believe this will bring transportation in line with our future needs along the front range. The environmental, economic, and business benefits are huge in providing passenger and freight service to the downtown areas of the cities involved. This approach would certainly take pressure off I-25 and allow people to travel in relative safety. Thank you for including my comments in the decision process.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Fixed rail transit is not flexible to adjust to different demographics or needs. Doubling the existing bus routes could accomplish the same goals as a train but without the massive price tag and construction delays. For a thoughtful, detailed alternative to trains, visit my website: FreeSkiBus.org
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Since the NI25EIS site is down I'm hoping that my comments will get counted. I repeatedly hear that there are two packages, A and B, to choose from although I've never found reference to them on your site. I think those of us that live in N. CO need rail to Denver. It doesn't have to be light rail. I would like to see heavy rail that utilizes existing rail lines. I also don't like the idea of rail running down the I-25 corridor, although I understand from a right-of-way the appeal. My issue is that there is no N. CO town that straddles the interstate. All towns, and thus the majority of citizens live miles from the interstate. This would require a substantial increase in bus service from the urban centers to the interstate to access the rail. Rail MUST be part of the solution. Any package that does not include rail should be thrown out. We mustn't shortchange and burden future generations with a car only transportation system model. Thanks.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I'm definitely in favor of Package A of CDOT's North I-25 Environmental Impact Study. We are in desperate need of alternative modes of transportation, which would include better and more frequent and inclusive public transportation and rail options. Transportation improvements are LONG overdue!
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I grew up and lived until 1972 in the East where mass transit was a way of life. The light rail in Denver has had a huge impact on commuters and citizens using this great system. We in Fort Collins and north of Denver need to have the same type of rail for many reasons. 1. impact on the environment would be positive. 2. travel by car on I25 is a mess with constant heavy traffic and large freight 18 wheelers which contribute to the wear and tear of the roadways and people's stress levels. 3. We should start training the young people and future children how to use rapid transit instead of relying on the automobile solely for transportation. 4. More people would go into Denver for business, culture, sports, arts if there were an easier, more efficient way to get there and back. 5 We NEED mass transit!
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	In connection with Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) North I-25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (NI25 DEIS) and to provide viable transportation choices for the movement of people and goods in the Northern Front Range (NFR), I strongly support: necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Pkg A. It's time we moved into the 21st century.Thanks
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am writing to voice my support for a passenger/commuter rail service between Ft. Collins and Denver, and beyond.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I like this plan: To Expands 1-25 to three lanes each direction from Denver through at least Mulberry (possibly Wellington, I can't recall). For mass transit purposes, it also adds a line of rail transit along existing rail roads to connect the city centers of Fort Collins, Loveland & Longmont to one another. One could then in theory, get all the way to Boulder and downtown Denver using this rail system.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We in Longmont have been for too long underserved relative to the RTD taxes we have been paying. We would benefit in many ways from light rail and not much from widening of I-25. The I-25 congestion would be more effectively and environmentally soundly addressed by a significant investment in van pools - which would also help creat jobs more quickly - amother initiative that would ge helpful on many fronts is to encourage employers to promote telecommuting for many jobs. Finally, we should add a large energy wasting fines to folks exceeding the already energy wasting speed limit on I-25. The proceeds could be used for highway efficiency projects.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly prefer the I25 North Package A build plan. Primarily the choice is between serving existing population centers and using and sustaining existing compact civil infrastructure in Package A and building a completely new, sprawling metropolis of "I25 North" in Package B. Even though I live within earshot of I25, I prefer the former because it is overall cheaper at this time when the nation is so heavily in debt, is more energy efficient as fuel prices are sure to surge again, and maintains the character and identities of the North Front Range cities. Package A, together with the Mason St. Corridor plan, will breathe new life into the increasing number of vacant buildings along College Ave. thus countering urban decay. It will also support the heritage of the N. Front Range as being centered on the BNSF RR and US287 and of I25 as a nearby, uncongested bypass for long-range, interstate traffic.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	As I reviewed the draft EIS it is unclear to me how either Alternative A or B provides reasonable transportation links to key destinations such as DIA, Denver sports and performing arts complexes and the ski areas. Also, it is not clear how major destinations such as people who work downtown, at the Denver Federal Center etc would connect with especially the rail or bus option. In general, I like the idea of rail that connects existing communities rather than more investment in the I-25 mess. We need viable options to single passenger vehicles that does not promote more sprawl. Increasing density and options between and within cities, and making those that use I-25 help pay for improvements makes sense.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor a combination of bus rapid transit and commuter rail provided that both can be made to articulate with Denver's light rail system.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have been a resident of Northern Colorado for the twenty one years of my being. As long as I can remember traffic has been heavy on I-25 and it seems to get worse each year. I believe that a rail based transit system is the most effective plan for I-25. Buses and lane expansions only add future problems to the I-25 nightmare. Soon, CDOT will have to expand again as the area continues to grow. Expansion will especially become important when the national economy improves. Rail transit allows for additions to be made while only having to expand the rail area a few feet, compared to lane expansion. Expansion does not need to happen as frequently since multiple trains, as long as it is managed well, can be on one track. Finally, the costs to passengers is worth it because gas can be just as expensive if not more expensive. It can be cost effective for those building and maintaining the system because they gain the money back through the fares. I, as a native Northern Colorado resident support any kind of rapid rail transit and as long as it is by rail.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Plan "A", please. A train that actually stops in the destination city is infinitely preferable to a bus that stops on the highway. Getting off the highway is the whole point. Trains will also attract more commuters, people who would never ride the bus, even the "just-as-good-as-light-rail" BRT. Busses aren't as good, as useful or as pleasant as rail, particularly on longer trips. Bite the bullet and build the better alternative - commuter rail.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Thank you for your work on the North I25 EIS. After reviewing them I strongly encourage you to go with a combination of the commuter rail & bus options. After traveling the world and experiencing how Europe, Asia and larger US cities handle traffic, rail is the best long term option. It is more expensive now, but the best to add on to in the future to handle increased volume. Please also do not consider diesel trains; if Colorado is trying to be a "green" state, we need to use options that can use renewable resources and reduce pollution. To support the rail traffic, bus service should be utilized to get to areas not directly on the rail lines. Good bus routes are all ready in service in many North Colo. towns. Thank you for you time on this project. I look forward to commuting by train in the future.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We don't have the population density along north I-25 to support commuter rail, so please don't waste my tax money on such boondoggles. We do have significant congestion on north I-25, so please do add a third lane and please do upgrade the interchanges that need it.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I prefer widening I-25 to light rail. Light rail won't go where I have to. How do I get around (and bring back purchases) after I'm dropped off?
