

AGREN BLANDO COURT REPORTING & VIDEO INC

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

IN RE:

I-70 MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR - REVISED DRAFT
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING PRESENTATION, OCTOBER 2010

PURSUANT TO NOTICE to all parties in interest, the above-entitled matter came on for public hearing on Wednesday, October 6, 2010, commencing at 6:08 p.m., at 185 Beaver Brook Canyon Road, Evergreen, Colorado, before Gail Obermeyer, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Colorado.

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

I N D E X

PRESENTATION:	PAGE
Mary Ann Strombitski	3
Kevin O'Malley	5
Scott McDaniel	9
PUBLIC COMMENTS:	
Amy Cole	39
Patrick Eidman	41
Michael Hocevar	43
Roger Westman	46
Ken Katt	49
Mary Jane Loevlie	52
Smoky Anderson	54

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE INTERPRETER: (Untranslated
3 Spanish.) Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
4 My name is Lilia. If anyone needs Spanish
5 interpretation, I'll be outside. Thank you.

6 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Lilia.
7 Welcome, and thank you for coming out on this
8 rainy evening to take part in our public hearing.
9 My name is Mary Ann Strombitski. I'll be your
10 facilitator this evening.

11 This is truly your opportunity to be
12 heard. If you have not signed up to speak at the
13 microphone, then we would urge you to do so in the
14 next ten minutes. Kristi will be on hand to take
15 your name down and get you signed up; so if you'd
16 like to, please see Kristi now or in the next ten
17 minutes.

18 I hope that each of you have had an
19 opportunity to view the displays and to ask
20 questions of the CDOT representatives that are on
21 hand tonight across the hall in the gymnasium.

22 During the Open House, you probably had
23 a number of questions. If after the general
24 presentation you'd still like to ask some
25 additional questions, please feel free to do so.

1 And even during our general presentation time here
2 this evening, we will have representatives across
3 the hall, still with the displays, so that you can
4 learn more and ask any additional questions.

5 Just remember, when you talk to CDOT
6 representatives tonight, that any questions that
7 you ask or any comments that you make will not be
8 considered formal comments until those are
9 captured either in writing or by one of the court
10 reporters that we have on hand tonight. We have
11 two of those folks on hand; one to capture
12 comments here in the auditorium, and the other in
13 the gymnasium, in the public comment area, where
14 you can privately give your comments. All right.

15 We have a number of ways for you to be
16 able to provide comment this evening, in addition
17 to the court reporters. I will direct your
18 attention to the hearing agenda. It gives an
19 outline of what we are going to be doing this
20 evening. Also, included with this packet is a
21 comment sheet. You certainly are welcome to write
22 out any comments this evening and drop those in
23 the boxes in the public comment area; or if you'd
24 like to hang on to this and think about it for a
25 bit, you can mail it in to the address on the back

1 of this form. You can also go online to CDOT's
2 website and be able to provide comment.

3 Now, one thing I would like to share is
4 that a public hearing is different than a lot of
5 public meetings. So if you ask questions tonight
6 at the microphone, they won't be responded to
7 tonight, unless you ask those of somebody inside
8 of the gymnasium. But those questions or comments
9 will be captured and addressed in the final
10 documents. All right.

11 And without further ado, I'd like to
12 direct your attention -- we have Kevin O'Malley,
13 Commissioner with Clear Creek County, here tonight
14 who would like to provide additional welcome.
15 Thank you very much.

16 MR. O'MALLEY: Hello, everyone. I'd
17 feel a little more comfortable if I can hold onto
18 this microphone, so I don't start swinging my
19 hands all over the place. I would like to very
20 much welcome all of you to this beautiful facility
21 at Clear Creek High School. And I want to thank
22 the high school and the school district for
23 providing the venue for us tonight. And I want to
24 thank all of you for being here.

25 I've heard from a couple of folks from

1 CDOT who are wondering whether this rain we're
2 listening to is a good sign or a bad sign. And I
3 would like to tell those folks that it's a good
4 sign. We need some moisture, and we've needed it
5 for a while. The sheriff is in a much better
6 mood, now that he's not as worried about
7 wildfires. So it is a very good sign. Now, the
8 fact that I saw lightning strike out on the
9 practice football field just as I walked in the
10 door to the auditorium, that worries me a little
11 bit.

12 But those -- the folks from CDOT have
13 asked me to kind of encapsulate, in about three
14 minutes, 20 years of history. And so I'll see how
15 well I can do that.

16 This has been a very, very long
17 process. Six years ago, we had a meeting in this
18 building, if I remember correctly, and it was a
19 meeting, basically, exactly like this meeting
20 tonight. But I suspect that the tone of that
21 meeting was a lot different than what we will hear
22 tonight.

23 And what occurred is a lot of people in
24 Clear Creek County and all along this Corridor
25 invested a tremendous amount of time and effort in

1 understanding the transportation issues, and then
2 when this Draft was originally unveiled, they had
3 the feeling that they had been pretty much
4 ignored, both in substance and in process. And so
5 we were at a stalemate in December of 2004. And
6 fortunately for all of us, some leadership at the
7 state level decided that we weren't going to break
8 the stalemate, and that it was not a good idea to
9 let some federal judge somewhere break that
10 stalemate for us.

11 And so they invited everyone to the
12 table through a couple of different processes.
13 One of those was the collaborative effort that you
14 may have heard about, which brought 32
15 representatives of stakeholder groups that
16 included the agencies; which is the Federal
17 Highway Administration, and CDOT, the Army Corps
18 of Engineers, and there are probably a few other
19 federal folks there, representatives of
20 communities all along the Corridor, and
21 representatives of the environmental interests.

22 And I happen to be one of those 32.
23 And we sat around tables for, I don't know, eight
24 or nine meetings over the course of about that
25 many months, and had some very long, and in-depth,

1 and courteous, and not so courteous, and very
2 productive discussions, and we came to a Preferred
3 Alternative.

4 And that Preferred Alternative is
5 what's represented in the document that CDOT has
6 released as their Revised Draft. And the document
7 is not perfect. It's not perfect from Clear Creek
8 County's standpoint. It's not perfect from Vail's
9 standpoint. It's not perfect from Jefferson
10 County's standpoint. It's not perfect from CDOT's
11 standpoint and the Federal Highway
12 Administration's.

13 What it is is an agreement that works
14 for all of those groups. And it's something that
15 we can rally behind and now do the real work,
16 which is to make it happen. Because what you see
17 tonight is a first step that took 20 years to get
18 to. The second, third, and fourth steps hopefully
19 won't, combined, take that long.

20 But what those steps are and what we
21 have to continue to do is design the individual
22 projects that make up this Preferred Alternative,
23 find ways to fund those projects, and then build
24 them. And I think we can do that. It's not going
25 to happen just in Colorado. It will really take a

1 change at the national level, in terms of what we
2 want to do with our limited resources and whether
3 rebuilding and evolving our infrastructure is one
4 of the things we want to do with our limited
5 resources. And I'd certainly hope that that's the
6 decision that we come to. But anyway, that's kind
7 of the history.