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would just like to enter my opposition to a rail system unless it is an overhead monorail that parallels the intrastate highways with connecting bus service into the cities it services.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I just wanted to state my support of necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. I want to support all of the work to have Longmont connected into the system in any and all ways possible.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	What a great addition it would be to our north Front Range communities if we were connected by train and also to Denver's transportation systems! Please let's make it happen.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Although I am a member of the Environmental Advisory Board of Larimer County, my comments here are solely my own personal views. I strongly support Alternative A with its emphasis on commuter rail running through extant urban centers as well as needed improvements to I25. Only this alternative has the potential of encouraging core city growth and discouraging the exurban sprawl that negatively impacts the environment and spurs greater loss of our agricultural lands.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	My preference is Option A, the rail option, but would like consideration given to a elevated rail, such as monorail or mag-lev option. This could move people efficiently and quickly without compounding other traffic issues(truck and car, bicycle, pedestrian, ground rail), and potentially less impact from weather, or other environmental issues.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please, please proceed ASAP with improvements to the I-25 Windsor Exit. It is so congested, the traffic lights on the east side are not adequately visible, heavy construction trucks and general traffic will eventually make the overpass in need of repairs anyway. So our hope is that you make this a priority.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	To Whom It May Concern: I support the intention of developing a Colorado front range rail system, all the way to Colorado Springs, and then Pueblo, and then on to Durango. My point is that creating an efficient system of rail travel in this country should start at a state level and then continue to put the passenger rail system back on the tracks across the USA.
12/29/2008 CDOT State Hotline	I strongly support option A, especially the rail option. I moved here 1 1/2 years ago, I had a choice between Portland OR or here. I am originally from New Mexico. I wanted to live in a place with rail, I chose here because it isnt as cold. Rail will make us less dependent on oil and on personal cars. I think rail is what will best serve us in the future and I would love to have it so I can visit my family in NM.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please make sure rail transportation for commuters (be it light rail or heavy high-speed rail) is a large part of the I-25 project. My work at CSU involves near-daily trips to Denver from Fort Collins, and every time I get in my car to go to Denver, I think to myself how much more pleasant it would be if I could spend that travel time reading, or relaxing, letting someone else "drive." I commuted by rail when I lived in Europe (both in France and the UK) and it was such a pleasure. Americans may claim they love to drive their cars, but when rail travel is convenient and the stops well-placed, it's truly much more fun AND relaxing -- not to mention better for the environment. Thank you for reading my comments.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly favor an emphasis on regional rail service. Ideally, it should provide a practical and speedy alternative to Longmont, Loveland, Boulder, and Denver.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Option A is the best choice by far. Focusing on I 25 will only encourage development along I 25, causing issues with town tax revenues and blighted town centers.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support: 1)the mass transit components of Package A - using existing rail to connect city centers from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver FasTracks and RTD bus routes and 2)safety upgrades to I-25.
12/29/2008 CDOT State Hotline	As two retired educators my husband and I are strong supporters of option A.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I rank commuter rail as my highest preference, with bus rapid transit as a second choice. In economic comparisons, the external costs associated with existing transport must be considered.
12/29/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I heartily support light rail and bus travel between Fort Collins and Denver. The traffic is terrible on I25 as everyone knows and adding more lanes to highways just encourages more cars and more traffic.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	We need to build our future. The population along the front range of Colorado is growing, and will continue to grow at a faster pace for the foreseeable future. We need to develop a transportation infrastructure that will accommodate the population growth and then increasingly regionalized job market in Colorado. Adding lanes to I-25 will not decrease commuter use; in other parts of the country we have seen that more lanes more traffic with no change in congestion in communities. Commuter rail is a vital option that can reduce traffic and congestion along I-25. By alleviating the negative effects of sing vehicle commuting on air quality and foster economic development along the front range. Los Angeles had this option in the 1950's but declined. We can make an informed choice and encourage the DOT to make a choice for quality of rule, preservation or our natural resources and the Colorado economy.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The Poudre Canyon Group of the Sierra Club supports Alternative A with an emphasis on commuter rail on existing rail lines, or near local communities. This will keep downtown areas vital and encourage compact growth so VMTs can be reduced and air quality improved. We are opposed to the addition of auto lanes to I-25 because no region has built its way out of congestion; rail is the most cost effective and environmentally sound alternative. We feel that maintaining more lanes and new road construction is unsustainable financially and environmentally over time. We cannot afford to maintain existing infrastructure. Rail is the most financially and environmentally sustainable kind of transportation infrastructure, and there is broad support for this 21st Century solution. Thank you. Conservation Chair, PCG
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	Prefer rail to run on existing tracks not on I-25.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 CDOT State Hotline	<p>My husband and I are ages 61 and 63 respectfully. We have been residents of Ft. Collins since 1979! We have never regretted our decision to move to Colorado and the beautiful city of Ft. Collins. However, as we get older, we do have a great many concerns regarding I-25! Since I see that the deadline to get in our feedback is tomorrow, this may not be the most organized letter but will try to put my thoughts in short concise statements!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Getting to the airport! My husband is still working, but we do travel a fair amount. On one occasion, we headed to the airport with plenty of time to spare, only to get south of Loveland to find the road at a standstill due to an accident. We sat and sat in the traffic and finally my husband said, "if we don't start moving, we aren't going to make our flight!" So, we illegally drove through a ditch to get off of the interstate and started heading south and east and finally our strange route did get us to the airport in time to run and catch our flight! It is an absolute miracle that this hasn't happened to us more often as we often find the road at a standstill due to an accident!2. Tourism! On one trip back to Ft. Collins last summer, the traffic going north was worse than usual due to cars pulling trailers, RV's etc. probably going to Rocky Mountain National Park. My husband commented that "tourism" is one of Colorado's main revenues; but, he bet after fighting I-25 the people in the RV's etc. wouldn't be back nor would they recommend going to Estes Park to their friends!"3. Getting to events in the Denver area! We are going to the Buell Theater tonight to see the play "Jersey Boys"! Our friends offered to drive and my husband was more than happy to take them up on their offer. We have tickets with a group of friends to the Rockies. Last summer we started to a game and there were so many wrecks and delays that the game was truly ruined when we finally got there, for my husband, who was the driver.4. Comments from others! Our son, who grew up in Ft. Collins, and now lives in California, said to me recently, "Mom, I know that you think there are too many people in California but at least they build roads to accommodate them! He should know as he is a Titleist Rep and travels through a great deal of Northern California! He commented that the road between Denver and Ft. Collins was worse than anything he had to travel on in his territory!5. Revenue from Wyoming and adjoining states! I know that Ft. Collins businesses and Denver businesses as well, benefit greatly from the people who come to Colorado from Laramie and Cheyenne. They too have to travel I-25 and therefore our state very likely loses revenue from adjoining states due to the condition of our roads!6. Our hope for the future! Neither my husband nor I consider ourselves inactive or old! But, according to our local newspaper, "The Coloradoan", Colorado is now the 5th fastest growing state. With roads that are already in poor repair and not meeting the needs of the current population, it is a real concern for those of us who hope to be able to enjoy retirement and all of the beauty that Colorado has to offer! If some sort of commuter rail service were available, we would definitely take advantage of it! (And, I have heard countless friends echo the same sentiment!) Therefore, I hope you give careful consideration to Package A of the CDOT North I-25 study. Thank you for allowing me to express my concerns! In closing, a quote by Benjamin Franklin - "Dost thou love life? Then do not squander time, for that is the stuff that life is made of."
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I appreciate the amount of detail available on the I-25 EIS website. It was daunting initially to find what I needed to review in the options. At this time, I support Alternative A Commuter Rail from Ft. Collins to Denver. I am concerned about the integrity of the BNSF rail lines for commuter use and also wonder how much impact the freight schedules will cause since we live within 1 mile of the tracks and the trains go through FC often! I would hope that the light rail options for Longmont, Boulder and Greeley areas can be a reality soon. I personally know a great number of people who drive to Denver or Boulder daily from Cheyenne and Fort Collins....most of them solo in their cars. We all need other options.....soon! Thank you.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>As a past user of light rail in Chicago I strongly recommend a similar system for the front range. I vote for plan "A" with the hope that it would eventually be expanded from Cheyenne to Colorado Springs. Thank you.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I own a property in Mountain Range Shadows, and the tenant gave me your info on alternatives proposed. I STRONGLY support commuter rail service! This would be much more energetically efficient transportation, would reduce emissions and traffic congestion, correspondingly reducing traffic accidents, injuries and fatalities. It makes so much sense! Thank you for asking our opinions!</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>We cannot move into the 21st century without rapid transit among our comities. I grew up in SO California and grew up in the utter mess of the So California transportation system. Don't make that mistake! Give commuters options other than polluting cars. Event with non-polluting cars, traffic is a problem. I would shop and visit Denver more often if I could catch a train. I would also open employment opportunities, I won't drive there however.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>Please support Package A</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Email	<p>I have been involved in transportation issues in Larimer Co. since the early 90's. In that time I have come to realize that the ONLY feasible new transportation need is passenger rail from Fort Collins to Boulder and Denver.</p> <p>We all know that the U.S. cannot sustain our current rate of oil usage. Rail will significantly reduce that.</p> <p>The air quality in the entire front range is a present problem which passenger rail can significantly reduce.</p> <p>Passenger safety is the other major improvement which passenger rail will provide to our citizens.</p> <p>Add to these the convenience, reduced stress, improved accessibility, lower cost, reduction of sprawl and the benefits of passenger rail are clear.</p> <p>The most useful way to implement passenger rail is to use the existing Burlington Northern Santa Fe lines beginning in Fort Collins and ending in Denver. This option will utilize the existing downtown in all the cities and towns on the route and thereby reduce sprawl away from those existing town centers.</p> <p>With the uncertain future of oil availability, I believe the implementation of the passenger rail ONLY is the one portion of all the elements of both plan A and B that should be considered. We very well may not need any additional lanes once Larimer County citizens have an alternative to the single occupancy vehicle.</p> <p>At the very least this option, passenger rail on the BNSF lines, should be considered and the cost of this only should be shown and broken down into its elements for the citizens information.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I would like to see Package A implemented, with the commuter rail extending south to northern Denver. My husband and I will use the rail, instead of driving to Loveland, Longmont and Westminster often. We will go to Denver for concerts, museums, meetings and entertainment more often. We lived in Northern Virginia and saw the always increasing use of Metro there; however, the shortsightedness of not extending metro to outer suburbs and building cross-connections in the beginning, has because of costs at the time, has meant that the metrorail is not as flexible and does not serve populations as it could/should.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I support plan A, especially the rail portions that provide alternative services to the towns in the corridor. Such services could boost the economies of all town along the route.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>The need for public transportation to Denver is noted. Bus transportation to Denver should be a priority and plans for rail transportation should begin now.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I am in favor of option A.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>It would be great to have a light rail from Fort Collins to Denver along 287 (Not I-25).</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I want to bring commuter rail to the North Front Range. I support: necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I used to commute to Denver. Having a commuter rail would have helped out tremendously. Many of my clients commute to Denver and all have comment that public transportation is very much needed. It would be faster and less stressful than driving which would improve their quality of life. It would be less expensive which would enable them to spend more in this community of save, or pay down their debts. Jobs in the community are.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 CDOT State Hotline	<p>I have reviewed both packages A and B and the criteria for comparing the two packages, and have some comments that favor package A's commuter rail option (with commuter bus from Greeley) over the BRT option.</p> <p>The two packages are compared for time from Fort Collins to Denver. I believe this is a poor indicator for two reasons:</p> <p>1.) Much of the commuter traffic along this corridor is between Front Range cities (Boulder-Longmont to Fort Collins) and East-West to Greeley; rather than between the North Front Range and Denver. For example, NFR MPO surveys and census data revealed approximately 46% of workers in Loveland commute from elsewhere. Of employed Loveland residents, approximately half commute out, with the bulk of these employees travelling north to Fort Collins or south to the Longmont-Gunbarrel-Boulder region. I myself commuted for one year between Fort Collins and Boulder - there was simply no good way to make this trip as both I-25 and 287 require long car trips. A rail alternative would be attractive to maintain mobility and the ability of employees to reach their jobs without becoming "supercommuters." I would suggest the EIS look at a more sophisticated projection of commuter times for all major regional commuting routes, not simply Fort Collins-Denver.</p> <p>2.) The comparison of rail and BRT considers only time in the mass transit vehicle, not total trip time. Yet the bulk of the population lives, and will continue to live, nearer the BNSF rail line (for Fort Collins, Loveland, Berthoud and Longmont) or quite east of I-25 in the case of Greeley, rather than near I-25. The travel time from downtown Loveland to the I-25 park and ride is at least 15 minutes, or more, in rush hour, making BRT less convenient and attractive. For Greeley residents, bus service from Greeley to Denver may be more attractive than the trip to I-25 for BRT.</p> <p>Additionally, the DEIS mentions that rail transit along the BNSF will support infill development goals. However, this is not modelled. I would suggest the EIS include a model based on the rail transit option and current projects underway such as the Mason Street corridor project in Fort Collins and downtown redevelopment in other cities, as well as station area TOD opportunities, that impact land use. The EIS may find it worthwhile to explore market trends in these areas. (It is very difficult to accommodate supporting land uses for BRT.) It also seems to me that the proposed parking at some of the proposed rail stations is limited, potentially limiting the use of Park n Ride options ...</p> <p>Based on these concerns, I believe the best way for the North Front Range area to grow is to support transit along the BNSF corridor, with commuter bus service linking Greeley to surrounding communities, as shown in option A. The ability to use rail transit to reach both to Boulder and Denver is an important component of this concept, despite current uncertainties about Fastracks. I-25 will need improvement, in particular at interchanges, but there is no reason to target all transportation funds to I-25 to the detriment of existing communities.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I am in complete support of a bus line to Denver now and commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont to Denver in the long term. These new transportation options will reduce traffic, congestion, and improve air quality in our communities. I am in favor of any action to reduce sprawl along I-25 and these new transportation in options will only encourage growth in our city centers.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I drive I25 to DIA at least twice per week. The four lane portion is in very bad shape. This needs to be expanded to six lanes to north of Fort Collins as soon as possible. Many other highway projects have been given priority in the state like I25 in South Denver while the section I drive north of Longmont is ignored. It is way past time to do it right and finish six lanes all the way to CO Hwy 14.