8 And I haven't seen anybody put up the
9 clock, so I don't know how far over my three
10 minutes I have gone. But I would like to welcome
11 Scott McDaniel, who's the program engineer for the
12 I-70 Corridor. And he will make a presentation of
13 exactly what is in this document that, this time
14 around, was -- Flo, what did you say, 476 pages?

15 FLO: 486 pages.

16 MR. O'MALLEY: 486 pages. The last
17 document if you, you know, put it in 8-1/2-by-11,
18 which is what this one is, that document was about
19 3200 pages. So this one, at least, is easier to
20 absorb.

21 Again, welcome, and thank you for being
22 here. Scott.

23 MR. McDANIEL: Thank you, Commissioner
24 O'Malley, for that great, strong presentation. I
25 just want to share with the group some words of

1 wisdom that Commissioner O'Malley shares with me
2 every time we present something new. And he says,
3 "All right, but don't mess it up," so . . .

4 MR. O'MALLEY: That's not what I say.
5 That gets to the crux of it, but that's not what I
6 say.

7 MR. McDANIEL: So welcome. I'd like to
8 thank all of you for taking time out of your busy
9 schedules to learn more about what we are
10 proposing on the I-70 Mountain Corridor. My name
11 is Scott McDaniel, and I am the -- I work with the
12 Colorado Department of Transportation. And I am
13 the project manager for the I-70 PEIS. We are
14 really excited to be here tonight to share
15 information with you on the Programmatic
16 Environmental Impact Statement; which is really a
17 mouthful, so I'm going to refer to it as the PEIS.

18 This has been a long process, as
19 Commissioner O'Malley said. It has taken us a
20 long time to get to this point. And we couldn't
21 have done it without the countless hours of many
22 of you here in the audience tonight to get us to
23 this point. And for that, I want to thank you
24 all.

25 So the purpose of tonight's meeting

1 really is to receive comments on the PEIS. And so
2 tonight, during the meeting, we will give you some
3 background on the project and about the document
4 that we have prepared for this. And we also want
5 to help you find the information that you're
6 interested in, so you can make comments on this
7 document.

8 We have a number of staff -- a number
9 of staff positioned in the display room back here
10 who can help you with any questions that you might
11 have. And we have numerous information stations
12 positioned along the hallways and in the gym as
13 well. And as Mary -- as Mary Ann mentioned, we
14 also -- after this presentation, we're going to
15 have an oral comment period where you can sign up,
16 and you will have three minutes to present oral
17 comments. You can also give comments to another
18 court reporter that's positioned out in the
19 hallway.

20 And we have a couple other ways that
21 you can give comments as well. You can either
22 write them on a comment form or we have some
23 computers. If you're more comfortable with that,
24 you can type them in the computer. But those are
25 all good ways that you can give comments tonight.

1 And, lastly, we will be accepting
2 comments up to November 8. So you can, if you
3 want -- and I'll share more information with you
4 about how to do that -- but you can give us
5 comments up until November 8.

6 So we've been talking about the PEIS.
7 What is a PEIS? A PEIS is a National
8 Environmental Policy Act, or a NEPA, document.
9 NEPA is a law that requires any agency that
10 receives federal funds, like CDOT, to consider all
11 kinds of environmental impacts on their programs,
12 policy, or projects, before we can do anything.
13 So, in other words, we can't build anything until
14 we do a very comprehensive environmental study
15 first.

16 And so what this PEIS will do is it
17 will result in a broad Tier 1 decision that will
18 form the framework for the vision of the Corridor
19 as we move forward with future studies. So what
20 this PEIS does is it establishes a long-term
21 Corridor vision. It's a 50-year vision for the
22 Corridor. That was a really key component that
23 everybody that helped us come up with this
24 solution felt was important.

25 We didn't want to have a solution that

1 was going to be -- that was going to only have a
2 short life. We wanted to make sure that whatever
3 solution we came up with was going to continue as
4 well in the future. And we had the year 2050 as
5 our planning horizon for this project. So
6 anything that we do, we expect it to last that
7 long.

8 And the PEIS also identifies programs
9 of improvements. It defines the purpose and need
10 for this project. It also defines the travel
11 mode, capacity, and general location of the
12 transportation solution. However, this PEIS will
13 not result in any type of construction or impacts
14 to our environment or communities. But it does,
15 however -- it does consider the range and types of
16 impacts and the mitigation strategies that we'll
17 be using to move forward with future studies. So
18 that's what a Tier 1 document is.

19 What's the Tier 2 process? That's
20 really the next step. After we get through with
21 this, we will be going into the Tier 2 process.
22 And, typically, those are smaller projects that
23 fall with under -- they fall within the scope of
24 the Tier 1 decision that we are solidifying
25 tonight. And those Tier 2 projects are ones that

1 come up with the specific impacts and the specific
2 designs that will be implemented on the Corridor.

3 So, basically, Tier 2 is a deeper level
4 of detail about those projects. And those Tier 2
5 projects will be -- again, there will be project-
6 specific analysis done, and they will also refine
7 the alternatives and specific alignments and
8 design for those projects. Those projects will
9 have their own specific purpose to meet, but they
10 will also keep in mind the goals for -- that we
11 expect to have for this -- for the Tier 1
12 decision.

13 The Tier 2 project will result in
14 construction projects and impacts to our
15 resources, but they will also include project-
16 specific litigation as well. Again, the Tier 2
17 projects will fall within the travel mode,
18 capacity, and general location of the Tier 1
19 decision and refines the alternatives and
20 allows -- it does, again, come up with those -- so
21 let's skip to the next one. Sorry. I must have
22 got that a little mixed up. Let me make sure I'm
23 in the same place.

24 So, really, how did we get to where
25 we're at today? Commissioner O'Malley, he did

1 give you a little history of what has occurred.
2 We did -- in 2000, we issued a Notice of Intent to
3 prepare the PEIS. And then in 2004 is when we
4 released the first draft of the PEIS. And because
5 of that, we got a lot of comments back. And it
6 wasn't very well received, to be honest with you.
7 There was a lot of agency and public comment on
8 how we -- how we achieved the decision that we
9 came up with.

10 And so because of that, we really had
11 to take a step back and figure out how we were
12 going to proceed. And so with our stakeholders,
13 we tried to develop a process to improve how we
14 were going to formulate our solution for the
15 Corridor. And from that, we came up with the
16 collaborative effort process, which Commissioner
17 O'Malley referred to. And this team represented
18 people from all interests on the Corridor. And we
19 used an independent facilitator to help us come up
20 with a consensus for the solution that we wanted
21 to have for the Corridor.