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Please, please support an initiative to build a rail system to Denver. This is the most sustainable option and would be well worth the cost for the options it would offer Northern Coloradoans!</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Commuter rail through Fort Collins to Denver is much desired in my household for safety and economy. I dont want to have to move form Fort Collins for my job! Id rather live here and not Denver.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>It's simply ridiculous that we don't have an extensive, reliable commuter rail form Northern Colorado to Denver. There are multitudes of people who benefit from and take advantage of a commuter rail. Business commuters and concert enthusiasts along would justify this, this would cut back on a significant amount of pollution, save a tremendous amount of energy and provide a safer means of travel.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>We want a bus line to Denver and a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont to Denver.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I am writing is support of Package A, which will result in commuter rail along the 287 corridor. It's past time to move away from a car-centric transportation mode and invest in more energy-efficient infrastructure.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I am writing to express my support for option A. Just adding lanes to I25 will be a never ending project requiring more and more lanes over the coming years. Something different needs to be done and in the long run I feel that a rail system will be the ultimate answer. Delaying implementing that option will just make it more expensive when it is ultimately built. Let's bite the bullet and get it started.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Fax	<p>Rapid transit is a must for Colorado. We are caught in a nation wide dilemma as more roads lead to more traffic, more pollution, and more expense. While the rest of the world was building rapid transit, the United States was building suburbs. It is estimated that our current highway system, if maintained properly, will cost a minimum of \$500,000 annually. One of our candidates for county commissioner has investigated the possibility of using the existing railroad tracks for both freight and rapid transit by negotiating the timetable. Freight can adapt nighttime schedules while daylight hours can be used for transit.</p> <p>I believe that there is opposition to this proposal from various merchants in the area who do not want easy access to other areas. Also, there are tax incentives for some developers that might be lessened and used for the transit program. One of the scare tactics was that it would cost \$4 million a mile to construct tracks.</p> <p>Many of us older citizens would transit exclusively. We regularly drive to Longmont to ride a bus to Denver.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to establish a rapid transit system in this area. Beginning now will benefit everyone. Let's take Colorado into a new age.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Do not develop in undeveloped areas. Keep construction impact on traffic to a minimum.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>Continuing to solve the transportation problem by expanding the use of single-person vehicles is absolutely irresponsible, as we saw this past summer, we are at the mercy of foreign nations that have no particular incentive to mitigate the flow of cash from here to there. Additionally, we all pay the price of climate change to the extent that we cannot find alternatives to our current route of greenhouse gas emissions. I carpool between front range cities daily and would love an alternative!</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>It is critical that at a minimum a bus route from Wellington to Denver is created, funded and functional in 2009. We need this service now. Plus as this service becomes more popular with North Colorado citizens we have a base population to get off the bus and on to a brand new light rail system. Gas isn't going to stay at under 2.00 per gal forever, we need to lead and not follow.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I support pkg. A</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Email	<p>Please note that I spoke at the public hearing in Loveland in support of the commuter Rail component of Package A. The reason for this email is to list more reasons why I support Commuter rail along Hwy 287.</p> <p>Here, again, are my preferred implementation steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commuter bus between Denver and Greeley 2. Commuter rail from Fort Collins to Longmont and Thornton, using BNSF rail as much as possible 3. Each north front range town and community should promote transit options strongly as they become available, thereby motivating additional people to use transit 4. Remediate safety problems on I-25 and its interchanges. <p>I do not support increasing the number of lanes on I-25 as written in either Package A or B. Here's why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use of the North I-25 EIS Record of Decision in the upcoming 2035 Land Use EIS is a huge red flag to me! Given the close relationship between transportation and land development, and the unlikelihood that funding will become available anytime soon, it makes me wonder whether the purpose for this EIS is to lay the groundwork for the next wave of development. 2. Considering that state and regional infrastructure is sadly out of date and underfunded, it would seem prudent for greenfield development to FOLLOW transportation infrastructure rather than precede it. There are 5 interchanges in 5 miles between Hwy 60 and Crossroads. Population density is very low in that area now. If the Record Of Decision includes plans for 6 lanes plus two 5-mile merge lanes in that stretch, then developers will develop for car-based development in that area. All that additional car traffic will very negatively affect regional health and safety metrics. 3. Regarding Land Use EIS, Colorado and CDOT should set a standard for transit-oriented design in new development in regions with population above some level and the greenfield around Berthoud, Johnstown and Loveland would be a perfect place to for this new requirement. Space should be reserved for walking, biking, bus routes and stops and/or a rail spur, depending on development location within a longterm Transportation Plan, so that new populations have choices other than driving or staying home. 4. Mass transit (rail and bus) should be designed to handle the peak load traffic times so that additional lanes and roads do not get built. Transit is expand-able at far more reasonable costs than additional lanes, as peak traffic continues to grow. By contrast, to build highways to handle peak traffic loads is to lag demand – the more roads and lanes, the more traffic. 5. The goals of the EIS should include health effects (air quality, incidence of respiratory health conditions, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, exercise benefits, etc) in addition to the 'regional and inter-regional movement of people, goods, and services in the I-25 corridor', and 'addressing mobility, accessibility, safety and aging infrastructure'. People do not only "move about" here. People are born, work, raise families and retire here. The climate is conducive to outdoor exercise and health benefits result. But if air quality worsens due to increased car traffic then even bicyclists' health is impacted and there are a lot of bicycle commuters here. 6. The EIS should assess metrics at 2030 and 2050 – to stop at 2030 is only 20 years away. The Portland, OR area for example, had a 50 year land use plan since the mid 90's – let's learn from them. Assuming a 2% annual increase in population growth over 40 years will reveal the cost-effectiveness of rail and feeder transit systems versus the expense and negative health effects of additional I-25 lanes, roads feeding I-25 and parallel arterials. <p>Thanks for the chance to provide additional feedback.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	After all the studies over the years have been dusted off and examined, the best option for Commuter Rail is the utilization of the Burlington Northern-Rio Grande corridor.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	Real commuter rail thru town based between Fort Collins Loveland Greeley Longmont etc to Denver high speed, fast, efficient and frequent. Provide a bus transit system now while we ramp up the commuter rail system. Avoiding I-25 with rail avoids undesirable growth outside.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	To encourage more usage for communities it would work far better to have a commuter rail system then more usage of I-25. I would use commuter rail a lot!
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I want to state that I support Plan A over Plan B. I feel the extra cost is justified because, in the long run, Plan A will better serve the communities' transit needs with less environmental impact. Plan A will also better mesh with total front range passenger rail service if and when that happens. Its my opinion that Plan B will encourage more strip development along I25 and thus add to the problem the Plans are intended to solve. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIS.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I do not like toll roads. Adding highway lanes is a great disruption to traffic and commuters, and I do not like that either. I like the other alternatives...the issue is how late to trains and buses run - can I get home at a convenient hour?
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I think that Option A is the best. The bus transit in Option B is not worthwhile for two reasons: 1. people won't use the buses. (They are far liklier to ride trains for mass transit). 2. The buses will travel I-25 adding to the congestion. Also, I feel that keeping the rail routes along the city centers of the towns in Option A benefits these communities. Something needs to be done about traffic congestion in Northern Colorado. I also feel that I-25 should be 3 lanes in each direction from Denver through Fort Collins and Optioh A accomplishes that.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	Please consider the Public Commuter Rail plan, not only is it the least expensive but it has gained popularity in many other areas. This has profound economic, environmental, and cultural implications that can truly help Larimer County.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	I have loved ones all over the Front Range, having grown up in Boulder, attending college in Denver and presently residing in Fort Collins and working in Loveland. I have family and friends spread throughout the area. Bus line between Fort Collins and Denver now and commuter rail in the eventual will help bring people together in a way currently impossible.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please put in a rail system to Denver. It may cost more in the short run, but in the long it will save money, and, more importantly, the lives of those killed each year on Interstate 25.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	We need better public transportation between Fort Collins and the Metro Denver Area! Have you ever tried to get there without a car? Its impossible.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	In general, I support: necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. I would also like noise studies done re: noise impacts of local train service in city centers/how they can be mitigated. I attended the meeting on December 9th, 2008, and heard many speakers. I liked what Tim Johnson had to say.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	The working class of Northern Colorado need a profound change in the public transportation sector. This, I believe, is most crucial for achieving a slice of the "new" American Dream
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I have been following the issue for some time now and have examined the plans. I urge you to adopt Plan A.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Our household and friends believe the infrastructure of our railroad system is extremely important. USA Has two east-west trunk-RR-lines here in the West: one in the north, & one in the south. Fifteen years ago I wrote AMTRACK our opinion that they could/should team up in a joint effort with municipalities between the two trunk lines and create a cooperative effort to connect the existing trunk lines with a north-south trunk line along the front-range/I-25 corridor. We still think this a splendid, future-oriented plan for several reasons. Passenger/Freight would of course have to be worked out (Probably as in other parts of our country.). If your "Package A" is compatible with moving in this major n-s trunk-line direction as a first step, my household and I are all in favor of your "Package A." Please excuse my spelling. It is late, and I can't access spellcheck.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>New Belgium Brewing Company-500 Linden St. Fort Collins, CO 80524</p> <p>As co-founder/CEO and Sustainability Director of the nation's third largest craft brewery, we are writing to express our strong support for Package A within the North I-25 Draft EIS. Environmental stewardship has been a core value of New Belgium's since our inception. Our coworkers utilize the I-25 corridor quite often, and we would be pleased to have the option to travel by rail as we feel it is the only solution on the table that will benefit our environment and our health.</p> <p>By investing in core-city transit systems, Package A will increase alternative transportation options and, by doing so, will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, vehicle miles traveled, air pollution, and Colorado citizens' financial costs of fuel. It will reduce our impacts to open space, wildlife habitats and river corridors and directly aid urban renewal planning in Northern Colorado.</p> <p>New Belgium is purposefully located in the heart of Old Town Fort Collins. We chose this site over less expensive options outside of town because we wanted our coworkers to have the opportunity to ride their bikes and walk to work, thereby increasingly their quality of life and helping them to have a smaller impact on the environment. Passenger rail along the Front Range would also aid in this effort by reducing miles driven in cars, currently our only option.</p> <p>The reality of our climate crisis is widely known, and we are seeing governments and prominent businesses across the world make concerted efforts to reduce our impact on the environment. Transportation plays a key role in this endeavor, and the availability of passenger rail will greatly increase the ability of our Front Range communities to plan and implement sustainable development. Colorado is quickly emerging as a leader in the New Energy Economy, and we strongly feel a progressive and environmentally wise transportation plan, as described in Package A, will solidify our leadership role.</p> <p>On behalf of ourselves and the 300 coworkers employed by New Belgium, we urge you to support Package A for the I-25 North Corridor. We also strongly encourage you to implement the passenger rail system before I-25 is further widened. By investing in passenger rail first, the 1.3 billion-dollar expenditure for widening I-25 may be significantly delayed or possibly unnecessary and will significantly reduce ongoing maintenance costs on north I-25.</p>
12/30/2008 Email	I support the alignment of rail service along the highway 287 corridor through the Berthoud, Loveland and Fort Collins Communités.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the commuter rail option.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Email	The following may be of interest if the I-25 EIS based costs on Colorado Railcar information. Also, I'm not sure the safety issues were adequately addressed based on the second reference in the following email. Thank You, Evelyn King Two stories in the Oregonian about rail transit will be of interest to Colorado readers. First is a story about Colorado Railcar, which has been proposing a design for "Diesel multiple units" (DMU) that transit agencies can use for commuter trains. Portland's transit agency, TriMet, ordered some of these DMUs and has had serious problems with Colorado Railcar. The basic problem, I think, is that Tom Rader, who runs Colorado Railcar, has historically had a business of rebuilding passenger rail cars from older cars. Building cars from the ground up is much more difficult and I suspect he underestimated the cost and difficulty in order to get orders from transit agencies. This will affect RTD to the extent that RTD was depending on Colorado Railcar for its US 36 and North Metro lines. Read the full story at http://www.oregonlive.com/special/index.ssf/2008/12/trimet.html Second, the Oregonian maintains a unique map of Portland's light-rail system. Instead of showing schedules, it reveals all the crime that is associated with Portland light rail. The rail stations, especially on the east side, have been taken over by local gangs. You can see the map at http://blog.oregonlive.com/oregonianextra/2007/11/max.html
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	I strongly support the commuter rail alternative as a pivotal solution to future transportation needs. It's the most pragmatic idea with respect to money and the environment. PLEASE strongly consider this alternative. Thank you!