22 And in 2008, the Collaborative Effort
23 Team came up with a recommendation, which we
24 called a consensus recommendation. And that
25 recommendation is now the Preferred Alternative.

1 We've worked with the Federal Highway
2 Administration to incorporate that decision into
3 our document.

4 So the next question is, what is the
5 Revised Draft? Again, this Revised Draft replaces
6 the 2004 Draft. And we decided to do a Revised
7 Draft, because as we started working on coming up
8 with a final document, we realized that a lot of
9 time has elapsed, and there are some NEPA
10 requirements that did require us to look at what
11 has changed since 2004. So we worked with the
12 Federal Highway Administration to determine what's
13 the best way for this study to move forward in the
14 fastest, most efficient way. And that's how we
15 came up with the Revised Draft concept.

16 And so what the Revised Draft does is
17 it does fully address the comments received in the
18 2004 Draft. It updates the analysis on all of our
19 environmental and community resources. It also
20 anticipates impacts of future construction. And
21 it also identifies mitigation strategies and
22 planning for the Tier 2 process.

23 And I don't know that I need to say
24 much about this. I think we all understand the
25 importance of I-70. We all know that I-70 is the

1 only east/west interstate in Colorado. It
2 connects communities with our recreational areas.
3 And it's important to the quality of life and the
4 economic base for our state for freight and
5 tourism.

6 So what happens if we don't do
7 anything? We all know that if we don't do
8 anything, growth is going to continue, and it's
9 going to lead to more trips up the Corridor. We
10 know that the Denver metropolitan region has a
11 huge impact on the travel patterns of the
12 Corridor. Travel conditions are currently
13 congested, and they are expected to get worse in
14 the future. Trips that now take just over three
15 hours will eventually take more than five, and the
16 congestion will be unbearable. We estimate in the
17 near future that there will be 9 million people
18 who will choose not to drive on the I-70 Mountain
19 Corridor due to the congestion.

20 So how did stakeholders participate in
21 this process? There are thousands of people that
22 helped us get to this point; and for that, we are
23 truly grateful. There's many people who have
24 donated their own personal time to help us come up
25 with this solution. And we found that stakeholder

1 involvement results in the best solution for this
2 Corridor, and we used that to get to where we are
3 today.

4 And the mechanism or the means that we
5 did, as we talked about, is the Collaborative
6 Effort Team. And the Collaborative Effort Team is
7 comprised of 27 stakeholders from Garfield County
8 to Denver. And this team worked to help us craft
9 the solution that we now call the Preferred
10 Alternative. And it formulated a long-term
11 stakeholder involvement process to help guide us
12 through this transportation improvement process.

13 One thing that we learned through the
14 collaborative effort process is the importance of
15 stakeholder involvement; and even more so, early
16 and often involvement with the stakeholders. But
17 because of that, we wanted to duplicate that
18 success. And so we came up with and we utilized
19 the concept called Context Sensitive Solutions.

20 CSS is a collaborative
21 interdisciplinary approach that involves all
22 stakeholders. It seeks to develop transportation
23 facilities that fit the physical setting and
24 preserve scenic, aesthetic, historic, and
25 environmental resources, while maintaining safety

1 and mobility. This is the Federal Highway
2 Administration's definition of CSS, and it really
3 holds true.

4 But the way we like to look at it is
5 that CSS is a process and it's an approach. And
6 it's based on the idea that transportation
7 projects should consider the big picture. So CSS
8 will guide all transportation improvement projects
9 in the I-70 Mountain Corridor. We are committed
10 to well-thought-out choices and to work -- that
11 will work now and well into the future. And,
12 again, I just want to reemphasize that we are
13 committed to early, continuous, and meaningful
14 involvement with the public and stakeholders.

15 So as we went through the PEIS,
16 obviously, the number of alternatives or the
17 number of things that we could do on the Corridor
18 are endless. And so what did we consider? Based
19 on -- we took a large look at a number of
20 different alternatives, but we did break them down
21 into some categories.

22 Besides the No-Action Alternative,
23 there are four general categories or families of
24 improvements that we considered. The first one is
25 the No-Action. And, basically, what the No-Action

1 Alternative is is what we're doing today. It's as
2 if we didn't do the study at all. We just
3 continued with our routine maintenance,
4 construction projects, with no capacity
5 improvements.

6 The next one is the Minimal Action.
7 And the Minimal Action involves only minor
8 infrastructure and non-infrastructure improvements
9 to improve small deficiencies with the highway
10 system.

11 And then next is the Highway
12 Alternatives. And the Highway Alternatives will
13 add roadway capacity and fix highway deficiencies,
14 such as sharp curves.

15 And then the next is the
16 transportation -- or the Transit Alternatives.
17 And Transit Alternatives introduce dedicated
18 transit service to the Corridor. And this is --
19 this is a very important step for CDOT and for the
20 Corridor; because, as we'll speak further, this is
21 part of what we consider to be a multimodal
22 solution.

23 And then the last one is the
24 Combination of Alternatives. And that is just the
25 combination of both roadway and transit on the

1 Corridor.

2 And as I alluded to, why do we need a
3 multimodal solution on the Corridor? As we went
4 through the alternatives development, screening,
5 and evaluation process, we, along with our
6 stakeholders, realized that no single mode of
7 transportation is going to solve our problem. The
8 relationship between capacity and congestion is
9 not direct. You can add capacity to a highway,
10 but it's not necessarily going to improve
11 congestion.

12 If you can remember that 9 million
13 number that I shared with you earlier, some of
14 those 9 million are going to get on this highway.
15 If all we do is highway expansion, they're going
16 to start using the highway, and that capacity that
17 we added isn't going to last very long before
18 we're back to the congestion conditions that we
19 are in today. So, therefore, we know that we have
20 to have a multimodal solution that includes both
21 transit and capacity highway improvements. And
22 that's the only way that we're going to solve the
23 transportation problem on the Corridor.

24 And what we really want to emphasize
25 tonight is the Preferred Alternative. This is

1 really where our focus has been. This is what
2 came out of the consensus recommendation that was
3 developed by the Collaborative Effort Team. And
4 what I want to point out is that this Preferred
5 Alternative for this project is unlike anything
6 that CDOT has ever done before. It consists of
7 four primary parts: a non-infrastructure
8 component, an advanced guideway system, a flexible
9 program of highway improvements; and, of course,
10 future stakeholder engagement.

11 The non-infrastructure components are
12 improvements that don't require new
13 infrastructure. Some examples of these are
14 providing traveler information. Some other
15 examples are we would be -- we would consider
16 shifting passenger and freight travel times to
17 either time of day or day of week. We also look
18 at things like promoting high occupancy vehicle
19 travel and also public transportation. We can do
20 a lot of these things at CDOT, but many of them
21 require action by our local communities, such as
22 land use controls.