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Please add language to the information related to interchanges that allows the potential for roundabouts at the ramp termini, and adjacent to other ramps at other controlled intersections such as frontage roads. The language in the DEIS does not preclude roundabouts but it does not endorse their potential either as a practical alternative. Thank you.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the COOT Proposals for improving the north I-25 traffic problem. It is a challenge we have to face. I am a Loveland native, in my 80's, so I have seen first hand all my life the never-ending increase in traffic between Fort Collins and Denver. I am definitely in favor of Package A. I know it is already a possibility as I was a college student in Denver during the 1940's, and I could take the train from Loveland to Denver, and my husband took the train to the University of Colorado in Boulder at that time. The most important consideration in train transportation is that they must run on schedule, so that you can count on being where you need to be on time. Trains in Europe run on time, so I know it is possible for us to have equally dependable service. I also am in favor of toll roads. I mentioned that my husband was an Engineering student at C.U. during the '40's. One of their projects was designing the "Toll Road", Highway 36 from Boulder to Denver. It was paid off long before it was expected, and it is no longer a Toll Road. In most states even after the toll road is paid for, a toll is still collected to pay for the upkeep of that highway. I think Colorado may have to adopt such a plan in order to keep up with the increasing demand for our highways. People who use the roads need to help pay for them. Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion. You have a very challenging job, but a very necessary one. I wish you success in the planning and implementation of all your projects.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	Comments on North I-25 EIS 1. This project seems misnamed, "North Front Range Transportation (Draft) Plan" would better describe the effort. 2. I prefer Package (Alternative) A. The following comments refer mostly to this alternative. 3. The study area and the alternatives should extend to the border and speak to the connection with Cheyenne. Cheyenne is the functional northern end of the region, not Fort Collins, not Greeley. 4. I strongly support the passenger rail in the mostly-287 corridor as proposed. 5. I believe the renaissance of the highway-85 corridor is an equal key to the future of the region as the 287 corridor. To that end the "commuter-bus" seems like too little a transit effort to promote transit oriented redevelopment. I recommend either bus rapid transit or rail as an expression of the statewide investment in this corridor. 6. "Commuter" Rail and "Commuter" Bus may reflect technical definitions of equipment and service, however they erroneously imply that the North Front Range is Denver focussed. A term which might make more sense to the public and reflect the region could be to substitute "Regional" for "Commuter." 7. I believe the 287 and 85 corridors are the social and economic main streets of the region. I-25 is a vital service corridor. The plan should reflect this by including freight movement and delivery along that corridor. 8. Similar to the need to acknowledge the Cheyenne connection, the plan should acknowledge the Estes/Rocky-Mountain National Park connection. This is a key access and attraction to the region. The plan should anticipate transit connection to complement efforts in the National Park and town.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	With ever increasing population of Northern Colorado and erratic gas prices, we need to solve our regional transportation nightmares. I believe a commuter rail from Fort Collins down to Denver, and possibly further, is that solution.
12/30/2008 Mail in Comment	A vote for package A using the Burlington Northern Tracks!
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	We strongly endorse an increase in funds for mass transit along the front range. We believe that a bus line from Fort Collins to Denver as an immediate, viable option but the long term solution must involve a commuter rail system like the one New Mexico is building between Santa Fe and Albuquerque down the median of I-25. Increase the gas tax and use development fees to reduce greenhouse gasses and urban sprawl. Please act now before the situation goes from bad to worse.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support Package A. It appears that this package offers the most transportation options. I have more comments and questions, but that is a good summation. Thank you for the opportunity to offer our opinions.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	We need plans for some sort of mass transit system (railed) along the Front Range of Colorado before residential and commercial development makes it impossible. To do so, this is key to the growth and sustainability of the region.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support PKG A. Thank you.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am writing to support Package A of CDOT's North I-25 Environmental Impact Study. I moved back to Colorado after having lived in the Portland, Oregon area for about fifteen years. During those years Oregon installed the MAX light rail. When the light rail was expanded to the west side, which is where I lived, the ridership in less than a year surpassed the quota that was predicted after two years in existence. I personally rode the light rail as much as I could and this was before the high gasoline prices. I say protect beautiful Colorado environment as much as is possible. Taking many cars off the road will greatly help Colorado just as it did for Oregon.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	A bus line to Denver now and a commuter rail through Fort Collins, to Denver in the future. We don't want sprawl along I-25.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	More roads/lanes will make it easier for people to drive, more people will drive and then they will want more lanes to ease congestion. A bus just rides with the traffic. Why take a bus in traffic if you could drive. A commuter rail is the only option if Colorado is committed to clean air and smart growth. In a time when gas is expensive we need to think of non-auto transportation.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I want to cast my support for package A for the DEIS. This is due to rail being constructed through existing towns and cities. I think the long term value from the investment would be much greater for these existing communities, rather than encouraging new communities next to I-25. Also in regards to homeland security, it would be wise to separate the various means of transportation.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support package A because it most actively incorporates public transportation options
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	As a Fort Collins community member, I want commuter rail on the existing railways throughout Colorado.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly favor working toward greater availability and use of public/mass transportation means, therefore, I support Package A for our region.
12/30/2008 Email	I have looked at the alternatives for the North I-25 EIS, and as a citizen of northern Colorado, fully support Option A, with a commuter rail and stopping point in Berthoud. I can't remember if there are options for transfer centers in north Longmont and/or south Loveland, but I feel that a centrally located transfer center in Berthoud would be a great alternative. Please consider this as my comments on the information that was presented in the public hearings. Thanks.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I appreciate the efforts of the Transportation Department to look at a solution to the I 25 project. I have two thoughts and comments. Having been a train user for the better part of my life I support the idea of developing a commuter line along the Front Range. I believe, it will be difficult to make the line profitable, or at least sustainable, due to the automobile culture in this country and the relative low density of population. The rail needs to be made awfully attractive to the population (schedules, connection points, price per ride etc) or there just simply will not be enough usage. I agree, that a rail system could help improve our downtowns. However this will only happen in context with reducing the noise currently produced by the loud train horns. The horns are blown several times during the night, as well as during the day, at a decibel level of 90 to 113. If the plan to route more trains for commuter rail does not include either an effort to revise the Federal Policy on train horns or the establishment of Quiet Zones, the development of the downtowns just simply will not happen as desired. On the contrary, more current residents will have to relocate out of the down town areas and areas along the train lines to preserve their quality of life, sanity and health. A very recently published study in JAMA confirmed in an overwhelming way the negative effect of noise and interrupted sleep on cardiac health in a way not even expected by the medical community. Downtown development, customers for downtown businesses and train usage go hand in hand and need to be considered together. Northern Colorado communities need the support of the railroads to solve this problem - just like RTD set aside several million for the creation of Quiet Zones along the proposed commuter rail in the Bolder, Lafayette, Longmont area. Thank you for your consideration. It will make a difference in whether I can remain a citizen of Loveland and become a train user once again.
12/30/2008 Email	I am writing to express my option for the 3 DOT alternatives for north I-25. My choice is for the rail only option from Package A. This is the only option that fills three requirements of decreasing air pollution, decreasing usage of non renewable resources, and an increase in passenger safety on the corridor. There is a real fear among citizens of northern Colorado, especially the elderly, in using I-25, and additional traffic lanes will just mean more cars trying to funnel into the bottleneck that occurs in the vicinity of I-76 and the Boulder turnpike. Thanks.
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	I support rapid transit and Commuter Bus transit along I-25 North Corridor on the short term. On the long term, as quickly as feasible, I support commuter rail along the I-25 corridor. If this were an option between Fort Collins and Denver, (even Boulder and Colorado Springs) I would rarely take a car along the corridor. I strongly support transportation which would decrease carbon emissions.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I am writing in support of package A, based on my belief that, over the long term, a healthy commuter rail system linking our northern front range will be the most energy efficient, environmentally sensitive, and most conducive to quality, sustainable development. Ultimately, those attributes will also make it the most cost-efficient, if the true costs of highways and cars are really weighed, which they often are not in these studies. And I believe the public will support this. We may not have \$4 a gallon gas right at the moment, but we cannot forget that it will return, and people's demand for mass transit will continue to grow, as it already has. Building more highways just encourages the waste of energy, and invites continued high maintenance costs, which Colorado then struggles to fund. Beyond all the cost, environmental, and sustainability arguments that can be made -- I'm sure plenty of people are making them -- I believe people will support this as the best long-term solution, and that's critical. I've seen the efforts to support mass transit alternatives among the front range communities, including here in Longmont, where it was the one issue that people seemed to agree on, regardless of political ideology -- and that leadership was shown with the citizen approval of Fastracks and the agreement of so many cities and municipalities coming together around it. I implore CDOT to please get on board!
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	I strongly urge that our limited financial resources to be used to 1, create commuter rail from Fort Collins to Denver 2, run bus down I-25 and 3, create regional bus service. The commuter rail is the least expensive and would benefit the most human beings living in the Northern Colorado area. This would also benefit the environment by improving air quality and creating less congestion with cars on roads thanks!
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I support the necessary safety upgrades on I-25, mass transit components of Package A, and most specifically commuter rail connecting city centers on existing track from Fort Collins to Longmont, there connecting with Denver Metro FasTracks and RTD bus routes. While I think bus-rapid transit is a good choice in some areas, I do not think it's appropriate for the I-25 corridor. It would also concentrate all transit options along I-25, and not serve the large populations and existing towns and infrastructure in Loveland, Ft. Collins, Berthoud, etc.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I attended the first meeting in Fort Collins and have followed the process with great interest. Public transportation among the Front Range cities makes good sense. I have travelled extensively in both the US and Europe - New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Boston, San Francisco, Athens Greece, Vienna Austria, two weeks in Switzerland, Paris - to name a few. It works so well and is a pleasure. Please please select Option A which puts the stations in the cities and towns where the people are! It's amazing that we have the railroad right of way yet can't make the obvious decision to use it. From downtown Fort Collins the fast track would facilitate travel for commuters, shoppers, entertainment venues in Denver, senior citizens, 25,000 students at CSU. As a senior citizen this would make visiting our son and family easy, safe, and fun. We could board in Fort Collins, get off at Union Station, take the light rail and arrive within walking distance of his home. We already get to Park Meadows or Littleton on existing light rail. Whoopee. Again, OPTION A is the only good choice. I-25 is Hell on Wheels. Thank you.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I favor option A
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We do our very best to conserve energy & reduce our carbon footprints everyday. Now it's time for all of us to make a big, big difference for all of Northern Colorado. Choose Package A of North I-25 EIS. Gas, especially cheap gas, will not be around for much longer. We would love to have an alternate to driving our car to Denver for daughter visits, etc. We need the good, environmentally sound Package A.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I strongly support option A which provides commuter rail in addition to I25 land additions. I believe this plans for the future needs and allows a transition from current driving habits of our population to more efficient and ultimately more affordable and convenient transportation options. This plans for current and eventual needs in services and will go far toward preparing for a sustainable future transit to fit the population and development pressures that exist and are evolving.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I live in Old Town Fort Collins and am writing to express my support for Package A of the N I-25 DEIS project. I believe that Package A will be beneficial to our area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Colorado has one of the fastest growing populations in the country; we need to do something to decrease traffic in I-25 and meet growing travel needs. Denver is one of the only large cities in this country without an established regional transit system. Thus the "No Action" alternative should not be considered.2) Although the initial investment of implementing Package A would be very high, in the end Package A will be good for the economy in this area as it will make northern Colorado a more desirable and safe place in which to live. In addition, it will hopefully negate need for future expansions of I25. The upcoming Obama administration has expressed interest in providing states with funding for infrastructure projects that would stimulate the economy and promote a cleaner environment as this one would.3) While Package B provides for public transportation through the use of buses, train service is more desirable than bus service for a variety of reasons: a) the bus service will not easily access Old Town Fort Collins. The well-being of Old Town is a priority for the City of Fort Collins and it's citizens. Buses leaving from the south end of town will be less convenient to those traveling from the northern half of town; b) trains are not subject to traffic delays and are thus faster and more reliable than buses; c) train use will help decrease carbon emissions; d) the frequency and size of trains can easily be adjusted by DOT in response to changing commuter volumes and needs; e) we already have a rail corridor to work with which will help facilitate construction of this project; and f) trains are likely to see more ridership than buses because trains are perceived as being more comfortable, aesthetically pleasing, and efficient by the public.4) Package B would add a car-pool lane to I25, however this is unlikely to result in a significant decrease in traffic volume as carpooling is simply too difficult for busy, overextended, geographically dispersed Americans. The additional all-use lanes proposed by Package A are more likely to decrease traffic density to some extent. My primary reason for supporting Package A, however, is that I suspect that train service will be more popular than bus service. High ridership of this public transportation option will significantly decrease traffic on I 25, resulting in fewer accidents, decreased noise and air pollution, and reduced commuter stress. <p>Thank you for reading my comments. I'm looking forward to improved public transportation in this region.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>I am disappointed that a ligh rail system does not exist between Fort Collins, Loveland, Longmont and Denver.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>We need to address the congestion issues on I-25 doing nothing now will negatively affect our communities in the long term. I am in full support of a bus line to Denver and a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver. Please take actions to make this happen.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>It would be a great benefit to myself and many of my friends that commute to Denver to have a more sustainable and affordable way to travel. A bus line would surely be utilized, as this saves on wear on our own vehicles and transportation is expensive. In the long term please consider a commuter railway through Fort Collins Loveland and Longmont!! It would be a God send in tough times!</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I think the way to go, is to think light rail/highspeed between Ft. Collins and Denver.</p>
12/30/2008 Mail in comment	<p>We need a light rail or public transit system connecting the Northern Colorado communities. This would both help the environment and reduce congestion and tax dollars spent on I-25.</p>
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	<p>I am writing to express my support for rail connections between Northern Co cities of Fort Collins, Loveland, Greeley, and into Denver, and my opposition to expanding I-25 by adding additional lanes.</p>

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/30/2008 Email	<p>CLEAN ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS FOR NORTHERN COLORADO</p> <p>Clean Water Action endorses "Package A" (with modification) of the North I-25 DEIS. Package A is a clean energy transportation solution for the future environmental and economic prosperity of northern Colorado. The future transportation systems available to northern Colorado residents will be a key feature that determines how this area develops as well as the environmental and economic health of the landscape and the citizens. Transportation systems that promote hi-density core-city redevelopment, reduce sprawl, incorporate transit, and provide safe and reliable means for moving people around will lead to a higher quality of environmental and economic health. In addition, fiscal responsibility that promotes the best use of taxpayer dollars will also increase economic opportunity and the overall prosperity of the region.</p> <p>"Package A" (with modification) of the I-25 DEIS is a clean energy transportation solution for the future of northern Colorado. Specifically, Package A will invest in transit that connects the city cores of Fort Collins, Greeley, Loveland, Berthoud, and Longmont, and will then be connected to the Denver Metro RTD/Fastracks systems. By investing in core-city transit systems, Package A will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce suburban sprawl by promoting core city redevelopment, • Promote between-city transportation in northern Colorado – which is the majority of current transportation patterns – rather than promoting increased commuting to Denver, • Reduce greenhouse gas emissions, VMTs, ozone, and air pollution, • Reduce impacts to open space, wildlife habitat, and river corridors, • Reduce energy and water needs of a growing population, • Reduce the amount of money that citizens pay for transportation and gasoline, • Increase bus, bicycle, and pedestrian travel in the cores of cities, • Increase the economic health of the region by investing federal and state transportation dollars in "Smart" projects that promote clean energy transportation solutions, • Maintain and increase the distinct character and economies of cities, • Decrease the amount of money cities and taxpayers will have to pay for new growth – core city redevelopment is much less expensive than sprawl, • Tie in directly with urban renewal planning of northern Colorado cities, • Fuel the New Energy Economy of northern Colorado, • Increase the overall prosperity and quality of life of citizens, • Serve as a national model for clean energy transportation in a growing metropolitan area. <p>The following modification to Package A is also endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Transit First": The passenger rail system for the Burlington Northern Sante Fe (BNSF) line should be built before I-25 is further widened. By investing in Transit First, the 1.3 billion-dollar expenditure for widening I-25 may be significantly delayed or completely unnecessary. Transit First will also significantly reduce ongoing maintenance costs on North I-25.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	PLEASE support a public transportation option - preferably a train to facilitate movement from Fort Colinsto DIA and Denver. I am willing to complete a questioneerif available. Thankyou.