23 The next part of our Preferred
24 Alternative is the advanced guideway system. And
25 this is the exciting part, in my mind. The

1 advanced guideway system consists of an elevated
2 train, mostly elevated. And it's mostly going to
3 be in the highway median. It's going to go from
4 the Eagle County Airport to C-470 in Denver, but
5 it also has a vision to connect to other transit
6 services. And that could be with the current
7 FasTrack Project, or it could be other things.

8 The technology that -- we haven't
9 identified the technology for the advanced
10 guideway system. That will be done in Tier 2.
11 But it could be things such as mag lev -- or the
12 magnetic levitation system, the monorail system,
13 or some other technology that's out there
14 that could work in our Corridor. And, again,
15 those will be done at the next level.

16 Some of the things as we're developing
17 the solution for the advanced guideway system, we
18 would, obviously, have to do a lot more study on
19 that. Some of the things that we would have to
20 study is the costs and benefits of those systems;
21 the safety, reliability, and environmental impacts
22 of those systems. We would also have to evaluate
23 the technology; again, the magnetic levitation
24 system, or monorails, or whatever technology would
25 best suit us.

1 We'd also look at ridership. And then
2 there would be other considerations that might be
3 outside these project limits. You know, there's
4 always that need to connect to other places to
5 make this a viable system, and we would certainly
6 look at those as well.

7 One thing -- the parting thought that I
8 would like to leave on all this is, every study
9 that we move forward with on this Corridor is
10 going to involve the I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
11 process with the involved stakeholder group and
12 come up with a solution that we need.

13 The next component of the Preferred
14 Alternative includes a Minimum Program of
15 improvements. And this is a flexible approach
16 that allows us to make changes and improvements to
17 the system, and they're phased in as needed. Some
18 of the components that are associated with the
19 Minimum Program of improvements, we refer to them
20 as specific highway improvements. This term is
21 very important, because these are improvements
22 that must be put in place before additional
23 highway improvements are considered.

24 But some of the things that are
25 included in the Minimum Program improvements, we

1 have more than 20 interchanges that we plan on
2 rebuilding throughout the Corridor as part of the
3 minimum program. We also have 25 miles of
4 additional auxiliary lanes. We would also have
5 new tunnel bores at the Twin Tunnel and
6 Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnel. And there
7 would also be other improvements for truck
8 operations, such as chain-up stations, that are
9 part of the Minimum Program.

10 I want to speak to the specific highway
11 improvements, because those are really what have
12 been identified as a high priority for the
13 Corridor. And what those specific highway
14 improvements that are part of the Minimum Program
15 are, is the six lanes from Floyd Hill through the
16 Twin Tunnel; and that would also include new bike
17 trails and frontage roads and connections to
18 frontage roads. We would look at the Empire
19 Junction interchange and see what improvements
20 need to be made there, with the -- with the
21 long-term vision that we want to incorporate in
22 that interchange complex.

23 We would also look at eastbound
24 auxiliary lanes at the Eisenhower Tunnel, as well
25 as westbound auxiliary lanes as well. And these

1 are all part of the Minimum Program of
2 improvements.

3 So the next is the Maximum Program of
4 improvements. Again, when we talk about the
5 flexibility of this alternative, we can have
6 things that are built within the Minimum, up to
7 the Maximum, and we can do anything in between.
8 But what the Maximum Program of improvements are
9 is everything in the Minimum, but we would also
10 have six-lane widening from the Twin Tunnel to the
11 Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnel. We would also
12 have four additional interchange improvements, and
13 then we would do curve safety modifications at
14 Fall River Road.

15 What I'd like to talk about next is,
16 how do we make those decisions? How do we know
17 when to do what? And that's where these triggers
18 come into play. We have identified -- the
19 Collaborative Effort Team identified triggers of
20 when things get done. And to identify what those
21 triggers are, the Maximum Program would only begin
22 only if -- the first trigger is specific highway
23 improvements and minimum -- in the Minimum Program
24 are complete and the advanced guideway system is
25 functioning. That's the first trigger.

1 The second trigger is the specific
2 highway improvements in the Minimum Program are
3 complete and the study proves that the advanced
4 guideway system is not feasible. And, of course,
5 the last trigger, which is very important -- I
6 think it's one of the most important ones in
7 this -- is local, regional, national, or global
8 trends or events have an unexpected effect on the
9 Corridor.

10 That could be a number of different
11 things. One of the things I like to throw out
12 there is that that could possibly be if we get --
13 you know, if we ever get a bid for the Olympics in
14 the future, this would allow for us to make
15 changes to our Preferred Alternative, maybe
16 advance the guideway system more. You know, it
17 would allow us to make accommodations for whatever
18 those changes would be.

19 And, again, I think this last one --
20 this last part of the Preferred Alternative is
21 what makes it so unique. And it's the ongoing
22 stakeholder engagement. We've talked about that a
23 lot tonight, but it is because it's so important.
24 And it really does allow us to come up with the
25 best solution for the Corridor.

1 And ongoing stakeholder engagement will
2 always follow the I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS
3 process on all future studies and projects.
4 Again, I can't emphasize that enough. That is
5 really the key to our success. It will also
6 include the Collaborative Effort Team. And they
7 will review the Corridor conditions and triggers
8 at least every two years. The team will
9 thoroughly review the purpose, need, and
10 effectiveness of these improvements in the year
11 2020.

12 And, again, this flexible approach lets
13 us focus on the immediate needs of the Corridor,
14 while maintaining that longer-term vision. That
15 is the key to the success of this alternative. So
16 that's what we're doing.

17 We also look, with the PEIS, at how are
18 things going to get effected? What are the
19 impacts, and how do we determine that in the PEIS?
20 As we all know, the I-70 Mountain Corridor is very
21 unique. And with this particular study, we're
22 looking at a 144-mile section of interstate
23 through very rugged terrain. And so you can
24 imagine that it's full of challenges, as we look
25 at what those impacts are.

1 However, this PEIS doesn't look at
2 every possible site-specific impact. We just
3 don't have the resources to do that. We also
4 don't have -- we don't know what those impacts are
5 going to be. We don't know the details of the
6 projects enough to know what exactly those impacts
7 are going to be. So what we try to do at this
8 point is just focus on the bigger picture. What,
9 in general, are those impacts going to be and what
10 are they going to affect?

11 We try to identify the important
12 resources of the Corridor, and we also look for
13 those areas that, you know, maybe have Corridor
14 bottlenecks. We also try to find those resources
15 that are the most sensitive to impacts.

16 Next, is, how did we analyze those
17 impacts in the PEIS? As you can see here in the
18 display, we've got some charts and graphs. If you
19 look at the document, there's thousands of charts
20 and graphs. And they will all help you understand
21 what those impacts are.

22 We reviewed and analyzed information
23 from agency data, public -- and published
24 technical reports. And the PEIS also does
25 describe a range of impacts that are

1 representative of our study. So what we tried to
2 do is evaluate what the Preferred Alternative is,
3 trends that we identified, and what those impacts
4 are. And as we all know, any construction that we
5 do will have impacts, and it will disturb our
6 resources. Even minor projects would have impacts
7 to our environment. The range of impacts is
8 related to the size and scope of those projects.

9 And when we look at the impacts,
10 there's numerous types of impacts. The first one
11 I want to talk about are direct impacts. Direct
12 impacts occur when transportation facilities
13 expand into areas next to the Corridor. So if we
14 do any widening, et cetera, those are going to
15 have direct impacts on our resources.

16 Indirect resources -- or indirect
17 impacts can occur when transportation facilities
18 change the Corridor conditions or character. Some
19 examples of that could be, like, induced growth or
20 changes to noise or visual conditions. And those
21 are some examples of indirect impacts.

22 We also looked at cumulative impacts.
23 And cumulative impacts occur when impacts of our
24 project, combined with impacts from other actions
25 in the Corridor, such as ski area expansion or

1 resource development, all join together.

2 So as we go through this process -- and
3 this is part of the NEPA process -- how does our
4 Preferred Alternative compare with all the
5 alternatives that we identified? And when we did
6 that, we felt like our Preferred Alternative best
7 fits the purpose and need of this project. It
8 relies on that 50-year vision. Maybe the
9 alternatives that we identified didn't even meet
10 the need of the 50-year vision for this project.

11 And, again, the flexible nature of this
12 helps us meet those future needs. And with the
13 multimodal decision that we have here tonight, it
14 meets both the capacity and congestion demands for
15 this Corridor.

16 Again, I talked about this earlier, but
17 how do the impacts of the Preferred Alternative
18 compare to other options? When you look at it and
19 you look at how the Preferred Alternative
20 compares, in general, the Preferred Alternative
21 compares -- the impacts are higher than the normal
22 action or most of the single action alternatives.

23 But when you look at it compared to the
24 combination alternatives, it's generally less than
25 that. So that's good. We do fall within that

1 range when we look at the impacts of the project.
2 And so it's not the highest, but it's not -- it
3 just falls within the range that we had identified
4 when we go through our resource analysis.

5 The last point I want to make is that
6 when we identify impacts, we don't always -- well,
7 we don't include the mitigation. So anything that
8 we do in the future, those impacts -- most of them
9 we will be able to mitigate or do something to
10 minimize those impacts.

11 And that leads to this next slide.
12 What mitigation strategy does the Preferred
13 Alternative include? One thing that we will do is
14 we will minimize the footprint process in Tier 2.
15 So what we analyzed in Tier 1 is -- could
16 potentially get smaller. And it's going to be our
17 goal, is to minimize that footprint in Tier 2 so
18 that the impacts are less.

19 Beyond designing solutions to minimize
20 impacts, we also have committed to ways of
21 minimizing both program- and project-level impacts
22 of the Tier 2 process. Chapter 3 of our document,
23 it describes how these strategies work. And we
24 also have four very important agreements that will
25 help us follow up on future studies and projects.

1 And I'll highlight these next.

2 This first agreement is the I-70
3 Mountain Corridor Context Sensitive Solutions. We
4 talked a lot about CSS. Again, this is the key to
5 how we identify what's important to our
6 communities and how we're going to deal with those
7 important issues. And, you know, another way of
8 looking at CSS, this is the how we are going to do
9 things. The PEIS is what we are going to do, and
10 CSS is the how. And that's what we're going to do
11 for all future projects.

12 We will always be mindful of the
13 Corridor context and its core values. All the
14 projects will follow a six-step decision-making
15 process that involves stakeholders in a meaningful
16 way.

17 The next agreement that we came up with
18 is the I-70 Corridor Programmatic Agreement. What
19 this agreement does is it establishes a process
20 for evaluating historic properties in the Tier 2
21 studies. It also includes details for all steps
22 of historic property evaluation. And this
23 document has been signed by more than 20 agencies
24 and organizations. If you can imagine the feat
25 that it was to come up with this agreement, it was

1 a monumental accomplishment for this study.

2 We also have some other agreements that
3 we're working on. And the next one is the Stream
4 and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program.

5 Again, you know, we're famous for having these
6 long acronyms. And the acronym for this is SWEEP.
7 And what the SWEEP agreement does is it protects
8 and enhances water quality of streams and riparian
9 habitats, and quality of wildlife. It defines a
10 process for complying with local, state, and
11 federal laws and regulations. It considers the
12 watershed context. It's focused on
13 sustainability. And there are ten signature
14 agencies identified for this document as well.
15 And we will have this document that will be agreed
16 to, and it will be part of the record decision.

17 And the last one I want to talk about
18 is A Landscape-level Inventory of Valued
19 Ecosystems, or ALIVE. And what this does is it
20 provides for long-term protection and restoration
21 of wildlife areas that intersect the Corridor.
22 We've identified 13 high-priority locations, and
23 they may be revisited in Tier 2. So we may add
24 some as well. And this, as well, has been signed
25 by seven federal and state agencies.

1 This next slide, I'm sure, has been on
2 everybody's mind, and it has to do with the cost
3 of the Preferred Alternative. We have estimated
4 the Preferred Alternative to be between 16- and
5 \$20 billion in the year that we expect to have the
6 money spent. Obviously, we're going to have to
7 have a new funding source. And that will be
8 necessary for us to implement all the
9 improvements.

10 We currently do not have all the money
11 identified at this point to implement the
12 Preferred Alternative. Currently, CDOT has just
13 over a billion dollars identified for I-70 in
14 state and federal resources for the I-70 Corridor.
15 But with this Preferred Alternative, what it
16 allows us to do is it allows us to implement
17 phases of the Preferred Alternative as funding
18 becomes available. And we will continue to engage
19 our Collaborative Effort Team to help prioritize
20 what these improvements are going to be and to
21 review those triggers for new improvements and
22 identify funding sources.

23 So what are the next steps for this
24 study? Well, we've been working on this for a
25 long time, and we are near the end, at least with

1 the PEIS. But this is a critical time for you to
2 continue to be involved with this process. The
3 public comment period for this project continues
4 until November 8. And we are very interested in
5 your thoughts and comments.

6 Of particular interest, we really want
7 to get your comments on the solution that we have
8 presented to you tonight, the Preferred
9 Alternative that we have identified for this
10 project. You can also comment on the Tier 2
11 process as well. And we will incorporate those
12 into our document. But most of those Tier 2
13 comments will be addressed in Tier 2. We will
14 just record them in this document.

15 So we hope to, after November 8, take
16 all the comments that we receive from everybody,
17 and we're going to incorporate them into the final
18 document. That final document we hope to have
19 ready by the winter of 2011. So just in a few
20 short months, we hope to have a Final PEIS for
21 this Corridor.