12/30/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I would like to register my support for PACKAGE A of CDOT's North I-25 Environmental Impact Statement. Commuter rail can be a major benefit to the north I-25 transportation corridor.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Hopefully using 287 railroad lines rather than straight hard I-25.
12/31/2008 North I-25 Web Site	I feel it is very important to have commuter rail for the Northern Colorado area. We need to look to the future when gasoline is in short supply. Colorado will greatly benefit by having commuter rail.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	As someone who chooses not to own a car it would be incredibly helpful to have faster and cheaper transportation options around Colorado. The lack of transportation to surrounding communities seriously limits employment options I would also definitely make use of a commuter rail to Denver, which would help make trips to the airport less strenuous.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Congestion on I-25 is only going to increase. Adding lanes is not a sustainable solution. We need alternatives to using our cars. Since rail services will take time to construct a commuter bus is a good interim solution.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	A bus line to Denver through Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont to Denver is needed. This is not financial good times now - but when is?
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I commute from Fort Collins N to Denver for college and work. I speak for myself and all others who commute the same route that we need light rail service between Fort Collins and Denver.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Every time I drive I-25 I feel guilty. All that oil. All those fumes. Isn't there a better way to travel that would be better for the environment? If we had a light rail system I would make every effort to utilize it. While we wait for rail, a bus serving Fort Collins to Denver would be more than appreciated. I used to use the bus that existed.
12/31/2008 CDOT State Hotline	I am in favor of the down town to down town rail connection using the BNSF rail road.
12/31/2008 CDOT State Hotline	I am strongly in favor of commuter rail connecting down town to down town. Its better than highway expansion.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I would love the light rail from Denver to Fort Collins but please no 8 lane highway.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Please consider with top priority a commuter rail service from Fort Collins to Denver. This is best for air quality in Northern Colorado and also less expensive to build than auto or HOV lanes on I-25
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	We cannot build our way out of congestion with more lane miles. We need a multimodal approach focusing on buses in the near term and commuter rail in the mid and long term.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	My top transportation priority is a commuter rail system. It borders on the ridiculous that our state has still not embraced this option. Many of my faculty travel from Denver and Longmont to teach in Fort Collins. They would all use this system or a bus system were it available. Great change comes from leaders willing to take risks and from those willing to push into peoples comfort zones. The wild west is gone, it's time we recognized that fact!
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I feel that in order for Northern Colorado to truly address the energy issues and the future we must create a light rail to Denver. In addition to easing traffic and lowering pollution we will also improve business in our major city due to increase spending in Denver. It is the right move now and for the future of our state.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	As the front range becomes increasingly populated the commuter traffic will naturally increase. Colorado is miserably behind on it's response to this population increase in the Fort Collins to Denver corridor. Putting light rail in would make sense, both in trying economic times as will as in response to current ecological needs. Colorado needs light rail through Fort Collins to Denver.
12/31/2008 North I-25 Web Site	We fully support option A
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Expanding I-25 will lead to more cars and pollution I believe commuter rail is a good idea for northern Colorado. It will combat both problems and I know I would personally use such a system.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Northern Colorado has a large number of commuter communities along the I-25 corridor. A public transit along this corridor would attract many professionals who choose to live outside the capital and commute to work. Myself, I drive 60 miles a day round trip on a route that could easily be made to have public transit available.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	What we need now as we have needed since I moved here in 1978 is a commuter rail from Northern Colorado to Denver. How many times will all of us witness the high traffic congestion from Fort Collins to Denver and the unnecessary accidents that occur because of it before we all make the right decision. I urge you to create this commuter rail now. We need to decrease the carbon footprint and increase our goal of a sustainable transportation source.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I believe a commuter rail in Northern Colorado is a great idea to reduce air pollution and to provide a sensible resource for daily commuters. With a growing population in the area directly contributing to increased traffic and auto pollution, this will be an effective strategy to reduce carbon emissions. I do not commute to Denver everyday but I know I would use a rail to travel for personal reasons.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I fully support expanding public transportation between our northern Colorado communities. As I look for work, the ability to commute to Wellington, or Loveland, ore even Denver would be greatly beneficial, but the ability to commute without relying on expensive vehicles I'd rather not own (cars ect) would both expand my economic opportunities and minimize ugly sprawl.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Not only are they thinking of moving my job to Denver (without rail service I would have to quit my job), but I have asthma / bronchitis and having less cars on the road to reduce the brown cloud would help me breath better.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I believe that having an alternative transportation system from Fort Collins to Denver would not only be a convenience to the residents but also strengthen the ties between cities on the Front Range. Giving people a safe low impact option to and from our capital city is a no lose choice. Not only would this be an asset to me and my peers but to people from all walks of life in Fort Collins.-
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Please support the proposed commuter rail from Fort Collins to Denver. It's the least expensive option and just makes the most sense.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I'm writing to request that you strongly consider a commuter rail through Fort Collins, Loveland and Longmont to Denver instead of expansion of I-25. As a commuter 25-50% of my time I would be ecstatic to be able to ride the rail as opposed to driving.

North I-25 Public Comments Received During Draft EIS Comment Period: 10/31 – 12/31/2008

Comment Date + Source	Comment
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	I know my family and friends as well as myself would value a train or bus to travel to Denver. Gas is getting cheaper now, but not forever. An efficient and bike friendly system would be nice but a train or bus in and of itself would benefit the front range in so many ways.
12/31/2008 Mail in comment	Offering a commuter rail from Fort Collins to Denver makes more sense than spending million of dollars on expanding I-25 to 3 lanes. The rail line would provide many commuters a safer travel between work and home, especially during periods of bad weather, snow, sleet storms, This seems to be the best bet for the now and the future.