22 And the finale for it would be a record
23 decision. What does a record decision mean? The
24 record decision outlines how the Tier 1 decision
25 will be carried out. And it will identify how

1 we're going to identify or prioritize projects in
2 the future. And it also identifies the
3 relationship of this Tier 1 document with the
4 statewide planning process. And it also talks
5 about how the Tier 2 process will move forward.

6 And again, it's important to remember
7 that this PEIS will not result in any
8 construction. We hope that if everything goes
9 well, according to schedule, we can have a record
10 decision by the spring of 2011. And then what
11 that means is we can go right into the Tier 2
12 process and start working on the specific projects
13 that have been identified here tonight.

14 So with that, I'd like to thank you for
15 your attention tonight. I hope this presentation
16 has been both informative and thought provoking.
17 I'm going to turn the microphone back over to Mary
18 Ann, and we'll explain more about the oral comment
19 process, which is going to be coming up next.

20 If you haven't signed up, and you want
21 to do oral comments, please go outside and visit
22 the booth to do that. You can do that right now,
23 and you would probably still have time to make
24 oral comments. I would also encourage you to
25 visit our stations outside and ask any questions

1 that you need to feel comfortable with the
2 alternative that we have prepared for you tonight.

3 Again, I'd just like to turn it over to
4 Mary Ann, and we'll move forward with the public
5 comment period.

6 MS. STROMBITSKI: First of all, for
7 audience members, thank you for your attention
8 this evening. This does conclude the general
9 presentation portion. We are about to begin the
10 oral comments section. If you'd like to remain in
11 the room, you're welcome to do so and listen to
12 any of the public comments, or you can rejoin the
13 Open House across the hall in the gymnasium.

14 Now, for those of you who have signed
15 up, I think I have about five or six folks who
16 would like to make oral comment. I'm going to
17 give you some brief rules; just a quick reminder
18 of how we will conduct this portion of our
19 meeting.

20 You will see when you step up to the
21 mic that I would like to have you state your name,
22 spell your name, and provide your home address.
23 Then when your comment portion begins, you'll have
24 three minutes. For about two and one-half of
25 that, you'll see a green slide on the screen. The

1 last 30 seconds of that three minutes, it will go
2 to yellow. And then at the three-minute marker,
3 it will go red. At that point, I will ask you to
4 complete your sentence and wrap up.

5 And then, to be fair, if you do have
6 additional comment, we will have somebody who can
7 escort you to our other court reporter, where you
8 can privately dictate any additional comments.
9 But for this portion, everybody gets three
10 minutes. All right.

11 So for our first person who has signed
12 up, I have Amy Cole. Amy, if you could please
13 step to the mic.

14 MS. COLE: Hi, I'm Amy Cole. And my
15 organization is the National Trust for Historic
16 Preservation.

17 THE REPORTER: Please spell your name.

18 MS. COLE: And my name is A-m-y
19 C-o-l-e. And you want our address? It's
20 535 16th Street, Suite 750, Denver, 80202.

21 MS. STROMBITSKI: Amy, if you will
22 allow me one thing. Just to let people know, any
23 comments that are made will be addressed in the
24 final record. And any questions that are asked
25 will be captured here, but we will not respond to

1 those questions tonight. Thank you.

2 Thank you, Amy.

3 MS. COLE: Okay. So, first of all, I
4 would like to, along with a lot of other people
5 here, offer kudos to CDOT and the Federal Highway
6 on the 180-degree shift in the content, tone, and
7 vision. And we'd like to add respect for historic
8 resources that we see in this version of the
9 Draft, versus the last one. At that meeting six
10 years ago, (inaudible) screaming or crying, and I
11 think that's a positive thing that we should all
12 recognize.

13 In terms of specific comments on the
14 Draft, the 4(f) section I think is greatly
15 improved. And we hope in the final you can
16 provide some clarification on the application of
17 the constructive use of 4(f) resources; the
18 meaning of the buffer zone that's described in the
19 document now, especially as it applies to issues
20 like constructive use and noise.

21 Secondly, we ask that you add a better
22 description of CSS in the Executive Summary and
23 the Introduction, which Scott talked about quite a
24 bit. But if you look at the Executive Summary and
25 Intro, the actual purpose of CSS is not in there.

1 You have to go back to Appendix A to find that.
2 And we, obviously, all know that the purpose is to
3 produce a better-designed project, not just to
4 check a box and say that the process was
5 completed.

6 And last of all, I am sure I am not
7 alone in also saying that we appreciate all the
8 hard work that has gone into the revisions. This
9 is a huge task. And as someone who reads a lot of
10 PEISes, I'm happy to not read 3200 pages this
11 time. So thanks very much.

12 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Amy. Our
13 next speaker for comment is Patrick Eidman.
14 Patrick, if you'll state your name, spell it, and
15 then provide your address.

16 MR. EIDMAN: Yes. Good evening.
17 Patrick, P-a-t-r-i-c-k, Eidman, E-i-d-m-a-n. I'm
18 the endangered placements program manager for
19 Colorado Preservation, Inc. We formed in 1984 and
20 continue to serve as the only statewide historic
21 preservation advocacy organization in Colorado.
22 One of our flagship advocacy programs is the
23 endangered placements program.

24 In 2005, the historic communities along
25 the Clear Creek I-70 Corridor were listed as one

1 of Colorado's most endangered places. And it was
2 directly in response to that initial draft, and I
3 think we have heard tonight why that was. And so
4 I'm here tonight just to express our appreciation
5 and kudos for how the process has changed.

6 Since then, our engagement placements
7 program has four levels of status per site. It's
8 lost and saved, which are self-explanatory, and
9 then alert and progress. And the communities are
10 currently in alert status. I'll be recommending
11 to our board, at the meeting in November, that
12 they move into progress as an acknowledgment, you
13 know, for a number of different things; you know,
14 primarily probably the programmatic agreement for
15 historic resources; 4(f), how that's changed, how
16 dramatically that's changed; and, of course, also,
17 the visioning process that has been part of that.

18 So, again, we thank you. We appreciate
19 the acknowledgement for historic resources in the
20 Corridor; how significant they are and how unique
21 the Corridor is. And we hope that this CSS not
22 only continues -- and it's heartening to hear
23 learning that it's definitely part of the process
24 going forward -- but then also can serve as a
25 model for other projects around the state. So,

1 thank you.

2 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Patrick.

3 Our next speaker is Michael -- I hope I don't mess
4 the name up -- Hocevar (pronouncing).

5 MR. HOCEVAR: Hocevar.

6 MS. STROMBITSKI: Hocevar. Thank you.
7 Michael, if you'll state your name, spell it, and
8 then also give an address.

9 MR. HOCEVAR: Okay. My name is Michael
10 Hocevar. It's spelled H-o-c-e-v-a-r. And my
11 P.O. Box is 364, Georgetown, Colorado. And I
12 thank you for letting me talk here tonight.

13 My understanding is that serious
14 consideration is given to a rail system. And that
15 has a lot of good merits. And I do understand
16 that in order to get people to actually use the
17 rail system and get out of their cars, the key to
18 having that happen is you need to have a
19 significant benefit in time of travel for people
20 to do that.

21 And the very first proposal I ever saw,
22 probably like 15 years ago, of a rail system had a
23 route that was pretty much almost a straight line
24 from DIA to Vail. And so it probably would run
25 kind of about where Central City is. And that

1 would be a very efficient, very straight way. It
2 would use pretty much tunnels and tresseling to
3 make it through all that terrain up there.

4 Now they have hotel rooms in Central
5 City. Central City might even want something like
6 that. And that could probably be a very
7 beneficial route.

8 But everything I've heard about it
9 since that original proposal has been assuming
10 everything is just going to follow I-70. Well,
11 I-70, we all know -- and I've worked on rock and
12 soil stabilization projects -- and CDOT knows that
13 or they anticipate at least providing a highway in
14 15 years, probably a little bit less for a
15 railroad; so a significantly long time. Because
16 it's just extremely narrow, extremely difficult to
17 work. Transportation gets worse for the first
18 couple years while you're trying to build this
19 thing. And then you got all your eggs in one
20 basket, so if anything ever happened in that
21 Corridor, you could use both the road and the rail
22 at the same time.

23 And you also -- if this particular
24 train stopped somewhere like Georgetown or Silver
25 Plume or Empire, in going up Silver Plume Hill,

1 you got a very steep grade for a railroad to go
2 up. It would go at a crawl, almost completely
3 unfeasible on time. Trying to put everything in
4 I-70 seems to me to be a very unfeasible idea.

5 And one thing that this kind of reminds
6 me of a little bit was when they built the parking
7 lot above Black Hawk, the miners' parking lot, the
8 first guy who wrote and proposed that idea had the
9 idea to have a tramway, almost like an elevator,
10 coming down the parking lot. That would be very
11 quick and efficient.

12 I think someone at Black Hawk didn't
13 really understand that, never really caught that
14 part, so they just came up with the idea for a
15 rickety old bus slowly winding around. I see that
16 same type of thing happening here on this; that a
17 lot of people are kind of missing the idea you
18 just take a whole different route altogether. You
19 really to want (inaudible) the transportation.

20 MS. STROMBITSKI: Michael, you need to
21 wrap up your sentence.

22 MR. KOCEVAR: And so I thank you for
23 listening.

24 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you very much.
25 If do you have additional comment, please go to

1 our other court reporter in the gymnasium area.
2 Thank you. Our next speaker is Roger Westman.
3 Please state your name, spell it, and provide an
4 address.

5 MR. WESTMAN: My name is Roger Westman.
6 Can you hear me okay? My name is Roger Westman,
7 693 Old Squaw Pass Road, Evergreen, Colorado
8 80439. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

9 THE REPORTER: Could you spell your
10 last name, please.

11 MR. WESTMAN: Westman, W-e-s-t-m-a-n.

12 Like many of you, I've been to many of
13 these meetings. They've all sounded good in a lot
14 of respects, but when it was all said and done, we
15 thought, boy, that's a lot of money, and we don't
16 have any of it. And I don't think that's changed
17 today. We have prospects and so on.

18 But I read a book years ago, and I came
19 away from that book -- and I bet you some of you
20 have read that book -- with the saying, "Check
21 your premises. Check your premises." And I'm
22 guilty of not doing that very frequently, I'm
23 sorry to say.

24 But let's look at our problem. Our
25 problem is the congestion on I-70. That's why

1 we're all here. What can we do about that? Well,
2 if you get a whole lot of money in 15 years,
3 you're going to be close to solving your problem.
4 But I submit to you guys that we can solve the
5 problem tomorrow by using a federal highway. It
6 goes from Denver, to Park County, to Fairplay, and
7 right up to Breckenridge, which is where a good
8 lot of the folks in Denver are going anyway.

9 It would help that part of our state.
10 It would take some of the burden off us. It would
11 give everybody else an alternative route; call it
12 an escape or whatever. The only problem down
13 there is Hoosier Pass, which just has hairpin
14 curves. We're all familiar with hairpin curves.
15 I understand that CDOT has, in the past, done some
16 sort of engineering, and they know how to handle
17 that, straighten that out. But in the meantime,
18 for those of us that live here, those curves are
19 nothing.

20 The problem down there sometimes is a
21 snow blizzard, a snow ground blizzard. And I bet
22 you that CDOT knows something about snow
23 blizzards, and they can fix that if necessary.
24 And I think it would be a big boom to that part of
25 our state and clearly to the folks that are going

1 to Summit County.

2 So a long time ago, also, I was asked
3 by the County Commissioners to hold some hearings
4 on the applicability of RTD coming into Clear
5 Creek County. I was neutral on it, and I still
6 kind of am. But I thought RTD really didn't much
7 care about Clear Creek County. They cared an
8 awful lot about Summit County, and they wanted to
9 get our tax money along the way. And I thought
10 that was a really bad idea.

11 I thought if they wanted to come
12 through Clear Creek County, let them come. And if
13 we wanted to use their buses, et cetera, we'd pay
14 for it on a trip-by-trip basis. Otherwise, let
15 them go to Summit County and do what they want to,
16 then we get the benefit of some transportation
17 here if we're so inclined. Thank you very much.

18 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Roger.
19 And our last speaker is Ken Katt. And while Ken
20 is approaching the microphone, I'll ask one last
21 call. If there are any additionalists that would
22 like to sign up this evening, please do so with
23 Kristi.

24 Ken, if you'll state your name, spell
25 it, and give an address.

1 MR. KATT: Okay. Ken Katt. That's
2 spelled K-a-t-t; 2703 West Long Drive, Littleton,
3 Colorado. Do you need a zip code or anything?
4 No. Good to go. Okay.

5 I've been involved in this process for
6 probably ten years or so, going back to when the
7 facility --

8 THE REPORTER: Excuse me, excuse me.
9 You need to slow down and speak slower, please.

10 MR. KATT: But I only have three
11 minutes.

12 THE REPORTER: I know, but --

13 MR. KATT: Anyway, I've been involved
14 in the process for awhile. I remember some fiscal
15 restraint being applied, when they capped the
16 \$4 billion, and we didn't even have much of a clue
17 how we were going to come up with the \$4 billion.
18 Now that we've removed the cap, to come up a 16-
19 to \$20 billion Preferred Alternative, we have even
20 less of a clue where that money is going to come
21 from.

22 If anybody in this room wants to
23 understand how our nation has gotten itself
24 umpteen trillion dollars into debt, you don't need
25 to look much further than to study the process

1 which took this from a \$4 billion project up to a
2 \$20 billion project.

3 Now, let me ask for a show of hands
4 here real quick. Because I've been doing
5 everything I can to try to protect citizens of
6 Clear Creek County who live west of the Twin
7 Tunnel, because you're going to be seriously
8 affected by anything that goes on. So can I see a
9 show of hands -- can I do this? -- show of hands
10 of every Clear Creek County resident who lives
11 west of the Twin Tunnel. Okay.

12 Let me ask you what your priority is,
13 for those who live west. Is, in fact, your
14 priority to avoid a road project to widen the
15 highway, because you know that's going to
16 absolutely destroy your quality of life? Will you
17 raise your hand if that's your number one
18 priority? Okay.

19 Or is your number one priority to get
20 some sort of high-speed transit system that we
21 really don't have a clue how we're going to pay
22 for, except maybe go into Denver and just hope and
23 pray?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Transit.

25 MR. KATT: I support transit, too.

1 Okay. I mean, I wrote -- if you didn't buy a copy
2 of today's Clear Creek Current, you might want to
3 read -- buy a copy and read it. I wrote a letter
4 to the editor, which is back here -- if you don't
5 want to buy a copy of it, I've got copies right
6 here with my contact information on it. I'm
7 trying to get -- and I kind of addressed that
8 situation.

9 Now, one of the things that -- I don't
10 know how many of you actually read through and
11 studied the draft PEIS. I did, pretty
12 substantially. And one of the things it says in
13 there, it says: Building the bus and guideway
14 first, only preserved for highways, was viewed as
15 infeasible from an implementation standpoint.
16 Infeasible from an implementation standpoint. The
17 other ones were ruled infeasible, because they
18 didn't have the money. This is because it's
19 infeasible to do so.

20 Now, we don't have to accept the bus
21 and guideway the way it's presented in the Draft,
22 which is bidirectional all the way through Clear
23 Creek County. That would be devastating. It
24 would destroy the quality of life every bit as
25 much as the highway has.

1 MS. STROMBITSKI: Ken --

2 MR. KATT: I'll wrap it up real quick.

3 However, we can put in a single directional
4 guideway that helps people bypass a lot of the
5 congestion that backs up to the eastbound
6 direction behind the Twin Tunnel on Sunday
7 afternoon. Do the same thing, another section of
8 guideway will help people bypass congestion which
9 backs up in the westbound direction on Saturday
10 morning behind Floyd Hill. And it's not going to
11 take umpteen billion dollars to do it.

12 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Ken. We
13 do have two additional speakers. Next is Mary
14 Jane Loevlie.

15 MS. LOEVLIE: Hi, I'm Mary Jane
16 Loevlie, L-o-e-v-l-i-e; 110 Montane Drive, Idaho
17 Springs, Colorado. And I'm a veteran I-70
18 activist, I guess you would call it. I've been
19 involved in the MIS, the I-70 Task Force,
20 (inaudible), the I-70 Coalition Board, the
21 Collaborative Effort. And I've been one of these
22 studying this to death for the last 20 years. And
23 I've been a representative for the City of Idaho
24 Springs in many of these instances.

25 I would like to applaud CDOT, too,

1 believe it or not, for a totally different feeling
2 from six years ago. The collaborative effort has
3 truly been collaborative. And if we actually
4 follow through on what we have come up with in our
5 Preferred Alternative, it will be incredible. And
6 I encourage everyone to really read the document
7 and understand and study. There are many of us
8 that really do understand what the meaning behind
9 all of these paragraphs are.

10 I do have one comment on the Executive
11 Summary and probably throughout the document. My
12 pet peeve is where we say "widening." And this is
13 in the Executive Summary, page 22. And it's in
14 the first bullet point, you talk about widening to
15 six lanes, instead of capacity increases to six
16 lanes. I think that just needs to be changed
17 throughout the document. We need a six-lane
18 capacity, that doesn't mean we always have to
19 widen.

20 And I also just want to point out, as a
21 public record, I think Idaho Springs -- much of it
22 was intentionally left out, as far as
23 improvements. Because Idaho Springs is a much
24 bigger problem than that. Our three or four exits
25 now are one big project in itself. So I just want

1 it on public record that at the request of the
2 City of Idaho Springs, CDOT worked with us to
3 develop what they call the Area of Special
4 Attention Report.

5 This was a data and workshop on
6 visioning with the City. 40 citizens got together
7 for a day and a half and came up with what we
8 thought -- how we could close that gap in I-70 and
9 actually do the best they could; the City of Idaho
10 Springs, the citizens of Colorado, and CDOT. So I
11 just want it a matter of public record that this
12 visioning report is a part of the PEIS. And thank
13 you very much for your time. I'm glad we're doing
14 it.

15 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you, Mary Jane.
16 Our next speaker is Smoky Anderson.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. This is
18 Smoky Anderson, 507 10th Street, Georgetown,
19 80444.

20 MS. STROMBITSKI: Please spell
21 Anderson.

22 MR. ANDERSON: A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. I'm a
23 member of the Open Space Committee here in Clear
24 Creek County. And I'd like to thank CDOT and the
25 people that worked on the PEIS for including the

1 greenway system throughout the county. I think
2 that that was something that was greatly missed in
3 the first one. In the second one, they greatly
4 should be commended for including that.

5 As we go into Tier 2 and start looking
6 at further plans, further implementation along the
7 Corridor, certainly every member of Open Space
8 will be interested in working with CDOT and the
9 people there to ensure that the greenway is
10 rightly placed and worked with. Thanks for
11 letting me speak tonight.

12 MS. STROMBITSKI: Thank you very much.
13 And we don't have any other speakers at this
14 point. So our oral comments section is closed.
15 Please feel free to rejoin the Open House. If
16 you'd like to drop comments in the box or to talk
17 to our other court reporter in the gymnasium,
18 please feel free to do so. Thank you for your
19 participation.

20 (The public hearing concluded at
21 7:21 p.m., October 6, 2010.)

22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF COLORADO)

2)ss. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 COUNTY OF DENVER)

4 I, Gail Obermeyer, do hereby certify
5 that I am a Registered Professional Reporter and
6 Notary Public within the State of Colorado.

7 I further certify that these
8 proceedings were taken in shorthand by me at the
9 time and place herein set forth and were
10 thereafter reduced to typewritten form, and that
11 the foregoing constitutes a true and correct
12 transcript.

13 I further certify that I am not related
14 to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the
15 parties herein, nor otherwise interested in the
16 result of the within proceedings.

17 In witness whereof, I have affixed my
18 signature and seal this 13th day of October, 2010.

19 My commission expires May 10, 2011.

20

21 _____
Gail Obermeyer, RPR
22 216 - 16th Street, Suite 650
Denver, Colorado 80202

23

24

25